

- 1886—Ontario gave municipal suffrage to widows and single women.
 1889—Province of Quebec gave municipal suffrage to widows and single women.
 1898—Ireland gave municipal and county suffrage to widows and single women.

School Suffrage.

- 1850—Ontario gave school suffrage to women.
 1861—Kansas gave school suffrage to women.
 1875—Michigan gave school suffrage to women.
 1875—Minnesota gave school suffrage to women.
 1876—Colorado gave school suffrage to women.
 1877—New Zealand gave school suffrage to women.
 1878—New Hampshire gave school suffrage to women.
 1878—Oregon gave school suffrage to women.
 1879—Massachusetts gave school suffrage to women.
 1880—New York gave school suffrage to women.
 1880—Vermont gave school suffrage to women.
 1883—Nebraska gave school suffrage to women.
 1885—Wisconsin gave school suffrage to women.
 1886—Washington gave school suffrage to women.
 1887—North Dakota gave school suffrage to women.
 1887—South Dakota gave school suffrage to women.
 1887—Montana gave school suffrage to women.
 1887—Arizona gave school suffrage to women.
 1887—New Jersey gave school suffrage to women.
 1891—Illinois gave school suffrage to women.
 1893—Connecticut gave school suffrage to women.
 1894—Ohio gave school suffrage to women.
 1838—Kentucky gave school suffrage to widows.
 1898—Delaware gave school suffrage to tax-paying women.

Miscellaneous.

- 1888—England gave county suffrage to women.
 1889—Scotland gave county suffrage to women.
 1894—England granted parish and district suffrage to women.
 1898—Ireland gave municipal and county suffrage to widows and single women.
 1887—Montana gave tax-paying women the right to vote on all questions submitted to tax-payers.
 1898—Louisiana gave all tax-paying women the right to vote on all questions submitted to tax-payers.
 1898—Minnesota gave women the right to vote for library trustees.
 1898—France gave women engaged in commerce the right to vote for judges of the tribunals of commerce.
 1901—New York gave tax-paying women in all the towns and villages of the state the right to vote on questions of local taxation.
 1902—New South Wales gave women state suffrage.
 1903—Kansas gave women bond suffrage.—Chicago Teachers' Federation Bulletin.



OLIVER TWIST HAS ASKED FOR MORE.

For The Public.

In the patois of Jamaica the term "buckra" signifies white fools. So says Mr. W. E. D. Scott, author of "The Story of a Bird Lover," a book in which he records the life history of a naturalist. The dictionary says that on the Calabar coast of Africa the term signifies a demon. "In the days of the colonial slave trade its African center was the region about the mouths of the rivers Calabar and Bonny, whither the captive Negroes were brought from great distances in the interior. * * * Their sufferings on the route are dreadful; many succumb and are abandoned. Rohlf's informs us that 'any one who did

not know the way' by which the caravans pass 'would only have to follow the bones which lie right and left of the track.'"

So the Calabar Negro called the white man a demon—not knowing any better, but in the West Indies and in the southern United States it means "white man."

Time was when the black man, or "nigger" (this form was not originally opprobrious) appeared as a demon to the ignorant imagination of the white man. Troublesome children were rendered "good" by the frightful warning: "The black man'll git ye!" But the white man and the black have grown to know each other better with the passage of time, with the result that the terms by which they describe each other have undergone a radical change of significance. In either case the original term for fear has come to express contempt. In the sentimental race-venedetta the black man's "buckra" matches the white man's "nigger."

In the "Story of a Bird Lover" men and their social relations are only touched upon incidentally. For instance, the author quotes a fellow-passenger on the boat that was conveying his party to Jamaica as saying: "The privileges of a white man in Hayti are not numerous, but exemplary conduct on his part always enables him to overcome the social disadvantages attaching to his unfortunate color." He dismisses the subject with the final statement that "our own amusing, amazing, not to say humiliating experiences later on in an island whose black population is six hundred thousand and whose resident whites number less than fifteen thousand, made the story quite credible. We came to understand how a black man may feel in a white man's country." A philosophic and manly view of the case.

Again, the author remarks that "Mr. W—— finds life very dreary here because of the social privations. Relations with the blacks are trying; one must not treat them with too great indulgence as they interpret this to mean fear. Some years ago Mr. W—— was employed as attorney for a Quaker firm in Portland, and they, wishing to act with great humanity, had toasted bread and coffee served to the employes on a cotton plantation every morning, and in other ways treated them with great consideration. As a result, the Negroes, thinking their owners were trying to propitiate them, called their employers 'buckra,' white fools. The enterprise failed."

Those three words, "the enterprise failed," were the only comment of our author; which was quite appropriate, for he was not writing a treatise on sociology, but a story of bird life.

But are not those words, in conjunction with the circumstances on which they formed a comment, profoundly significant to the student of sociology?

A few years ago a great manufacturing concern in the state of Ohio deplored the inefficacy of an experiment similar in kind, the employes in this case being intelligent, educated, high-class white mechanics. I refer to the case of the National Cash Register Company, which tested, on a somewhat expensive scale, the value of paternalism toward its employes, and was greatly pained when those employes, later, struck, to enforce a demand for an increase in wages. Many newspapers were surprised at the apparent ingratitude of the workmen. It was too bad (they thought) that the workmen should be so rude as to look the gift-horse in the mouth. However, the "enterprise" failed; that is, if the "enterprise" was intended to forestall an ocular inspection of the horse's mouth. And if it was not so intended, why such a hubbub about that particular strike?

