

father, so long as the general policy is toward the democratic goal. For as that goal is approached those inconsistencies, no longer even seeming to serve a purpose, are sure to become obsolete.

What if "widows who do washing for the support of families" are to be given free water in Milwaukee as a special privilege? This is inconsistent with ideal democracy, to be sure; but though there may still be widows as we approach ideal democracy, there will be none "who do washing for the support of families." Ameliorative privileges like that will die off in a natural way as fast as democracy slays the great plundering privileges.

+

The third consideration, which involves the possibility of their realizing their municipal program, raises the most serious problem for the Socialists of Milwaukee to solve and their sympathizers to consider.

As to some of its items they will need the help of the State legislature, and this they may not get.

As to some they may be confronted with hostile judges, and sympathetic judges may be confronted with hostile precedents in the law books.

They may fail in ways that the voters who elected them will not understand, and make mistakes that may not be excused.

And through the city, and in and out among her people, there will glide the serpents of plutocracy, poison-fanged, hissing, coiling, crushing, clinging, their appearance transformed sometimes from devouring dragons into angels of light.

Big Business men may cry out to frighten little ones, churches may subtly coerce the superstitious, or confiding workmen may be panic stricken.

Milwaukee under Socialist rule may find herself near the lair of Judge Lindsey's "Beast," the moment her Socialist officials threaten its jungle. Whilom supporters of the Socialist candidates outside of the party—and even inside it—may thrill with a secret joy at the caressing touch of its velvet foot and tremble at the sight of its glistening teeth or the half playful scratch of its threatening claw.

All that and more like it or worse, the Socialist officials of Milwaukee may be expected to encounter. And if they make any progress at all in their program, the "Beast" may swell into national proportions, as it did when Mayor Johnson in Cleveland and Mayor Dunne in Chicago touched it on the raw in connection with the street car system.

Though this be the "Beast's" first encounter

with Socialism in power, it is not its first encounter with other enemies in power; and if in due time a majority of the voters of Milwaukee go over to the "Beast" and turn the Socialists out of office, no one need be surprised.

Novel methods may be necessary to enable the "Beast" to cope with its new adversary, but the "Beast," besides having the shrewdest advisers ready at call, is itself not unresourceful.

+

Those three considerations bring us to the fourth, which is that in meeting the responsibilities that have fallen upon it in Milwaukee, the Social Democratic party of that city should be encouraged by genuine democrats of every party and everywhere.

There is no question of joining the Socialist party; that is essentially unimportant.

There is no question of becoming a Socialist in the sense of accepting the Socialistic philosophy; that makes no practical difference at present.

The only question is whether those of us who are at one with Socialists in their purpose of abolishing the exploitation of labor—and this means all of us who are genuine democrats,—shall by hostility or indifference to them give aid and comfort to the common enemy, or shall encourage and support the Milwaukee Socialists in the democratic work that has come their way.

+

It is a gratifying fact that democratic Democrats and insurgent Republicans in Milwaukee made the Socialist victory of last week possible. It will be more gratifying if the same voters, though outside the Social-Democratic party, keep the Social-Democrats in municipal power in Milwaukee as long as they are faithful to their democratic program and efficient in advancing its realization. Voters of similar sympathies elsewhere may help along by refusing to be misinformed by newspaper misrepresentation.

+ + +

### CATHERINE HELEN SPENCE— PROPHET OF THE EFFECTIVE VOTE.\*

Catherine Helen Spence was born on October 31, 1825, in the beautiful Scottish village of Melrose on the silver Tweed. The historic Abbey met her childish gaze, and among her earliest recollections was seeing the long procession of mourners that

\*Catherine Helen Spence of South Australia died at Adelaide (p. 322) on the 3d of April, 1910, at the age of 84 years, 5 months, and 3 days.

followed the remains of Sir Walter Scott from Abbotsford to the family vault.

It is very easy in Miss Spence's case to trace out the relation between her heredity and environment and her subsequent career. She used to say of herself with a little touch of very human pride and satisfaction: "I count myself well-born; for my father and mother loved each other. I count myself well-brought up; for my father and mother were of one mind as to the care of their children. I count myself well-educated; for the admirable woman at the head of the school which I attended from the age of four and a half till I was thirteen and a half and left Scotland for good, was a born teacher and in advance of her times."

Her force of character and practical ability, her sound judgment and breadth of view, Miss Spence drew from her mother's side; while to her father she owed her literary sensitiveness and her abounding and irrepressible hopefulness. He was a lawyer, but not much of a money maker, and in the years of terrible financial depression that followed the close of the Napoleonic wars he was ruined and the family decided to emigrate.

Because they were Liberals and keenly interested in social and economic experiments, they decided to go to South Australia, then the land of promise for all such. They went out in 1839 as assisted passengers under the Wakefield colonization plan. But little Catherine was not a "desirable immigrant" within the meaning of the Act, and so her passage had to be paid in full.

