

HERBERT BIGELOW.

Herbert Bigelow has been elected President of the fourth Constitutional Convention of Ohio, now sitting at Columbus.



This election was the more conspicuous because Mr. Bigelow, in the campaign, doubted, and at times said that he doubted, his own election as a delegate, because, as he put it, "I have been so near to this progressive movement for years that many men have come to regard me with foolish fear." His fears in this were not without historic justification, for the fathers of political reform have generally had a Golgotha for their reward.

But this age seems to be rapidly reversing some features of the historic program. We have determined to stop encores. Old things are rapidly passing away; some things, if not all things, are becoming new. And this reversal is seen in Bigelow's election as president of the Ohio Constitutional Convention.

For fifteen years Mr. Bigelow has been the embodiment of the progressive movement in Ohio—this, with all due honor to Tom L. Johnson, whose energies were focused largely on the great

work done in Cleveland. But Bigelow, in that movement, has been the great apostle to the gentiles. He has worked throughout the State, stirring up every corner and cranny. He has made enemies in this work, and he has made warm friends.

Had his campaign occurred four years ago I question whether he could have been elected. Men, just a little while ago, were much prejudiced against him. But a tremendous change has occurred in four years. Men have come to understand him and his cause. Then, the fact that he was a Congregational clergyman, prejudiced many who denied clergymen the right to "mix in politics." But this age has turned the microscope on everything, including its prejudices, and it is looking to substance—not form.

Labels no longer scare. The age is protesting against infallibility masking under ancient form and alleged "guarantees." The Convention came to see nothing dangerous in Mr. Bigelow.

STANLEY E. BOWDLE.



WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN GREAT BRITAIN.

Our critical attitude toward the violence-wing of woman suffragists in Great Britain has brought us complaints from American woman suffragists, most of which add nothing to a better understanding of the situation. One critic, however, does, with painstaking care, explain the matter from the viewpoint of the militant side. This is Alice Paul, of Moorestown, New Jersey. She begins with a request for space to explain that an account of the woman suffrage agitation in great Britain "given in *The Public* of December 22, 1911,* contains serious misstatements of the suffragist position." We do not think that the editorial in question contains serious misstatements, nor that it contains any misstatements except the one explained below and to which our critic does not refer. But that the reader may judge we reproduce it here as an appropriate introduction to Miss Paul's criticism:

It may be that the cable reports which attribute last week's assault upon Lloyd George to the violence-wing of British woman suffragists, are in that respect untrue; but the act itself, the hurling of a box into his face with evident intent to do him physical injury, is so manifestly in line with the tory policy of that group as to make their responsibility for it fairly probable.

Whether this inference against them and their leaders be valid or not, there is no obvious escape

*See vol. xiv, p. 1282.

from the conclusion that the assault could not have been inspired by any democratic purpose. When attacked, Lloyd George was coming away from a Liberal meeting at which he had been speaking for woman suffrage. His speech was made in a campaign for equal suffrage for adults regardless of sex, which he is leading and which has every reasonable prospect of immediate success if the House of Lords do not use their limited veto—of success during the life of the present Parliament if they do. Tories are opposed to that policy, for tories stand for the classes and against the masses always. Those that oppose woman suffrage, want property suffrage for men alone; those that favor woman suffrage, want property suffrage for men and women alike; and both are opposed to adult suffrage. The special ire of both kinds of tory is excited against Lloyd George at this juncture because he is campaigning for adult suffrage on a democratic basis and is likely to succeed.

Lloyd George demands the abolition of "plural" voting, and in this the whole Ministry are with him, while the tories of both sexes are against him. He demands manhood suffrage, and in this also the whole Ministry are with him, while the tories of both sexes are against him. He at the same time and through the same Parliamentary bill demands woman suffrage along with manhood suffrage. On this the Ministry is divided, but the tories of both sexes are a unit against him. The difference between the two is that the Ministry have agreed to acquiesce if he gets the support of a majority of the House of Commons (which he has undertaken to do and doubtless will succeed in doing if violence by woman suffragists doesn't have the effect of driving away his weaker supporters), whereas the tories of both sexes are determined to thwart him if they can, to the end that the highly prized privilege of government by property instead of people may continue. This is the otherwise inexplicable meaning of the revival of systematic violence by a certain group of woman suffragists in Great Britain. It is the meaning, too, of the assault upon Lloyd George last week at the close of his London speech for adult suffrage regardless of sex.

