

particular situation which of all situations most conduces to such promiscuity—namely, the meeting of the girl who is poor and very pretty and the man who is rich and very careless, because he knows he may count on much forgiveness because he is rich.

Mr. Patterson's answer to Mr. Roosevelt's point that "extreme Socialists hold that all wealth is produced by manual workers, that the entire product of labor should be handed over every day to the laborer, that wealth is criminal in itself," is this:

They don't hold anything of the sort. What they do hold is that all wealth is produced by labor (manual and mental) and that no wealth is produced by merely owning a vacant lot and waiting for it to rise in value, or by cutting coupons from bonds. They do not believe that the entire product of labor should be handed over to labor every day. In fact, they are the very ones who advocate enormous masses of social capital, which is wealth withheld from distribution.

Mr. Roosevelt says that Socialists would "enthroned privilege in its crudest form" by allowing "each man to put into a common store what he can and take out what he needs." To this Mr. Patterson replies:

A still cruder form of privilege might exist—namely, to allow some men to put into a common store nothing at all and to take out a thousand-fold. This still cruder form of privilege than any of which Mr. Roosevelt can conceive is the one which now exists in America and other civilized countries. To take a most conspicuous example of its working, it is the privilege which we allow to the present generation of Vanderbilts and Astors and Thaws—the privilege we are preparing to accord to future generations of Rockefellers and Carnegies and Coreys—unless something happens first.

+

Now everyone who is at all intelligent about Socialism, be he advocate or opponent, knows that those statements by Mr. Patterson represent it truly, as to every one of the points he quotes from Mr. Roosevelt. What injustice, then, did our brief characterization do to Mr. Roosevelt's tirade?

+ +

### **Murder for Murder.**

Details of the electrocution of a woman in the New York prison at Auburn are somewhat more horrible, if possible, than the newspaper reports of her own dreadful crime. If lethal orgies like this tended to check murder, they would be justified by utilitarian standards of morality (vol. x, p. 102; vol. xi, p. 881). But in essential principle they could not be expected to do so, for the deliberate taking of life cannot in the nature of things foster respect for life; and in actual practice they are not a deterrent, as comparative sta-

tistics show. Revolting to wholesome minds, degrading to the minds they do not disgust, these legalized experiments in homicide tend only to gratify murder lusts and to augment the crimes they are vainly supposed to check.

+ +

### **An Advertisement Suitable for Use Anywhere.**

Mr. Taft's prosperity boom, turned loose several months ago, has gone astray. A suitable reward awaits the finder who will take the trouble to head it in this direction.

+ + +

### **A SECOND-HAND TARIFF VOTE.**

The hosiery hysteria is developing several new ideas of citizenship and stimulating a more thoughtful concern for its responsibilities. As some great reforms have grown out of insignificant incidents and trivial causes, so now a face to face recognition of the economic and political facts illustrated by the "stocking situation" promises to persuade woman of her own power—her own natural prerogative—to be expressed by and through an equal ballot.

The artful, insinuating invitation to "influence" the man-vote is to woman an actual revelation of her age-long stultification.

+

Woman, the original economist of short cuts and sensible savings, is being undeceived as to the necessity for proxies in the performance of her wish or will.

The vicarious vote is a vexation to her faith in herself.

The bland impudence of the dominant sex in promptly bringing to her good-natured genius for repair the battered and bungling policies of the commercial piracy of which she is the victim, exhibits a species of hardihood and a style of effrontery that not even submissive woman can by any stretch of self-respect approve or encourage.

The devoted habit of her sex has ever been to rise up and defend or applaud the authority by which her pride has been clubbed senseless. Stripped of her stockings she is suddenly "coming to." Every living organism has its vulnerable spot.

The progress of ideas is excusable, and woman need not be censured if her common sense is reached via her vanity instead of through some nobler quality. The peacock was born vain. His masculine human copyists have magnificently acquired and exemplified vanity, but, for the greater part, woman has had vanity thrust, buttoned,

hooked, laced, draped, painted, powdered and puffed upon her.

So much for endurance.

And in the necessary and diligent business of reflecting or skillfully revising this contributed vanity to please her august lord, she has forgotten and neglected—even denied—her worthier place and purpose in the scheme of life.

"Inconsistency" has always been the contemptible title bestowed upon woman by her chief critic, since it became his pleasure to create within her, by coercive means, a childish irresponsibility out of which only inconsistency could grow. So the charge is futile, infamous, hateful and cowardly, and must finally rest with and upon man himself, as his pitiful appeal for rescue, cried to those he holds incapable, shamelessly but stoutly declares.

The second-hand vote is the resort and stock-in-trade of political scavengers and junk men. It has lost its faith, its ideals, its integrity, fibre, force and virtue. It smells of subservience, seduction and shame. It is suffrage scrap.

Subject woman logically is good at bargaining, but instinctively she shuns the second-hand store.

Also, if starvation compels or surfeit advises the disposition of clothes or other comforts she effectually erases all personal identification marks.

Is her vote, then, in essence or principle, to be weighed up, junk-wise, by tariff thieves, panicky politicians, mendacious, mendicant merchants and assiduous advertising agencies?

+

Woman has borne much shame, but this last demand for her unquestioning, unthinking obedience to the sneering tyranny of political overseers must call forth rebellion or compel hopeless retreat.

Why should woman, personifying chastity, living all the social virtues and graces, clothed in beautiful morality and serving the spirit of holiness undefiled, all as strictly stipulated by superior man, finally degrade her honor and sink her immaculate pride in the unspeakable shame of a second-hand vote.

Can the security of first-class homes be strengthened by such political practice and material?

Can the safety of children and the sensitiveness of old age be protected or provided by such pathetic prostitution?

Can the mistaken gift and the vicious use of such votes ever be reconciled?

Can the ideals of noble womanhood ever be realized by the assigned votes of the barrel-house brigade?

The scavenger statesmen will say "Yes" as easily

as they say "No" to every measure proposed or advanced in the interest of better social conditions.

So long have they bought and sold in the open market—been bought and sold in dark closets and alleys,—that profit and preference are the regulating principles of their soulless, inconceivable traffic.

They scream and shout about stockings, but they are blind, deaf and dumb about white slavery, seduction, age of consent and the legal loopholes through which voteless women cannot pursue and destroy them and their institutions.

The scavenger statesmen and their runners call a vote a vote. Black, white or yellow. They gather them all at the lowest price and steal from woman a fair substitute for good measure.

+

Woman's wit and woman's skill, her discrimination and courage, are as efficient, as expedient, as reliable as man's.

Why not her vote?

Because she is the home-maker, and too often the home-supporter, men say "her place is in the home," while by their politics and other perversities they are unfitting themselves for its blessings, as they are unfitting the home itself to bless or benefit.

Are we trading first-class opportunities for a second-class life?

It is all in the vote—in *all* the votes.

Woman can save the day—and whatever stockings or other stock she needs.

*But not with a second-hand vote.*

GEO. E. BOWEN.

---

## NEWS NARRATIVE

---

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article, on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

---

Week ending Tuesday, March 30, 1909.

---

### The Recall Election in Los Angeles.

At the "recall" election in Los Angeles on the 26th (p. 277) the only contestants for Mayor—the Mayor in office having withdrawn from the contest—were George Alexander, the candidate of the "recallers," and Fred C. Wheeler, the Socialist party candidate. It was only by a close vote that Mr. Alexander defeated his Socialist adversary, his vote being 14,003 and Mr. Wheeler's 12,342.