

in reference to the position of the doors and windows, etc., in her house, asked the following question: "And now, my good woman, tell the court how the stairs run in your house," to which the good woman replied: "How do the sthairs run? Shute, whin I'm oop sthairs they run down, and whin I'm down they run oop."—N. Y. Tribune.

THE NONSENSE OF IT.

Short Answers to Common Objections Against Woman Suffrage.

1. "I have all the rights I want." Have you the right, if a married woman, to control your own earnings? Have you the right to make a will? Have you the right to your own child, if left a widow, supposing that your deceased husband, in some fit of ill-temper, bequeathed your child to the guardianship of someone else? Have you the right to the guardianship of your child, at any rate, if you have married a second husband? In many states of the union, women have not these rights; and you ought to be ashamed of yourself, if, not having them, you do not "want" them. Again, do you not want a right to vote on the expenditure of your own tax-money; on school laws, on temperance laws? You have no right to shut yourself within the circle of your own interests, and to say that you do not "want" such rights as these.

2. "If the laws are wrong, they are being corrected without women's voting." Aye, but not without the demand of women to vote, and the consequent agitation of the subject. That is what is changing the laws. The common law of England (which Lord Brougham called "a disgrace to any heathen nation," so far as it related to woman) prevailed almost everywhere in the United States, until the "Woman's Rights" agitation began. It was not till women began to talk about the ballot that any changes began to be made in the laws; and they have no security against the repeal of those improved laws, except the ballot in their hands.

3. "The polls are not decent places for women." No place is decent from which women are excluded. Women do not refuse to travel by rail because the smoking-car is apt to be a dirty place. They rightly demand that some other car shall be put on which shall be clean. It will be the same in politics. So soon as school suffrage for women became the law in Massachusetts, the legislature passed, almost without opposition, a statute to prohibit smoking and drinking at all voting places.

4. "Politics are necessarily corrupting." Then why not advise good men, as well as good women, to quit voting?

5. "If women voted, it would divide families." But families and nations have quarreled twice as much over religion as over politics, ever since the world began. If you allow women to choose their own religion, why not their own party?

6. "Women would only vote as their husbands or fathers do." Many women have no husbands and no living fathers. If they have, and vote as these men do, there will be no quarrel. If they vote differently—as they are very likely to do on questions of temperance, religion, and the right to control their own property or their own children,—then this objection falls to the ground.

7. "The best women will not vote." Will they not? Then they are not truly the best women. Women who are really conscientious will not shirk their duties when the time comes, depend upon it. The complaint has been, in Massachusetts, under the school suffrage law, that only the best women have voted. It is very hard to satisfy one's opponents.

8. "The most refined women will not vote." Many of the most refined women whom the land has produced have gone as missionaries to foreign lands, taught schools for freemen, visited the Five Points in New York, entered bar-rooms to save their husbands, or tended hospitals during the war. Will those same women shrink from dropping a piece of paper into a ballot box when the time comes? Refinement that takes the place of conscience is not worth much.

9. "Bad women will vote." They may and will vote, and so will bad men. But bad women will not vote openly as bad women; for vice in women, by instinct and policy, conceals itself and passes under another name.

10. "I should not like to hear my wife speak in town meeting." But you are often willing to pay other men's wives to sing in public, and if a woman may properly uplift her voice to sing nonsense, why not to speak sense?

11. "It will turn women into men." Happily you cannot do that. It is because women, after all, are different from men that they deny the right of men to represent them, make laws for them, judge them in court, and spend their tax money. If they are the same with men, they have the same rights; if they are distinct from men, they need the ballot to help make laws for themselves. Take which view you please, it comes to the same thing.

12. "Women are too busy to vote." Why not say, "Men are too busy to vote?" Men are apt to claim that their own day's work is harder than that of their wives.

13. "Women do not know enough to vote." That is always the excuse for excluding a disfranchised class. Bancroft says that the original charter of Delaware put the government into the hands of a royal council, on the ground that "politics lie beyond the profession of merchants." So the agents who came out with Sir Edward Andros to take away the liberties of the New England colonies wrote back, in great contempt: "It is pleasant to behold poor cobblers and pitiful mechanics, who have neither house nor land, strutting and making no mean figure at their elections." Now, the merchants and mechanics have the ballot and it is only women against whom the same old objection is brought up!

14. "Women do not want to vote." How can you tell, till you give them the opportunity? We gave the ballot to the freedmen, because we knew they needed it, whether they knew it or not. The more intelligent among them knew it, at any rate; and so the more intelligent women—the leading authoresses and philanthropists, for instance—know and say that they need the right of suffrage, whatever the thoughtless and frivolous may say.

15. "It will lead to a dangerous intimacy between the sexes." In an oriental country, a physician can only prescribe for a woman by feeling the pulse in an arm thrust from behind a curtain. But as no political intimacy would exceed that which already exists in this country between the physician and his patients, the clergyman and his parishioners, the school superintendent and his teachers, the merchant and his bookkeepers, the mill owner and his operatives—the objection is idle. If you honestly prefer Turkish institutions, go and live where they prevail; but if the American system is the best, let it be made consistent with itself.

16. "Women cannot fight, so they should not vote." Formerly women were refused permission to hold real estate, on the same ground. "When fiefs implied military service," wrote Dr. Johnson, in 1776, "it is easily discerned why females could not inherit them, but the reason is at an end. As manners make laws, manners likewise repeal them." The same reasoning applies now to voting.