Our mistake in the foregoing editorial resulted from a misapprehension of the cable news dispatch. We understood that Lloyd George's speech was "for equal suffrage for adults, regardless of sex." This was erroneous. Personally, Lloyd George advocates adult suffrage, but his speech, as we now understand it, was in support of a Cabinet compromise. It is a compromise which, if favorably acted upon by Parliament, will by amendment so alter the Cabinet's manhood suffrage bill as to extend the suffrage to about 7,000,000 women, inclusive of the wives of all male voters.



Replying to that editorial, Miss Paul makes three separate points. We give them in their order, and in full as she states them, together with our reply to each.

I.

On the first point Miss Paul writes:

First. You give the impression that the militant suffragists are opposed to a universal franchise (male and female) and are asking for a limited franchise.

Exactly the reverse of this is the case. The Woman's Social and Political Union (the organization responsible for the recent militant demonstrations) stands, as does the whole woman suffrage movement, for equality of voting rights between men and women. It has always asked simply for the removal of the sex disqualification. As long as men had a limited franchise women were willing to accept a limited franchise also. To demand more for women than was possessed by men would have been obviously impracticable.

Now, however, that the Government proposes a manhood suffrage bill, enfranchising all men, the militant suffragists demand that all women shall be enfranchised likewise.

In accordance with this demand for universal suffrage, the W. S. P. U. refuses to accept any lesser measure, such as the Conciliation bill, which is advocated by some members of Parliament, among them being Mr. Birrell, a member of the Cabinet.

This Conciliation bill (which provided for the enfranchisement of women householders, but denied to women the property, University, and lodger franchise possessed by men) was proposed, not by women, but by a committee of members of Parliament. The suffragists, while not in any way deviating from their demand for votes for women on the same terms as possessed by men, accepted this bill as a temporary settlement, because it virtually gave women political equality with men and because it made impossible the exclusion of women in any subsequent electoral reform act. "But now that women are to have manhood suffrage," says Miss Christabel Pankhurst in *Votes for Women*, Dec. 15th, 1911, "we cannot tolerate the Conciliation proposals, which would place women voters in a minority of one to twelve. These proposals would abolish one form of political disability of sex merely to substitute another. Because, while men vote by virtue of their manhood, women would vote, not by virtue of their womanhood, but merely as ratepayers."



(1) That the woman suffrage movement in Great Britain "stands . . . for equality of voting rights between men and women," is true enough; and it may verbally declare for adult suffrage, though we doubt if this has ever been done in behalf of the movement as a whole, or by all its organized bodies. But, whatever the verbal declarations may have been, our point in the matter is that such incidents as the violent attack upon Lloyd George in response to his speech for enfranchising 7,000,000 women, and the circumstances of that attack, are evidence of a tory spirit in the violence-wing of the movement.

(2) Miss Paul hardly states with accuracy at this point what the violence-wing is demanding at the present juncture; but further on in her letter she makes the fact clear that their demand is not exactly "for equality of voting rights between men and women," but that it is that *a bill enfranchising women be proposed officially by the Cabinet.*

One must understand that the Cabinet is composed of 19 persons, and that in order to carry their measures in the House of Commons they must be unanimous. Now, the Cabinet is not unanimous on woman suffrage, and nobody can effectively order them to be. But they are unanimous on manhood suffrage and on the abolition of plural voting. The latter questions were decided by their constituencies at the recent general elections. Woman suffrage was not decided at those elections. With a Cabinet divided on woman suffrage, therefore, a Cabinet bill including woman suffrage is a political impossibility. Any attempt by Cabinet leaders to force one would probably result in a dissolution of Parliament and new elections. The best that could be hoped for in those circumstances was the Cabinet compromise that has in fact been made, under which the Cabinet manhood-suffrage bill is to be so drawn as to make an amendment enfranchising 7,000,000 women, including the wives of all workingmen who are voters, easily adaptable to it on the floor of the House of Commons. Any such amendment adopted in the Commons is thereupon to be an integral part of the official bill and to be forced through the House of Lords with the rest.