For some years it was a close struggle. Her father, who was the first town-clerk of the municipality of Adelaide, died in 1846; but her mother lived to the age of 97, always taking the keenest interest in public affairs and in every way supporting her brilliant daughter. One brother, Mr. John Brodie Spence, was a cabinet minister in the young colony; and he and his sister pursued their sociological studies together. Their friendship, a peculiarly close one, was only ended by his death in 1902.

+

For her first few years of young ladyhood Miss Spence taught school, but gradually took up journalism, being a reviewer and literary and political contributor to the press in Adelaide and other Australian cities, besides writing five novels, all of which but one passed the stage of serial publication and found acceptance in London. An admirable text-book, "The Laws We Live Under," was an order from the Education Department.

But the seed from which was to spring her life's work had already been sown in her mind.

At the age of seven she used to watch her parents reading to one another over their breakfast the costly London paper (fifteen cents a copy); and observing how their spirits rose and fell with what they read, she asked her mother one day what was this Reform Bill they were always talking about.

The reply was never forgotten. "There are a great many people who think that all things are so right and good that if they were greatly changed mischief would follow; but your father and I think there is nothing made by men, even the British Constitution, that is so good that it might not be made better by men." That was the beginning. That answer became the standard by which later on every opinion, conservative or radical, was measured.

Ten years after, it was her father who called her attention to the principle of the quota embodied in the Adelaide municipal constitution by which a quota or quorum of the citizens, by giving all their votes to one man instead of eighteen votes to eighteen candidates, could elect him as councilor. This clause had been inserted in London by Rowland Hill of penny postage fame. With a new city charter it passed out of existence and its interest for us lies in the impression made upon the mind of a young girl, an impression re-awakened when nearly twenty years later Miss Spence came across Thomas Hare's "Proportional Representation" and in conjunction with it read John Stuart Mill's arguments for a fair representation of minority opinions. The title she gave in 1861 to her first published pamphlet on the subject, "A Plea for Pure Democracy," expresses its main appeal to her—not so much because it promised a more accurate system of representation, not because she was so eager to have minorities as such represented in the legislatures, but because she was convinced that a slovenly system of mob representation, whether the electing mob were a landed aristocracy or a body of wage-earners, was bound to result in political corruption with its horrible accessories of moral degradation and intellectual stagnancy. No system of election in existence came so near the democratic ideal of having the legislative and administrative bodies adequately and effectively represent the wishes of the entire community, and thereby of having legislation and administration "broad based upon the people's will."

To those who argued in distrust of the so-called uneducated vote her reply was ever, "The cure for democracy is more democracy." To those over-eager radicals who resented having the conserv-

ative element, whose preponderance in politics they had long been fighting, thus deliberately provided with their place in the legislature, she answered that until now politics have taken their tone and methods from war;—instead of a peaceful co-operation to make the Parliament a true mirror of the people, a representation of its convictions and its aspirations, it has been the outcome of a battle in each electoral district, as if injustice in one electorate would ever right a converse injustice in another electorate.

+

From this time on for a little over fifty years Miss Spence's main object in life was to bring about everywhere a just system of political representation, or, as she preferred to call it, Effective Voting. To this she gave the best of her thoughts and the last of her energies. The great English leaders of the movement, Hare himself, John Stuart Mill, Leonard Courtney, Lord Avebury, all of whom she met during a visit to England in 1865, considered that she had done more than any of themselves to make it a practical issue and bring it under the notice of the man in the street.

Her correspondents on the subject were to be found in every country in the world, including India and Japan. When in 1893 she came to the United States as Australian representative to the International Conference of Charities held in connection with the World's Fair of that year in Chicago she made exhaustive inquiries in every city she visited into methods of city, State and national government and carried home with her in her trunk an alarming list of examples of misrepresentative popular assemblies in the States, which she used ever after to sharpen the point of her remarks in urging more speedy action upon reformers in other nations. For she loved America and she thought it a terrible thing that a people so essentially sane and sound should have so much of their city and national life corrupted by the professional politicians who after all are such a mere handful compared with the great bulk of honest and well-meaning men and women.

While in America she gave more than a hundred addresses mainly on her two subjects: "Effective Voting" and "The Australian System of Boarding Out Dependent Children."

+

Besides her facile and convincing way of presenting what folks had thought as theoretical as the fourth dimension, and her faculty of bringing out its human side through her own intensely human sympathies, she made one important original

contribution to the Hare System as outlined by Hare himself. With this modification it has come to be called the Hare-Spence system.

His plan drawn up for England pre-supposed one nation-wide electorate, represented by say six hundred members. Each elector was to vote for as many candidates as he pleased, numbering them in the order of his preference. Each candidate who succeeded in polling over a six-hundredth part of the total vote (this forming the quota necessary for election) would be elected. Any votes not needed (surplus votes) to elect a successful candidate, or any which would otherwise be wasted upon a candidate far down at the bottom of the poll, were to be transferred to candidates already in possession of a heavier vote.

