

The Public

DEC 8 1909

A National Journal of Fundamental Democracy &
A Weekly Narrative of History in the Making

LOUIS F. POST, EDITOR
ALICE THACHER POST, MANAGING EDITOR

ADVISORY AND CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES H. DILLARD, Louisiana
LINCOLN STEFFENS, Massachusetts
L. P. C. GARVIN, Rhode Island
HENRY F. RING, Texas
WILLIAM H. FLEMING, Georgia
HERBERT S. BIGELOW, Ohio
FREDERIC C. HOWE, Ohio
MRS. HARRIET TAYLOR UPTON, Ohio
BRAND WHITLOCK, Ohio

HENRY GEORGE, JR., New York
ROBERT BAKER, New York
BOLTON HALL, New York
FRANCIS I. DU PONT, Delaware
HERBERT QUICK, Iowa
MRS. LONA INGHAM ROBINSON, Iowa
S. A. STOCKWELL, Minnesota
WILLIAM P. HILL, Missouri
C. E. S. WOOD, Oregon

JOHN Z. WHITE, Illinois
R. F. PETTIGREW, South Dakota
LEWIS H. BERENS, England
J. W. S. CALLIE, England
JOSEPH FELS, England
JOHN PAUL, Scotland
GEORGE FOWLDS, New Zealand
W. G. EGGLESTON, California.

Vol. XII.

CHICAGO, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1909.

No. 609

Published by LOUIS F. POST
Eileworth Building, 357 Dearborn Street, Chicago

Single Copy, Five Cents Yearly Subscription, One Dollar
Entered as Second-Class Matter April 16, 1908 at the Post Office at
Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879

EDITORIAL

Out Where the Bullets Sing.

Take it easy, ye knight errants of true blue reform! Take it easy when you feel like slugging the Bryans and La Follettes and Heneyes and Cummins for not being right enough or going far enough. They may not fit into any doctrinal pigeon hole that you or we happen to own; but maybe they see more than they let on they see, when they have the leisure to look. They haven't much leisure though, for they are on the firing line! Don't you realize, it? On the firing line men are awfully busy shooting and dodging bullets. Bullets, understand, bullets! Did you ever hear a bullet sing? It sounds very important, so we are told; as important as your own best beloved doctrine of righteousness—while it's in the air.

* *

The British Suffragette Question.

The Public's editorial on the campaign of violence which the militant suffragettes are carrying on in England (p. 1108), is replied to by the Woman's Journal in its issue of November 27. Although many points are made in that reply, there is but one which seems now to be at once pertinent to the issue raised in our editorial and not therein sufficiently anticipated. To this point we confine our response.

* *

The contention of our editorial was that the demand of the militant suffragettes for suffrage

CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL:

Out Where the Bullets Sing.....	1153
The British Suffragette Question.....	1153
Old New England's New Message.....	1154
The First "Insurgent" Battle.....	1155
Subsidizing Forbidden Trade.....	1155
An Interesting Debate.....	1155
The Graft Exposures in Chicago.....	1156
How to Agitate.....	1156
The "Sweating" of Prisoners.....	1156
The Ballinger Case.....	1156
Another British War Scare.....	1157
Unpaid Officials (R. B. Brinsmade).....	1157

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE:

Proposed Land Values Congress (Johan Hansson).....	1158
Fiscal Questions in Canada (J. Z. White).....	1159

NEWS NARRATIVE:

The British Land Question.....	1160
The Land for the People.....	1161
The Irish Land Bill.....	1161
Just Taxation in Cleveland.....	1162
Status of the Gompers Case.....	1162
The Nicaraguan Situation.....	1163
News Notes.....	1163
Press Opinions.....	1164

RELATED THINGS:

Patience (Geo. E. Bowen).....	1166
The Rearing of Pheasants as a Social Service! (L. Willoughby).....	1166
The Security of Property.....	1167
Suffragette Violence (Edward D Mead).....	1167
The World's One Philanthropist (Wm. Marion Reedy).....	1169

BOOKS:

A Fine Exposition of Ethics.....	1171
Books Received.....	1173
Periodicals.....	1173

for women on the terms on which it is conferred upon men, would place highly restrictive property qualifications upon woman suffrage in Great Britain. Under those qualifications, most workingmen's wives could not vote though their husbands did, nor could any unmarried working woman unless she individually occupied lodgings worth \$50 a year unfurnished. This was our inference from the laws regulating male suffrage in Great Britain. We based it upon the statement of British suffrage statutes made by President Lowell in his work on English government. But the Woman's Journal disputes either President Lowell's statement or our inference—one or the other, we are not certain which. Of course, if the statement falls, the inference falls with it. But does the Woman's Journal really think that either statement or inference is disposed of by merely saying that its fallacy "has been shown over and over again by Keir Hardie, Philip Snowden and other well informed English suffragists"?

+

As we hold Mr. Hardie and Mr. Snowden in high esteem, both as citizens of the world and as public men, we should readily accept any statement of fact they might make of their own knowledge, and should rank high any opinion or inference of theirs from the facts they stated. But the Woman's Journal quotes no statement of theirs, no opinion of theirs, and does not even vouch (except in the vaguest way, and apparently not on personal knowledge) for their having authoritatively or deliberately said anything at all on the point. We submit that its vague and unverified reference to some possible expressions by Mr. Hardie and Mr. Snowden (and others unnamed) is inadequate. In our editorial, we cited for our basic facts the elaborate treatise by President Lowell, "The Government of England," specifying pages for reference; and we have not now the slightest reason for doubting President Lowell's accuracy. From those facts we drew our inference, and we see no reason yet for altering it. Our inference may, indeed, have been erroneous, but the Woman's Journal does not show wherein nor how. If that paper, which we regard with undiminished respect, or any other paper or person, will cite authorities proving President Lowell wrong in his summary of the British suffrage statutes, or point out definitely by reference to his summary or any other authoritative document a fatal error in our inference, we will gladly make a complete retraction of that phase of our suffragette criticism. But unless President Lowell is wrong in his statement of the

British statutes, or we in what seems to us to be a very obvious inference from his statement, Mr. Hardie, Mr. Snowden and the other Englishmen are mistaken if they have said anything to warrant what the Woman's Journal attributes to them.

+

With reference to a point raised by the Woman's Journal regarding the same phase of the subject, let us suggest that if it investigates with an open mind it will probably learn that the proportion of workingwomen in England who individually (not in couples but individually) occupy lodgings worth \$50 a year unfurnished, is by no means so large as in its comment upon our editorial it ventures to imply. Even in this country, how large a proportion of unmarried workingwomen occupy lodgings for which they individually pay \$50 a year unfurnished? And, then, what of workingmen's wives? Are they, or are they not, a negligible factor in the movement for equal suffrage?

+ +

Old New England's New Message.

In a recent speech in his home city, James J. Storrow, one of Boston's leading men, and deservedly so, gave out his conception of New England's message to the country. "Liberty" was the word with which the Fathers were deeply concerned, he said, and they showed that they were not only ready to preach the gospel of liberty, but to die for it. Those days are past, Mr. Storrow proceeded, but the present New England generation must remember that the Declaration of Independence does not stop with the word "liberty"; it goes on to say that every human being has the inalienable right not only to life and liberty, but also to the pursuit of happiness. It is on this basis that Mr. Storrow's conception of New England's message of the present rests. Listen to him:

Behind every human activity there must be a moral idea if the activity is to be of real consequence. What are we New Englanders thinking about to-day? We have passed on from the word liberty, having attended to that little matter, to the word "happiness." We have been studying conditions of human life. We know more about it than our fathers did. We know that the ordinary boy or girl born into the world is fitted to enjoy a healthy, happy life, and yet we see in a great city hundreds and thousands of boys and girls, through no fault of their own, but due to their unfortunate environment, condemned to the prison cell of unhealthy and unhappy lives. I believe that the moral idea New England is formulating to-day, and that lies perhaps unexpressed in the minds and hearts of us New Englanders, is that we are going to do our utmost to solve successfully the problem of so organ-