Upon getting this compromise, Lloyd George stated that he believed he could secure the adoption of such an amendment in the Commons, and would undertake to do so. Instead of being aided in this, or at least let alone, he was assailed by leaders of the violence-wing of woman suffragists as insincere, and his efforts to accomplish the result were rancorously opposed by them and their organs. The politically impossible or nothing was the burden of their demand; and one result of their tactics was the violent personal assault upon George which we condemned in the editorial that Miss Paul criticizes. Such conduct on their part fully implies, as we look at it, that the violence-wing, unless utterly irresponsible, is influenced by un-democratic impulses.

II.

Miss Paul proceeds:

Second. You state that the renewal of militant methods is caused by the likelihood of the passage of a bill enfranchising men and women on a democratic basis, and that the militancy of the suffra-

gists is part of an attempt to avert the passage of such a bill in the hope of securing, instead, a limited franchise on a property basis, for both sexes.

This also is exactly the reverse of the real situation.

The recent renewal of militancy has been caused by the Government's announcement of a bill to be introduced next session giving the vote to every man but to not a single woman. The militant agitation is being conducted in the hope of forcing the Government to include suffrage for women on the same terms as for men, in its electoral reform bill.

Mr. Lloyd George and Sir Edward Grey (members of the Government) hold out to women the hope that woman suffrage may be secured by an amendment to the Government's manhood suffrage bill. Such an amendment is only too surely doomed to defeat, and is advocated, apparently, merely for the purpose of keeping the women quiet a little longer by deceiving them into the belief that the amendment may possibly be passed.

The Government is kept in office by a coalition having (Dec. 1, 1911) a majority of 118 votes. If woman suffrage were included in the Government bill it would command the entire coalition vote, regardless of the private opinion of the members of the coalition, and would thus be carried into law; for the defeat of the bill would mean the defeat and resignation of the Government and thereby the destruction of those measures in which the members of the coalition are particularly interested. If, on the other hand, woman suffrage is merely introduced as an amendment to the manhood suffrage bill, the 45 Liberals and the 22 Nationalists, who are personally opposed to woman suffrage, will be free to desert from the ranks of the coalition, since defeat of the amendment will not mean the defeat and resignation of the Government. These 67 adverse votes (counting 134 on a division) will wipe out the coalition majority, and the amendment will be defeated by 16 votes. This conclusion is based on the assumption that since the manhood suffrage bill is a party measure, the voting will follow party lines, so that support for the amendment cannot be anticipated from Conservative ranks. This supposition is strengthened by the recent public letter in which Conservative members of Parliament who have heretofore been active in supporting woman suffrage, declare their opposition to universal suffrage.

As far, therefore, as can be predicted in advance, there seems no hope whatever of the passage of such an amendment. It is for this reason that the suffragists are using every means to secure the incorporation of their measure in the Government bill instead of leaving it to an amendment which is practically certain of defeat.



(1) Miss Paul's second point is answered in part in our reply to her first. Bearing in mind the explanation in that reply, it should be readily seen that the political impossibility of forcing in

a divided Cabinet an agreement on a non-party question, a question not passed upon at the elections which brought that Cabinet into power, is almost absolute. But this is not all. When it is further considered that those suffrage organizations and leaders that are, by verbal and physical violence, now proposing to compel 19 disagreeing Cabinet ministers of a party in power to unite upon a non-party measure, were active at the elections of only two years ago in trying to disturb Liberal meetings at which Mr. Asquith spoke, and altogether peaceable with reference to Conservative meetings at which Mr. Balfour spoke, the futility of what Miss Paul calls their hope "of forcing the Government to include suffrage for women on the same terms for men in its electoral reform bill," would seem to be obvious.