Besides, the objection proves too

much. It appears by the published record of United States military statistics that out of men examined for military duty during the rebellion, more than a quarter were found unfit; but that this varied with different professions. Of journalists 740 in every 1,000 were disqualified, of preachers 974, of physicians 670, of lawyers 544. The majority of all these classes are as useless for warlike purposes as women; far more useless than the fighting women of Dahomey. Are these classes therefore to be disfranchised, like women? On the other hand, of all unskilled laborers only 348 in 1,000 are disqualified; of tanners 216, of ironworkers 189. Is the voting power to be taken away from lawyers and journalists, and to be concentrated on iron workers and tanners? We should do that to be consistent.

In the Prussian army, the most powerful in the world, Gen. McClellan tells us that all men are enrolled, and those unfit for field service are employed as military tailors or nurses. Once apply this principle to women and you may draft them for military duty as much as you please.

The amount of it all is, that woman must be enfranchised; it is a mere question of time. She must be a slave or an equal; there is no middle ground. Admit, in the slightest degree, her title to property or education, and she must have the ballot to protect the one and use the other. And there are no objections to this, except such as would equally hold against the whole theory of republican government.—Thomas Wentworth Higginson.

"HONOR."

To the practical American mind there is something comical, yet sad, about the constant flaunting before the world by the Spaniards of their "honor." What could be more grotesque, for instance, than a speech of a member of the cortes, we believe he was, who thanked God that while the Yankee pigs "might blockade their ports they could not blockade their honor." How wholly mediaeval their conception of honor is! Surely Spain to-day needs a new Cervantes, to expose with his sarcastic pen the utter emptiness, as far as anything good and useful to themselves or others is concerned, of Spanish "honor." It seems to be little, if any, better than the "honor" of the brawling duelist, exposed to the vulgar gaze and attack of every passer by. At best it is close akin to the honor of the brute whose rage and hatred of its stronger opponent lead it to seek self-destruction.

What a poor silly kind of honor it is that knocks its brains out against a stone wall rather than climb it.

Spanish "honor," as depicted by themselves, seems to be something inherent in them, something quite aside from any useful thing they do. And what could be more vapory and fantastic than honor of this kind. Men and nations, apart from what they do, are empty nothings. The kind of life they give expression to by their words and deeds is all there is to them.

What wonder, then, that a nation that relies upon a shadowy "honor" is utterly unable to stand before one that, with all its shortcomings, is still a nation of workers, of men who do things.—The New Earth.

SEEN AND HEARD IN CHICAGO STREETS.

Here in brief are the principles of that business which is called "modern" by the pessimist, but of whose aging and passing the optimist already sees signs.

I frequently buy fruit at one of the down-town sidewalk fruitstands. It is managed by a young and intelligent Italian, assisted by an older man who speaks less English.

In the absence of the younger man the other day I purchased some green grapes marked "sweet," which proved to be quite otherwise. A couple of days later, while purchasing other fruit, I gently rebuked the young man for having had the sign "sweet" over such very acidulous grapes. He looked ashamed, but managed to get his defense into words:

"Business man have do dat."

And then bethinking himself that it was not he who had sold me the grapes, he added:

"I not sell you dem, no. I sell dem idiots."

"Idiots" was evidently a happy word, and he repeated his statement with much satisfaction, probably not noticing the implication that the older man must have mistaken me for an idiot.

Again I gently remonstrated in behalf of good morals, urging that such discrimination was unfair, that all should be treated alike. But having vindicated himself of any intention of misbehavior toward me, with an air of superior business knowledge he smilingly replied to my statement of principle:

"Not pay, not pay."

ALICE THACHER POST.

It may be asserted in the broadest possible terms that it is the natural right of every man to employ his talents and industry . . . in the man-

ner which he considers to be most for his own advantage. . . . A law that seeks to check the course of this "free exchange" is inherently wrong. . . . If a person forcibly takes away a part of his property from another person, without any equivalent, it is simply robbery.—"A Policy of Free Exchange. Essays by Various Writers." John Murray, London, 1894.

"I don't understand it. When I gave my lawyer the facts in the case he decided it in five minutes."

"Well?"

"Well, when it got into the courts it took the judges three weeks to decide the same points, and they decided the other way."—Puck.

First Spaniard—The creature, ah, so magnificent! Who is it?

Second Spaniard—You do not know? That is Gen. Shaveter, the commandant of the forces American.

First Spaniard—Ah, ah! Ees he not well fed?—Cleveland Plain Dealer.

"This room is very close," remarked the guest to the head waiter; "can I have a little fresh air?" The well-drilled automaton raised his voice to the highest pitch. "One air!" he yelled; after a pause, adding; "and let it be fresh!"—Tit-Bits.

If drunk with sight of power, we loose
Wild tongues that have not thee in awe—
Such boasting as the Gentiles use
Or lesser breeds without the Law—
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

—Rudyard Kipling.

THE PUBLIC

is a weekly paper which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the really valuable news of the world. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without hope of discreditable reward. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both. Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department of original and selected miscellany, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, *versus* as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest. Familiarity with THE PUBLIC will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filling.

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico; elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to the date in the address label on the wrapper.

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by
THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, Room 622,
Schiller Building, Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:
THE PUBLIC, Box 667, Chicago, Ill.

SUBSCRIPTION AGENTS:

Western Reserve, Ohio, OTTO PRISTER, 316
American Trust Building (Telephone, Main 1069),
Cleveland, Ohio.