Miss Spence's improvement consisted in suggesting the division of the country into districts, each returning, say six members, thus doing away with the enormous and unwieldy electorate and the complications in both voting and counting the returns which would be inevitable under Mr. Hare's original plan. At the same time a six-member electorate gives room for ample freedom of choice and allows the two or three main parties to be represented in proportion to their power in the electorate, and also allows of any other party which is numerically of sufficient strength to poll over one-sixth of the total vote cast (which may be made up of both original first choices and subsequently transferred votes), to be represented by one member. And it is not possible for any party of less numerical strength to have any representation at all, which does away with the fear that a legislature so elected would consist of nothing but faddists.

+

Miss Spence lived to see Effective Voting adopted in whole or in part in several countries—in the State of Tasmania, in Japan, in Belgium, in Finland, in the Kingdom of Wurtemberg, in Sweden, in several of the Swiss Cantons, and in Denmark; while in nearly all other countries an active propaganda is going on.

It was always somewhat of a sore point with her that her own home, South Australia, which was the first country in the world to tax unimproved land values, which originated the secret ballot and the Torrens Act for simplicity of land transfer, which had the first juvenile court, which had led reform in so many other lines, should be obstinate on this the matter dearest to her heart. But after every defeat and set-back she always pulled herself together as she remembered her

consolation prize of steady progress in so many distant lands.

Her own most striking appeal to her own fellow-voters was made in 1897 when she, an enfranchised citizen of the first Australian State to give its women the vote, stood for election as a delegate to the convention called together to vote upon the question of the colonies federating into one Commonwealth. She was not anxious to be elected, but her candidature gave her an unsurpassed opportunity for carrying her gospel into the remotest corner of the colony.

South Australia has an excellent organization and great educative work has been done by Miss Spence and her co-workers, especially Mrs. A. H. Young, who has been for many years her right hand in bringing home to Australians the power of the Effective Vote.



In conjunction with Miss Emily Clark, cousin of Miss Florence Davenport Hill, Miss Spence was instrumental in bringing about those great changes in the public care of the dependent child which have made the South Australian system the envy of social workers everywhere. It encourages parental responsibility and at the same time makes it the State's business to see that every child deprived of his own natural home shall have mother love and care under a conscientiously supervised system of boarding-out. Since the State either pays the bills or sees that they are paid, the State calls the tune, and a very harmonious tune it is, since the welfare of her future citizens is its burden.\*



In private life Miss Spence was "Aunt Kate" to more than her own nephews and nieces, and at different times during her long life she filled a mother's place to three families of orphaned children.

Her vivid interest in whatever concerned human beings, either as individuals or as fellow members of a community, made her friends wherever she went. Her name is a household word in many an American home today. The last letters received from her showed no failing in vitality, and discussed the autobiography which she had just begun and was publishing in serial form. Her illness, therefore, must have been very brief.

Of her it may be truly written that she has died in the glory of youth.

ALICE HENRY.

\*See *The Public* of June 1, 1907, p. 213.

---



---

## EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

---

### HENRY GEORGE, JR., ON THE SOCIAL AWAKENING.

New York, Apr. 6.

Revolutions occur in two ways. One way is by roar and convulsion; the other, quietly—at times almost by stealth. The Single Tax idea is accomplishing a revolution in this country in the latter way. I have just concluded sixty addresses under the management of the Henry George Lecture Association, Frederick H. Monroe, President, and have spoken in nine States, Minnesota and Iowa being the most western. Everywhere I have found the utmost activity of Single Tax men for practical political results as well as for the propaganda work, and all stimulated to freshened efforts by the remarkable reports of progress of the idea in Canadian, British, German and Japanese politics. But what was far more significant was the readiness—even eagerness—of large general audiences for information about the Single Tax.

For of my sixty addresses, only eight were delivered under Single Tax auspices, Mr. Monroe's purpose from the beginning being to put his lecturers before the audiences already formed by educational, business, civic and religious organizations, rather than to undertake the trouble and expense of gathering special audiences. Therefore besides these eight times I spoke before nine Chambers of Commerce and lesser gatherings of business men, thirteen times before universities and lesser educational institutions, twenty-one times under religious auspices—eight of which were from Protestant pulpits—and nine times under miscellaneous auspices.

Among the latter was a debate with Mr. Arthur M. Lewis, the well-known and able Socialist lecturer, in the Garrick Theater, Chicago, at ten-thirty on Sunday morning, March 20. I had by letter in *The Public* declared this debate off on discovering that without consulting me, Mr. Lewis had changed the title from "The Theories of Henry George" to "Are the Theories of Henry George Exploded?"—a form of subject that I would not care publicly to discuss with anyone. But upon Mr. Lewis' desire to revert to the subject upon which we had originally agreed, I engaged in the debate and found what satisfied me as to the futility of such discussions between Single Taxers and Socialists at this time, when both, instead of trying to find how each differs from the other, ought to be engaged in fighting the common enemy, monopoly, no matter how defined. This is what is being done at the present time in Great Britain and Germany, where Single Taxers and Socialists generally waste no time in fighting each other, but work shoulder to shoulder in the great movements for democratic progress. Why not pursue such a policy in this country? I have for some time thought it best, and the debate with Mr. Lewis makes me all the stronger in that judgment.

My addresses before the business men's associations were for the most part devoted to Japan, its progress, and its tax problems, and to the land-grab attempts of our banking syndicates in the Far East.