Human nature is alike the world over. The Jamaican Negro laborer and the Ohio white mechanic are like Oliver Twist—they both "want more." And

when the mechanic gets to be a rich capitalist he still wants more; and if he cannot get it in fair business rivalry, he is not always above securing it through railroad rebates, private car "blinds," "icing" charges, ship subsidies, etc. Indeed, they do say that he has been known to go to the extent of "influencing" legislatures to help him to more than he could otherwise get. And "the more he gets the more he wants." But no matter how much he gets—one million, two million, ten million, twenty, fifty, one hundred million dollars—the "cupidity" of the man who gets the least, and asks for more, surprises him; grieves him sorely!

Yes, give a Jamaican Negro laborer toast and coffee, and it's more than likely he'll be asking for sugar and cream.

Give a banker the right to issue bank notes to the face value of his government bonds, and he's sure to ask the privilege of issuing "asset currency" to boot!

Give the earth to a railroad magnate, and he'll demand that it be exempt from taxation—and he'll get pretty nearly what he asks for.

Still, it fairly stupefies Mr. Bumble when Oliver asks for "more"!

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

"MANIFEST DESTINY."

For The Public.

"Benevolent assimilation"
Is still at its grewsome task;
Not once in its manifold efforts
Has fallen the pious mask.

Nor even when torture of natives
Was woven into a jest,
Nor at capture of Aguinaldo
Through cunning ruse of a guest.

Each act was extolled in its season,
In a series of similar crimes
On our history's page recorded,
Of these most prosperous times.

Meanwhile we are gazing at Russia,
Aghast at her frightful scenes,
The blackest of which can but rival
Our own in the Philippines.

Where "benevolent assimilation"
With Machiavellian wiles
Still remembers the first "plain duty"
We owe to our stolen isles.

Where, under a "strenuous" ruler,
But lately, for duty's sake,
Six hundred more natives were lying
Like grass in the mower's wake;

With their women and children mingled,
Crushed into the common grave,
Close clinging to husbands and fathers,
Out of the question to save.

And the wholesale feat was accomplished
At only a trifling cost;
Of our brave American soldiers
Only seventeen were lost.

The cheap-won, blood-dyed laurels
Belong to General Wood;
And our worshipful spoil-appraisers
Still call his handiwork good.

We boast of our peace-loving rulers,
And gains of one-sided war;
Our long-sighted national conscience,
Spying but evils afar.

We are used to the trick of glamor,
To the windings of disguise,
To the steering of wily pilots
Through a mist of goodly lies.

D. H. INGHAM.

THE MORO MASSACRE.

Letter by Moorfield Storey, President of the Anti-Imperialist League.

The cable from Manila brings us the news of an exploit by which, in the words of the President, our soldiers "have upheld the honor of the American flag" and over which this civilized Christian nation is expected to rejoice. What is it?

The island of Jolo is one of the smaller Philippine islands. Its area by the last encyclopaedia is given at 333 square miles, and its population cannot be large, as the same authority gives the population of the whole Sulu archipelago, consisting of 188 islands, with a total area of 2,029 square miles, as 22,620. In a crater at the top of a steep mountain were gathered a body of Moros, or, as Gen. Wood in his official report says, the position was "defended by an invisible army of Moros." This place was attacked by our troops, and, to quote the official report, "all the defenders of the Moro stronghold were killed. Six hundred bodies were found on the field. * * * The action resulted in the extinction of a band of outlaws."

What was their offense? Gen. Wood describes it by saying that they were men "who, recognizing no chief, had been raiding friendly Moros, and who, owing to their defiance of the American authorities, had stirred up a dangerous state of affairs."

A later unofficial report says that "the families of the Moros remained in the villages located in the center of the crater at the apex of the mountain, and the women and children mingled with the warriors during the battle to such an extent that it was impossible to discriminate, and many were killed in the fierce onslaught."

The severity of the resistance may be gathered from the fact that though the Moros were described as having an almost impregnable position, our forces lost only 18 killed and 52 wounded.

No prisoners were taken. No wounded remained alive when the conflict was over and 600 human beings were slain without mercy. Not even women and children in the villages were spared. Every American must regret deeply when any of our brave countrymen are killed or wounded, but that regret must be far greater when they are sent to their deaths for such work as this.

Suppose we had heard that the British had dealt thus with a Boer force, that the Turks had so attacked and slaughtered Armenians, that colored men had so massacred white men, or even that 600 song birds had been slaughtered for their plumage, would not our papers have been filled with protests and expressions of horror? They "recognized no chief and had been raiding friendly Moros." What was their side of the story? No man lives to tell it. They have been exterminated. Is it possible that this is all the greatest and freest nation in the world, as we like to believe ourselves, can do for a people over whom we insist on extending our benevolent sway?

This outrage unhappily is only one in a series. The bloody record of Philippine conquest tells of many battles where Filipinos were killed, but none were wounded and no prisoners were taken; of systematic torture, of villages destroyed by wholesale, of cruel reconcentrations, of brutality in every form. The responsibility for this cruel policy—certainly the responsibility for this last crime—is with the President and the secretary of war. If they had really desired to stop this work, they could have done it, but they have taken the opposite course. Save Gen. Smith, who was made a scapegoat when the public conscience was aroused by the horrors of Samar, no officer has been punished for cruelty. Bell, Waller, Howse and