

port them in this. And they will finally win either Statehood, or an independence conceded by the United States as preferable to the island's admission as a State, which latter alternative is to be considered highly improbable.

RELATED THINGS CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

PLEA FOR EQUAL SUFFRAGE.

Translated from the Norwegian of Bjornstjerne Bjornson
for the Chicago Evening Post.

She rose up, saying: "In this world no justice shall we see,

So long as you make all the laws and ask no help from me.

High have you flown since first on earth the master you were made—

A tower now to Justice build! For you that task is laid!

"Too long were you sole master here—too arrogant your word!

Too great the sphere you had to fill—too close at hand your sword!

For justice and for peace your course was never set to steer,

Your compass never pointing true while steel was lying near!

"The elements you conquered—aye!—and Nature's secrets found;

By power and by wisdom's might as slaves you have them bound!

But peace among you holds no sway—one hears alone the call

To strife and war, as if in life the sword were all in all!

"Our homes into the hands of debt in recklessness you gave:

You crowned the money-power king, and made yourself its slave!

But not you only bear those chains; in bondage must repine—

I see you understand me now—your children—yes, and mine!

"For them I ask you, on your way through life, take me along!

Through Justice lies the only path to Peace—to right your wrong!

For Peace it is you violate, and blindly fail to see
That Justice points the only way—so give it now to me!"

+ + +

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Henry H. Hardinge in the Chicago Teachers' Federation Bulletin.

If woman suffrage rests upon a foundation of opinion it may win or lose as opinion changes; but if its foundation is laid upon some enduring principle, then it will win and last forever, once it is established. That it rests upon a fixed principle can be readily seen if you will stop and consider the nature of the suffrage, and its relation to government.

There are two kinds of government in the world; one is government with, the other government without, the consent of the governed.

If just government rests upon the consent of the

governed, as it manifestly does, then you can neither consent to nor dissent from an act of government, unless you can vote.

This is the true basis of suffrage, it is founded upon the eternal principle of liberty, and sex has nothing to do with the case; it is not a privilege, but is a right. Privileges can be withdrawn by the grantors, but rights are inherent; all the rights you have, or can have, you get when you are born and they last until you die; and if the question of woman suffrage ever was tried before a competent legal tribunal, which had sufficient brains to interpret the Declaration of Independence and sufficient courage to promulgate its findings, woman suffrage would be as much of an established institution in this country as the polling booth itself.

But lacking the vote does not or should not keep women from thinking about political subjects, and if once the women of this country become sufficiently well informed upon the subject of the initiative, the referendum and recall, proportional representation, local self-government, local option in taxation, and the science of taxation in general, they will be so well informed that they will want the ballot—want it hard; and there is no force in American society powerful enough to keep them from getting it.

+ + +

EXPERIENCE IN WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Hon. John D. Long, Formerly Governor of Massachusetts,
Before a Committee of the Massachusetts
Legislature.

"I was in Colorado and saw an election there. My daughters and their grandmother voted. I watched them and as I saw the process the whole argument about contamination vanished utterly into thin air. The election in that Colorado city was as orderly as in Hingham or in any ward of Boston. I have a tender feeling toward my own; I should object to any infringement on the delicacy of their lives, but they were not put to half so much notoriety or exposure as they would have been in a street car or at a concert or in getting into this room. My daughter, who is now working as a physician in the New York slums, comes in contact with the saddest elements of a great city. The exposure to which she was subjected at the election in Colorado Springs was nothing to the exposure which she faces now and of which I am very proud.

It is sometimes said that a woman ought not to vote, because she cannot fight. This is not true; she can. Some women lately have shown themselves pretty heroic against invading burglars, while some men have run away. A vote has nothing to do with fighting; it is the expression of an intelligent opinion. Besides, we are not going to have much more fighting.

It is said that women do not want to vote. Well, not half the men vote. You cannot drum them up to vote even in exciting elections. Most men do not want to vote, but if it is a question of right, it would not be just to deprive me of a vote because some other men do not want it. It has been said that the best way to repeal a bad law is to enforce it. If the majority of women really do not want to vote give them full suffrage and they will at once elect men who will repeal it.

There is no argument against equal suffrage, on the ground either of right or of expediency. It takes little or no time. The ordinary man does not give three hours a year to the exercise of suffrage. There is nothing in it to impair the nature of women. It has been tried in the election of school committees and who is conscious of the slightest effect which it has had in absorbing the time of women, or of unsexing them, or of affecting their domestic relations?

