

please to bring their pistols and cartridges to me, and then take their budding knives and work extra hours!"

CHARLES HOWARD SHINN



## "THE CITY OF THE CIVIC MIND."

From Report of the Recent Conference of Charities and Corrections, in the Survey of July 6.

Cleveland has a way of revivifying one's faith in the city as the "hope of democracy." Fifteen hundred members of the National Conference of Charities and Correction last month caught something from its spirit in helping to expand the range and democratic emphasis of their own body.

It was this city which contributed to the National Conference the largest audience which it has ever known. It was the press of this city which, at a time when the political grist was the most plentiful in the history of parties, opened its columns to a greater quantity of Conference news than any papers ever had done before. But it was not only the Cleveland of oil refineries, of steel specialties and of automobile parts that did this. It was the Cleveland of three-cent street-car fares and of the lowest death rate among the large American cities. It was the Cleveland which boasts of a larger home use of its public libraries than Chicago and a larger per capita circulation than Boston or New York, Philadelphia or Cincinnati. It was the Cleveland that has already expended \$12,000,000 on a "group plan" of public buildings which when completed will cost upward of \$25,000,000. It was the Cleveland which insists that more of its residents own their own homes than is the case in any other city of equal size. It was, finally, the Cleveland which claims a greater amount of intelligent acquaintance with civic affairs among its citizens than can be found elsewhere in the United States. The tent meetings during the traction campaigns a few years ago were great schools of public questions, and night after night the people listened to presentations of the law and the facts, transfused with the vision of the city that was to be. At the Mayor's Luncheon, held under the auspices of the Conference committee on standards of living and labor, when the spirit of the late Tom L. Johnson, Mayor and man, was vivified by his successor and associate, Newton D. Baker, this story was told:

A man once came to Mr. Baker and said: "My town is going to have a street railway fight. I want to know all about Cleveland's."

"I shall be only too glad to tell you all I know," said Mr. Baker, "but unfortunately I have appointments until one o'clock. Will you come back then?"

"How can I most profitably put in the two

hours until that time?" asked the stranger.

The answer was: "Go out on the public square, sit down by the most unlikely man you can find—the one who looks most as if he didn't know the difference between a franchise and a double track. Ask that man to tell you about Cleveland's street railway fight, and when you come back I will tell you whatever you haven't been able to learn from him."

The man came back at the end of two hours. "I needn't keep my appointment here," he said. "I found an old chap whose feet were out of his shoes, whose elbows were out of his shirt sleeves, and who looked as if he had just sobered up for the first time in a month—in short, I found the unluckiest looking individual at large. I put one question to him and he started right in at the beginning and filled in all the details and brought me down to date. There's nothing for you to tell me unless you know what's going to happen. He hasn't been let in on that."

This coming together of the expert and the man in the street, which has been characteristic of the militant city movements of the past decade, is scarcely less true of the fields of social concern treated by the National Conference. It would be impossible to interest an entire city in the book-keeping of a car barn as such, but when this is lifted into a place in the city's program of achievement, then the capacity of the people to study and understand is well-nigh limitless.



## VIOLENCE AND VOTES.

Lucia Ames Mead in *The Independent* of June 27, 1912.

We have recently seen the private property of neutrals destroyed without compensation in the "war" in which English suffragets have engaged in London. Their violence was by no means the result of impulse, but was coolly planned and executed, and they did what is prohibited by all codes in actual war.

The primary reason why these women, many of them refined ladies of social position, engaged deliberately in such lawlessness, at the word of command from headquarters, was chiefly that their judgment had been warped by misinformation persistently drilled into their minds for years by leaders whose devotion and ability were unquestioned and whose statements and unfounded inferences were adjudged to be equally unquestionable. Two statements were reiterated vehemently on all occasions—one, that extension of the suffrage to men had usually been achieved through violence, and only so could a stubborn Parliament be made to yield; the other, that all peaceable methods had been exhausted and nothing but violence, under the euphemism of "direct action," remained as the alternative to abject failure and submission. In

explaining the situation to Americans, the militants always added a further argument, accepted by many Americans as valid: "This is only what your forefathers did when they threw the tea overboard."

As an earnest suffragist of a lifetime, permit me to review the real history which concerns this matter and which, if truly understood by these militants, would have tempered their vandalism with discretion and prevented a most humiliating exhibition of fanaticism and much futile suffering in consequence.

