

under her. Horace J. Gray, a real estate broker, has been commander of post 30, G. A. R., a white post, with hardly another Negro in it. Clement G. Morgan, orator of his class at Harvard, has served five terms in the city council and board of aldermen, and was barely defeated for a seat in the legislature. Rev. J. H. Duckery is the colored member of the board of trustees of the public library. As far back as 1870, a colored man, Patrick Henry Raymond, became chief of the Cambridge fire department, in which there was, at that time, no other man of color. A colored policeman has served for 19 years without ever receiving a reprimand or punishment, and, in all, seven colored men have had seats in the city council. To this must be added that the spirit of good citizenship is more keen in Cambridge than in most American cities.—N. Y. Nation.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN ENGLISH POLITICS.

An editorial in the London New Age for August 20.

That women are in justice entitled to the parliamentary franchise is implied in every argument by which that has ever been claimed as a right. Once for all, it is implicit in the principle, "no taxation without representation," by which some Liberals, even, justified the Jameson raid and the forcing of a war on the Transvaal. Yet nothing is commoner than to find even zealous Radicals professing indifference, if not hostility, to woman suffrage. When they give any better reason than the platitudes of the bar-room, as to the risk of domestic strife when women meddle in politics, they are apt to point to the "danger" set up by the supposed conservatism of the majority of women. And there can be no question that it is this fear that has turned many Liberals from the women's cause. Thirty years ago it was almost solely from Liberals that it had any support. To-day it has fully as many friends on the other side. Tories of the stamp of Beaconsfield and Churchill saw the possible gain to their cause from the conservatism of upper class women, and the work of the Primrose league bore out their forecast. Hence, apparently, the Liberal change of front.

It cannot be too emphatically said that this change stands for demoralization on both sides. Conservatives lean to woman suffrage solely on the score of the party gain they expect from it. Liberals oppose it solely or mainly from fear of the same thing, though they frame bad arguments of another kind in their own justification. Per-

haps the very worst of these was that put forward by Mr. Gladstone when he professed that he was anxious to save women from the "pollution" of political life—the life he himself lived for over half a century. All the while he was perfectly ready to employ them in the very species of political work which involves for them most risk of demoralization—that of canvassing, in which they are often tempted to use unfair and even illegal methods. Such inconsistency disposes of itself; the course so defended is visibly indefensible.

To show exactly how this species of deflection will affect the Liberal party in the future is no necessary part of the argument. An obvious danger however, is that if the promotion of woman suffrage is left to Conservatives the most earnest women will be led to join the Conservative cause, regarding Liberalism as synonymous with political injustice; while a Conservative measure will in turn be certain to limit the principle as far as possible to the damage of democracy. But for any thoughtful man it should suffice to reflect that less flagrant inconsistencies than this have obviously recoiled on Liberalism, and that the wider the bearing of a moral anomaly, the greater the certainty of the harm. The rationale of the case may be put in a sentence. Serious politics aims, if at nothing comprehensive, at the betterment of all social life, and thus faces the greatest problem that mankind has to attempt. That the greatest of all practical problems can be solved by bringing to bear on it the remedial and constructive activity of only half of the race, even in its most civilized sections, is as inconceivable a doctrine as could well be framed in politics.

The inference of common sense, on the contrary, is that the cooperation of man and woman is as necessary in the state as in the home, and when Liberals have the courage and consistency to give the vote to women as women—to wives, that is to say, as well as to spinsters and widows—they will find that even at the polls they will have their reward.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON ON TOM L. JOHNSON.

A letter to the Boston Herald.

The Boston Herald of Friday last has an editorial on Tom L. Johnson which is eminently fair and just. Its tone is in creditable contrast with that of certain independent papers which

profess a belief in democratic ideals while making haste to belittle and misjudge the truest democrat in American politics since Thomas Jefferson.

The bitter antagonism of Hanna and McLean, men of the same type in opposite camps, is a credential that should naturally draw to Mayor Johnson the sympathy and confidence of sincere reformers. The instinct of spoliemen is rarely at fault, much more to be trusted than that of editors who take for granted the verity of slanders emanating from hostile partisans and subsidized news channels.

I hold no brief for Tom L. Johnson, but I do hold for him a profound regard and admiration from long association and personal acquaintance. I venture to assert that the current accusations of disreputable methods used to compass Zimmerman's defeat will be found baseless. The victor carries the peculiar reputation of always fighting in the open. Who else in political campaigns offers such advantage to his opponent?

A double contest is waging against the mayor of Cleveland. The rich and corrupt elements of his own party have combined with the powerful Republican machine to crush him and his cause. Even were the combatants on the same plane a chivalrous and sportsmanlike regard for the weaker side would insure considerate judgment. But where the rare quality of unselfish and earnest purpose abides with the beleaguered, it behooves gentlemen to be sure of their ground when joining forces with such discredited assailants.

As a witness of Johnson's victory over Earhart, the recreant Democratic legislator who sought renomination after voting with the monopolists to defeat the reform measures of the past session, I expressed to the mayor my surprise at his temerity in challenging the prominent leaders of his own party. "When I can reach the ear of the people," he replied, "I have small fear of the result. As a rule men do not vote for evil measures knowingly. They err through ignorance, and not design. When the issues are made clear to them they act accordingly. Were this not the case a democracy would be impossible. I never stop to ask what are the probabilities of success when the duty seems clear. Had Earhart been nominated, I should not have been discouraged. It would only have necessitated our going down later and defeating him at the polls. It is far better to have an honest Republican elected than a false Democrat."

Johnson's tactics, however mysterious