(2) Miss Paul's argument that an amendment from the floor of the House would be "only too surely doomed to defeat," calls for special attention. Her reason, which is that of Miss Pankhurst in Votes for Women of December 1, 1911, is in effect that members of the coalition are free to vote against the woman suffrage amendment, whereas if the disagreeing Cabinet were to unite upon woman suffrage in *their official bill*, that measure would command the vote of the entire coalition. Why? Because, as she says (again adopting Miss Pankhurst's reasoning), "the defeat of the bill would mean the defeat and resignation of the Government and thereby the destruction of those measures in which the members of the coalition are particularly interested." In other words, if the Cabinet united officially upon woman suffrage, a non-party proposition on which they are in hopeless disagreement, it would make woman suffrage as *strong* in the House as the party measures the Cabinet has been commissioned by the elections to write upon the statute books—Irish home rule, abolition of plural voting, manhood suffrage, land value taxation, etc. There are phrasings which better express that toryistic idea. One of them is that Miss Pankhurst's policy would make those democratic measures as *weak* in the House as woman suffrage. And what then? Simply this, that defeat on the woman suffrage point, the non-party point, would bring on a dissolution of Parliament and at once give the Conservatives a third election in three years at which to utilize the existing un-democratic property-franchise, and its toryistic system of plural voting, in order to defeat the Liberals and the democratic proposals they have twice carried at general elections. If a policy involving this disaster to democracy did not originate in tory

councils, it has, at any rate, a pronounced tory flavor.

(3) And why should woman suffrage as an amendment to the Cabinet measure fail in the Commons? Miss Paul explains, again adopting Miss Pankhurst for authority, that there are 45 Liberals and 22 Nationalists (Irish) in the coalition who are personally opposed to woman suffrage, which would reduce the coalition majority to a minority of 16. The suffrage wing that Miss Pankhurst speaks for therefore demand that a divided Cabinet be forced into unity on woman suffrage, a non-party question, in order that 67 anti-woman suffragists may be given the alternative of voting for a non-party measure they are opposed to or losing the party measures they were elected to carry. If they refuse to yield, who would get the benefit? Not women who want the suffrage, but the tories, who want to baffle the democratic movement in all its phases with a try at another general election.

Meanwhile, what about those Conservatives who personally favor woman suffrage, or profess to? Aren't there at least a score who would vote for the amendment in order to make up any loss of Liberals? The amendment not being a party measure, Conservatives could vote it into the Cabinet bill if they wished to, even if they voted against the bill after the amendment had become part of it and the Liberals were bound by it. This would be shrewd Conservative tactics if the Liberals really are insincere in offering opportunity for that amendment. But Miss Paul implies that there are no such Conservatives. She tells of a public letter from Conservative members of Parliament who are in favor of woman suffrage but opposed to "universal suffrage." That is, they are willing to strengthen the Conservative party with more voters on a property basis, but not to let in any voters on the manhood and womanhood basis. In the declaration of those Conservatives you have the whole coconut—milk, meat and all. The Conservative woman suffragists are for woman suffrage with a tory string tied to it. But *they* are not disciplined by the violence-wing of the woman suffrage movement. The amenities of the missile are reserved for Lloyd George, who is trying, in spite of the obstacles which the violence-wing throws in his way, to secure a majority in the House for an amendment that would give suffrage to 7,000,000 women.

Miss Paul's British friends think him insincere. We think they are mistaken. Be that as it may, however, his way is manifestly the only possible way of getting woman suffrage at the

present time (without a miraculous conversion of Cabinet ministers); and if this wing of British suffragists were democratic, that is the policy they could reasonably be expected to pursue.

But the measure as a House amendment is certain of defeat, Miss Paul assures us. That is quite possible. We don't know, and she is of course only able to make a guess. As good a guess as hers, however, is that it is quite as certain of defeat, in existing political conditions, if a *Cabinet bill* for woman suffrage is the *sine qua non*. Without a unanimous Cabinet, woman suffrage as an official measure is not a political possibility; and unanimity on this non-party measure is beyond hope in a Cabinet some of whose members are as much opposed to universal suffrage as are any of the propertied-woman-suffragist Conservatives.