Devotion to a cause, willingness to suffer pain and ignominy for it, must always command a sincere respect, either when the Hindoo mother throws her babe into the Ganges, when the Mexican *penitente* scourges himself with bloody whips and submits voluntarily even to crucifixion, or when a woman starves herself in prison to help attain the suffrage for her sex. Self-inflicted suffering will always win respect for sincerity; but inflicting suffering on the innocent is quite a different matter. The first, in the English situation, inspired admiration and brought accessions to the cause; the second has inspired a revulsion of feeling, in which not only the guilty suffer, but the great body of law-abiding suffragists are compelled to suffer also, to see the Conciliation Bill defeated, and to see their cause brought into ill repute.

A teacher who has promised her class a boon whenever the head master should announce the time for it had come is hardly to be blamed if she withholds it still, after that time arrives, if a part of the class, enraged at having to wait, seeks to intimidate her by smashing schoolroom windows. In like manner, a pledged majority of the House of Commons turned into a minority because they felt that Parliament must not yield to intimidation, lest it put a premium on violence and ensure its continuance through every successive stage. Parliament, in the last century, in extending suffrage to men, in 1832, in 1867 and 1884, never did so because of intimidation. There was some violence, but never any organized by reformers. It was wholly the result of momentary impulse and generally from the lowest orders of society. It was in absolute contrast to the organized, deliberate violence of the suffragets.

In 1831, the Reform Bill passed the House of Commons without any violence after a long period of oppression and suffering, in which there had been riots over the introduction of machinery which threw men out of work. The hostility to the Reform Bill by the House of Lords, however, did irritate the masses. Nottingham Castle, about which the militants talk so much, was set on fire and partially destroyed. A mob of vagrants broke into wine-cellars in Bristol and, after becoming intoxicated, set fire to many buildings, and some, too drunk to escape, perished in the flames. This, says one historian, was done by men "probably not

one in twelve of whom had ever heard of the Reform Bill." All of the writers upon this subject show the utterly rude and irresponsible character of these mobs. Some of the rioters perished on the scaffold for their offense. In connection with this largely irrelevant and always sporadic violence, immense lawful pressure was brought to bear on the Lords, and, finally, the threat to create more peers won the day and the bill became law in June, 1832.

Granting, for the sake of argument, that these mobs had some influence and really affected the Lords and the King with precisely the reverse emotions from those with which violence usually affects authorities, and, instead of making them more stubborn, made them more lenient, one must ask, is this hooliganism of hungry, drunken mobs eighty years ago a precedent for the deliberate, organized violence of women in this age who have ten times the political and industrial rights which those down-trodden, illiterate men had in those days?

There was rioting over the Chartists' claims in the forties. But absolutely nothing was gained by it. One of their demands—universal suffrage—is not yet granted, and others were slowly conceded after all violence had ceased.

So late as 1866, three men out of four in England were as unable to vote for Parliament as women are today, and most of them lacked the municipal suffrage which many English women now possess; yet none of their leaders advocated or were responsible for any violence in the effort for the extension of the suffrage.

In March, 1866, Gladstone introduced a Reform Bill. On July 23, the reformers, being refused what they thought to be their right to assemble in Hyde Park, quietly withdrew and went elsewhere; but it was afterward shown that their claim to hold their meeting in the Park was legal. However, certain of their rank and file together with "mischievous boys and ordinary London roughs" (McCarthy), crowding around the palings, felt one of them yield and impulsively made a rush, knocking the palings over for half a mile. This was spectacular and therefore much talked about. It was one lawless among a hundred lawful and orderly measures which brought about the passage of the bill thirteen months later, in August, 1867; as already said, it was utterly unauthorized by the reform leaders and without any previous knowledge on their part. It is grossly inaccurate to attribute the passage of the bill to this incident, which was almost accidental and with which the reform leaders had nothing to do. The further extension of the suffrage, in 1884, was unaccompanied by violence.