* * *

SHALL THE WIVES OF WORKINGMEN GO INTO FACTORIES AND SHOPS?

Editorial in the *American Machinist* of October 11, 1906.

A thing to contrast with the song of praise we are continually hearing about the great benefits conferred upon humanity by labor-saving machinery is the suggestion recently made in *The Independent* by Dr. Simon N. Patten, who is professor of political economy in the University of Pennsylvania and a recognized authority upon economics. In this article he expresses the opinion that wives whose husbands have an income of less than \$20 a week ought to work in the factory, the shop, or the office, to help out with the family expenses. His principal reason for this appears to be that the introduction of labor-saving machinery now used in factories has largely done away with much of the labor which was formerly performed by housewives within their own homes, and yet the necessity for their laboring exists. As Dr. Patten may readily ascertain, comparatively few of the workingmen of this country earn as much as \$20 a week. If, therefore, his advice is sound, the wives of a large majority of such workmen should perform some work outside their own homes in an effort to help support the family. This, of course, would inevitably mean the neglect of the home-making duties, and the practical breaking up of many humble homes.

If the results of all our boasted advances in the sciences and arts and in the construction and use of labor-saving machinery are no better than this; if after all that has been done in that line, wives of men who earn far more than the average, recompense of labor in this country, must leave their homes for outside employment, and we must accept that as a necessary condition, then all our arts and sciences are of little or no real use.

Dr. Patten would, in our opinion, do much better if he devoted his talent to a study of distribution and to an answer to the question of why it is that colossal fortunes are being amassed by means of monopolies and special privileges of various kinds—money accumulated by men to such an extent that they are utterly unable to make proper use of it, while at the same time the problem of support for workingmen has become so insistent and obtrusive as to make it seem to him necessary to propose such a remedy.

And supposing workingmen and their wives generally accepted this suggestion, what effect does Dr. Patten think that would have upon wages and upon the constant tendency to force young children into factories?

Socialists who believe that the use of privately owned labor-saving machinery is one of the chief

causes of our economic and social evils and who seek to "nationalize all means of production" will welcome Dr. Patten's suggestion as an authoritative confession of the failure of the present system. We by no means make any such acknowledgment. We do not believe that machinery oppresses men. Monopolies do that. Unfair advantages; special privilege; failure to secure a "square deal" for every man; these are the things that hurt and when they are done away with we shall then have heard the last of the "crushing effect of machinery" and of the necessity for women with able-bodied husbands going out of their homes to work for daily bread. With all due respect to Dr. Patten, his suggestion is discreditable to the science of political economy as taught in our colleges.

* * *

WOMAN SUFFRAGE MILITANT: THE NEW MOVEMENT IN ENGLAND.

Edith Abbott, Ph.D., in the *New York Independent* of November 29, 1906. Dr. Abbott Writes from London.

The past year has seen the woman suffrage movement in England enter upon a new and militant phase of its career—and a phase that bids fair to become as triumphant as it has been misrepresented and misunderstood. The temptation of the journalist to furnish sensational and readable stories at the expense of the cause has undoubtedly been extreme; but the truth will out, and the English public has awakened to a consciousness of the fact that a serious campaign is being carried on by serious women—women who are so tremendously in earnest, so full of courage, so full of faith, so ready to sacrifice themselves for their cause that they have changed the amused indignation with which they were first regarded into a hearty, if an unwilling, admiration. After all, one must respect earnestness, more especially earnestness that braves ridicule in support of an idea.

It is now pretty generally understood in London that newspaper stories of shrieking hysteria and behavior too absurd to chronicle were only newspaper stories; that such disorder as occurred a few weeks ago was caused much more by the metropolitan police than by the women; that the leaders of the new movement are not women of the notoriety-seeking sort, but women of cultivation and refinement—university women, philanthropists, women well known and long respected for work in a hundred good causes. Among the women now imprisoned in Holloway Jail, for example, is Mrs. Cobden-Sanderson, one of Richard Cobden's daughters, whom Mr. Bernard Shaw in a pungent letter of protest to the *Times* described as "long known to every one worth knowing in London as among the most charming and interesting women of our day."

It must, of course, be clearly understood that this new movement is disavowed by the old-line suffragists and that the secretary of the national association has publicly disclaimed for her organization any connection with it. But it would be difficult indeed to say now, whatever may have been the case before the last Westminster pilgrimage, whether a majority of the men and women here who believe in the cause are with the old suffragists or the new. ~~As a matter of~~