III.

For her third point Miss Paul says this:

Third. You refer to the action of the militant suffragists as being in line with "tory policy." May I call your attention to the following facts:

(A) Shortly after the recent militant demonstration, four influential suffragists in Parliament who belong to the Conservative party, the Hon. A. Lytton, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Mitchell Thomson and Mr. Ormsby-Gore, signed a protest against the renewal of militancy on the part of the women, and, together with other Conservative members of Parliament who are supporters of suffrage, urged, in a public letter (mentioned above), the support of the Conciliation bill which the militants entirely refuse to now accept.

(B) The National Administrative Council of the Independent Labor Party has recently passed the following resolution:

That in view of the Prime Minister's statement in regard to the proposed franchise reform, the National Council of the Independent Labor Party insists strongly that no measure will be acceptable which does not include both men and women, and urges that proposals for franchise extension which do not confer citizenship upon women should be definitely opposed.

The Council therefore calls upon the Government to introduce not a manhood suffrage bill, but a genuine measure of adult suffrage establishing political equality between the sexes.

Great numbers of local branches of the Independent Labor Party have passed similar resolutions, as have other labor bodies. The Aberdeen Trades Council, for instance, passed the following resolution on Nov. 29th:

That this meeting views with indignation the announcement by the Prime Minister that a Reform Bill extending the franchise for men only will be introduced next year, and decides to oppose by all means in its power any extension of the franchise which does not provide for political equality between the sexes.

The "Labor Leader," the organ of the Independent Labor Party, says in its issue of Nov. 24:

To talk at this time of day of Manhood Suffrage is to insult every woman in the country. The Prime Minister says the Cabinet is divided about Woman's Suffrage and therefore nothing can be done. A Cabinet has to take

action on many matters by majority vote without absolute unanimity being secured. We must unite the Cabinet on this question and that can only be done by outside pressure. The I. L. P. should throw itself valiantly into this campaign. The action of the Government has wiped out all differences in our ranks over policy, and we are all at one as to the line of advance. The purpose of our campaign is to compel the Government to bring in a genuine measure of political democracy, establishing the political equality of the sexes. Here are the three cardinal points: (1) Any fresh extension of the franchise to men that still leaves women deprived of the rights of citizenship should be strongly opposed. (2) We should not be content to wait for amendments to a manhood suffrage bill, since adult suffrage can only pass as a Government measure. (3) We must create such public opinion and bring such organized pressure to bear on the Government that they will be obliged to tear up their proposed manhood bill and bring in a full measure of political justice giving votes to men and women.



Paragraph A of this point does not seem to offer very strong proof against the theory of a tory spirit in the violence-wing of the British suffrage movement. Paragraph B speaks well for the desires of the Labor organizations mentioned; but it does not explain how to unite a divided Cabinet on a question regarding which there has been no party mandate, nor how even a majority in the Cabinet may be got for woman suffrage, if there is not a majority now, nor whether it would be reasonably prudent for a majority to force into an official party measure for presentation to the Commons a non-party measure over the heads of a Cabinet minority. As the Labor organizations quoted by Miss Paul, and the Labor Leader, which she also quotes, are in a political party in general hostility to the Liberal party, no popular strength for such a crisis could be safely looked for from them, if the crisis of another election were precipitated before the Liberals can redeem their pledges to their constituents at the previous election.

IV.

Finally, says Miss Paul:

In view of the fact, as shown above, that the policy of the militant suffragists, with regard to the Government's proposal, is the same as that of the I. L. P. and numerous other labor bodies, while it is opposed by the Conservatives, it is difficult to see the basis on which The Public describes the attitude of the suffragists as "tory."



The evidence presented by Miss Paul does not, in our judgment, bear out her conclusion. The situation speaks stronger than anything she quotes.