As to the throwing of the tea overboard in Boston, a supposed precedent, cited *ad nauseam* by English militants here, there was a slight superficial resemblance, but the difference was essential

and fundamental. The act was not vandalism, committed merely as a hostile demonstration. The serious men of Boston waited anxiously until the twenty days required by law had nearly expired, beyond which no cargo could remain on shipboard. The successful landing of the tea would have defeated the whole contention of the colonists in their great struggle. The captain of the "Dartmouth" had yielded and consented to take the tea back to England, but the Governor commanded the ship to be fired on if it sailed without a proper permit. This was not to be obtained. The eyes of all the colonies were on the men of Massachusetts, who were acting for them all. They acted solemnly and, assembling in the Old South, waited until they had lighted the candles, "determined not to act until the last legal method of relief should have been tried and found wanting," which situation came with the refusal from Governor Hutchinson to grant the permit. The future of the country was at stake. Then, and only then was the tea destroyed, not because the men of Boston wanted to destroy it, but because it was made impossible to return it to England or to leave it on shipboard, and to land it meant the overthrow of their liberties. Had it been sugar, or flour, or anything but tea, it would have been wholly different. Mere destructiveness as intimidation was the last thing thought of. But it was a matter of indifference to the English militants what they destroyed, so long as it was easy for them to smash it. There was scarcely a point of resemblance between their vandalism and this historic event. History has justified that event. Will history justify the destruction of private property on Regent and Oxford streets when women, armed with hammers in bags, at a signal smashed windows in order that by a spectacular demonstration they might get the suffering owners of the property to rush to the House of Commons and espouse their cause? They reckon ill who leave out human nature from account, as the result proved.

The appeal to the example of the American Revolution by the suffragets in justification of their course is of all things most unwarranted. The temper and method of the two movements were absolutely unlike. The famous watchwords of the Boston Revolutionary leaders, "Do not fire unless you are fired upon," "Always keep the enemy in the wrong," etc., are expressions of the scrupulous lawfulness and self-restraint which marked the whole trying decade preceding the hostilities, which they did not begin. Students of history will remember the condemnation by the responsible men of Boston of the mob which sacked the house of Governor Hutchinson. They will also remember that no less a man than John Adams promptly offered his services to defend the British captain after the Boston massacre, to ensure the lawful and orderly disposal of the case. It is as unfitting for the patriotic American to sanction

the appeal to the leaders of the Revolution in this matter as it is unworthy in every suffragist, American or English, to seek to trace apostolic succession from the hoodlums of Nottingham Castle, Bristol and Hyde Park.

Men, to be sure, have committed far worse crimes and been punished more lightly by English judges than these women, who have just cause for impatience. But two wrongs never made a right. Do not the condoners of their vandalism show an astonishing incapacity to perceive relative values when they cry out that "Parliament should remember that the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church"? Pray when have martyrs ever thrown stones at the men who sent them to the rack and stake? Was it not their Christlike willingness to suffer without reprisal that placed the halo around their heads? The perverse ratiocination which creates euphemisms like the word "protests" for throwing brickbats, which conjures up visions of thumbscrews and Iron Virgins by the word "torture" as applied to forcing nourishment upon would-be prisoners and would-be suicides, does not commend the militant sense of fairness to the public, which is inclined to ask, "If they choose voluntarily to go to prison, why don't they act like good sports and not complain when they get what they want?"

Spite of our pity for their suffering and gratitude for the great help they earlier gave the movement, loyalty to our cause and love for certain militants who may be charming personally does not require us to repress our condemnation of recent methods, never deliberately employed by English men to attain their vote and never by English women in attaining the political rights that they already possess, which include sitting on County Councils and being mayors.

As to the militants' claim that they had no alternative, the answer is that they had scores of legal methods quite spectacular enough to keep their cause ever present to the public mind. If every suffragist had vowed to wear mourning, with no ornament but a "Votes for Women" badge, to abstain from all amusements, to purchase of suffragists alone, to strike, as in the play, "How the Vote Was Won," or to do any one of a dozen similar things, their devotion and nerve would have been equally evident, and they would have retained the respect of all the world. American suffragists, knowing that violence would never be employed here, have been too loath to criticise actions due, as they say, to "conditions we know nothing of." But the principles of ethics and of human nature which govern Christians and Anglo-Saxons are essentially the same in London as in New York. Our best help to the cause is to reprobate boldly the employment anywhere of those methods of doing evil that good may come, which in modern times have never thus far won a single vote for any man or woman.

Criticism of any of those who are zealous for one's own cause is not easy nor pleasant; but, as Arnold of Rugby well said, "The measure of my love for any institution is the measure of my desire to make it better," so we suffragists may gauge our love for our just cause by our desire to purge it of every feature that is unworthy. At a time when the world generally is working to supplant the hoary old methods of force by the methods of law and order, it is singularly untimely for a cause which has been peculiarly based on right reason and right feeling to seek to reverse the process; and it is doubly culpable for those seeking to do this to fortify their conduct by a false appeal to history.

---

## BOOKS

---

### A FEW YEARS OF MICHIGAN POLITICS.

**The Politics of Michigan, 1865-1878.** By Harriette M. Dilla. Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, Number 118. Longmans, Green & Co., Agents, New York, 1912. Price, \$2.00 net.

Because it is only fragmentary, this work will have little interest except for those who are trying to obtain a larger view of the politics of Michigan. The period covered extends from 1865 to 1878. This includes the formation of the Republican party "under the oaks" at Jackson, in the '50s, and the coalition of the Democratic and Greenback parties, in the '80s, when, by combining their strength, they managed to elect a Democratic governor or two. But a quietus was, later, put on this kind of coalition by a Republican legislature passing a law that no candidate's name could appear but once on an official ballot. After that the minor parties were unable to muster sufficient votes under any single designation to overcome the normal Republican majority.

JUDSON GRENNELL



### VICTUALS AND DRINK.

**Cutting It Out.** By Samuel G. Blythe.

**The Fun of Getting Thin.** By Samuel G. Blythe. Both published by Forbes & Co., 443 S. Dearborn St., Chicago. Price, 35 cents each.

Told in lively humorous style, "Cutting It Out" is the story of a typical, jolly good fellow and steady drinker for 20 years, who quit because, as he explains, "After I was 40 years of age I noticed I began to go to funerals oftener; . . . all these funerals were of . . . good fellows and we mourned their loss. Also we generally took a few drinks to their memories." One of the pleasant surprises that came to him after he had quit was

the abundance of leisure he had. "When you are drinking," he found, "you are busy all the time—but get nowhere. Work is the curse of the drinking classes."

A second brief little book is all about how, after trying and giving up an indefinite number of exercises and diet cures, a fat man finds out just how to reduce. He discovers that no healthy person predisposed to fat ever "lost" any flesh. "The victim struggles with it, goes to the mat with it" and "does not debonairly drop it." He was in hot weather "the perspiring marvel and the most uncomfortable as well as the sloppiest person you ever saw. Besides, I was uric-acidy, rheumatic, and stertorous and clumsy." His cure, however, was entirely simple, wholly successful and is persuasively explained.

ROBERT E. GRAVES.

---

## BOOKS RECEIVED

---

—**Taxation of Land Values—As it Affects Land-owners and Others.** By John Orr. Published by P. S. King & Son, Orchard House, Westminster, London. 1912. Price, one shilling, net.

—**Individualism and the Land Question.** By Sir Roland K. Wilson, J. H. Levy and Others. Published by the Personal Rights Assn., 11 Abbeville Road, S. W. London. Price, one shilling net.

—**The Spirit of Chinese Philanthropy.** By Yu-Yue Tsu. Number 125, Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law. Longmans, Green & Co., Agents, New York, 1912. Price, \$1.00 net.

—**British Radicalism, 1791-1797.** By Walter Phelps Hall. Number 122, Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law. Longmans, Green & Co., Agents, New York, 1912. Price, \$2.00 net.

—**Provincial and Local Taxation in Canada.** By Solomon Vineberg. Number 128, Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law. Longmans, Green & Co., Agents, New York, 1912. Price, \$1.50 net.

—**Forty-fourth Annual Insurance Report of the Insurance Superintendent of the State of Illinois.** 1912. Part II, Life Insurance. Fred W. Potter, Superintendent. Published by the Illinois State Journal Co., Springfield, Ill.

—**The Law of Corporations: A Comparative Study with Particular Reference to the Protection of Creditors and Shareholders.** By Arthur K. Kuhn. Number 123, Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law. Longmans, Green & Co., New York, Agents, 1912. Price, \$1.50 net.



"Mother, may I go out to vote?"

Asked little Bessie Bowles.

"Yes, dear; put on your hat and coat,  
But don't go near the polls."

—Chicago Tribune.