(1) Here is a Cabinet of 19 ministers hopelessly divided in personal opinions on woman suf-

frage—a question regarding which they are under no party obligations.

(2) They compromise by leaving the question subject to amendment on the floor of the House of Commons, the amendment there adopted to be an integral part of the Cabinet bill.

(3) One of the greatest Parliamentary leaders of the day, Lloyd George (perhaps the very greatest and most influential), undertakes to carry through the House an amendment enfranchising 7,000,000 women, including the wives of working-men; and to this end he, perhaps also the most popular leader of his day, goes to the people of the country to arouse Liberal party support in the constituencies.

(4) His efforts are promoted by the woman suffrage movement, its violence-wing excepted; but he is denounced without reason or stint by woman suffrage leaders of the violence-wing. They declare in words that they demand a Cabinet measure or none, and by acts that they will not allow the Lloyd George amendment to the Cabinet bill to succeed as a House amendment if they can help it.

(5) Pursuant to this policy, their followers physically assault Lloyd George upon his concluding a public speech in favor of that amendment.

(6) The pretense for attacking Lloyd George is that he is insincere. The proof of insincerity, as urged editorially by Votes for Women (the organ of the violence-wing of woman suffragists) on page 1 of December 1, 1911, is that if he were acting in good faith in urging woman suffrage upon the Cabinet, he would reply to their refusal to insert it in their official bill, *with his resignation*. The torystic significance of this alternative is too plain to be overlooked or to be offset by mere verbal declarations of a democratic purpose. If Lloyd George were to resign from the Ministry, the present Parliament would hardly last a week, and the crisis the Conservative party most wants would be at hand. With this, all the democratic legislation to which that party is opposed and the Liberal party is pledged—Irish home rule, abolition of plural voting, manhood suffrage, land value taxation, labor laws—would go by the board until after another election to be held under the present torystic property-franchise voting laws. If that election turned against the present coalition majority, not only would all those reforms be knocked out, but so would woman suffrage—unless for propertied classes of women. Yet the violence-wing of suffragists demand of Lloyd George, and demand with threats of violence and with actual violence, that he abandon the policy

of amending the Cabinet bill in the House, and force the anti-tory coalition out of office by precipitating a Parliamentary crisis through his *resignation*—a crisis not over a party question but over a non-party question, and a crisis which could by no possibility benefit any but Conservatives nor promote any but tory policies.

In those circumstances—to say nothing of further evidence, which, however, is not involved in our criticized editorial—there seems to us only a choice of inferences as to the violence-wing of the woman suffrage movement in Great Britain; they are fatuously reckless in promoting their cause, or else they are moved by tory impulses.

NEWS NARRATIVE

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of *The Public* for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Tuesday, January 16, 1912.

Progressive Victory in the Ohio Constitutional Convention.

Herbert S. Bigelow's election as president of the Constitutional Convention of Ohio on the 9th is generally regarded in that State as a progressive victory, Mr. Bigelow having for years been the principal protagonist of Direct Legislation in Ohio and his election having been secured over the opposition of the Ohio State Board of Commerce of which Allen Ripley Foote is president, and by a union of the progressives of both the Democratic and the Republican parties. An objection to Mr. Bigelow, of which the most was made by his opponents, was the fact that he is a Singletaxer. [See *The Public*, vol. xiv, pp. 1167, 1186.]



The convention was called to order on the 9th at 10 o'clock by W. W. Stokes of Dayton. At his suggestion, Judge Dennis Dwyer, as the oldest delegate, his age being 82, was elected temporary president. Judge Dwyer was conducted to the chair by Herbert S. Bigelow and Caleb H. Norris, the two principal contestants for the permanent presidency. After the election of a temporary secretary, the oath of their office was administered to the delegates by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the State. These formalities over, John D. Fackler, president of the Progressive Republican League of Ohio and one of the delegates to the convention, nominated Mr. Bigelow for president in what is described by news dispatches as "a snappy speech" wherein he said that "it was advisable to elect a man in sympathy with pro-