

under the lead of the Illinois Equal Suffrage Association, are busy making a general organized effort to poll a heavy vote and to secure a large majority in the affirmative. While the result will be only an unofficial and legally powerless expression of opinion, it nevertheless will be such an expression under the best existing electoral machinery for securing one; and if the opinion turns out to be favorable, favorable action by the legislature will be stimulated by it. There are plenty of reasons for voting "Yes" on that question. If you want women to be housekeepers, give them a chance to take a responsible part in that municipal housekeeping in which men alone do so badly—as, for that matter, they do in all other housekeeping. If you want women to look after children, give them a chance at the government of the public schools. If you believe in democracy, which means what Lincoln called it, government of all by all, throw aside your selfish vanity and recognize that women are of the all, that they have a right to the ballot you yourself set so much store by, and that feminine influence in the public affairs of our common life is as important as in the private affairs of the family.



### Women's Suffrage in Great Britain.\*

Lloyd George's women's suffrage speech at Albert Hall, the principal points of which are reproduced in another column, fairly discloses the indefensible conduct of the physical violence faction of British suffragists—indefensible not alone as matter of decent order, but also for its manifest tendency to wreck the women's suffrage cause, and in no other possible interest—be the motive what it may—than that of the Tory party and its property-class allies.



This speech was given prior to the criminal conduct of the violence faction in wantonly destroying private property. It was given before a non-partisan audience of women's suffragists, organized by representative women's suffrage associations. Instead of co-operating, or at least holding aloof from this meeting, the violence faction sought to break it up. By disorderly methods they endeavored to prevent any presentation of the subject by the one person in all England who could speak with most political authority and influence in behalf of the cause which they profess; and this on an occasion when he was the guest of

women's suffrage organizations and leaders with at least equal right with Mrs. Pankhurst's group to represent suffrage sentiment.



What is the pretense for that disorder? To force the Liberal Cabinet to insert votes for women in its electoral reform bill. But as the Cabinet is divided—one-fourth of its members (like most of the Tory party and a small proportion of the Liberty party), being opposed to votes for women,—and as unanimity in proposing Ministerial measures is an absolute political necessity, how could the Cabinet be coerced? Only by giving to the Cabinet the alternative of doing so or of resigning official responsibility to the Tories until another election could be held under the present property-qualification and plural-voting system! Such is the demand of the violence faction of British suffragists. No other interpretation of their attitude and conduct is possible.



The women's suffragists in the Cabinet proposed something better than this interesting plan of the violent suffragists. Led by Lloyd George, they secured an agreement by the Cabinet to refer the dispute to the House of Commons. If a majority of that House would amend the electoral bill by inserting suffrage for women, the Cabinet would make women's suffrage an integral part of the official bill. This spelt victory for the women's suffrage cause. For even though the Tory members were to vote unanimously against the amendment in the House, and all the anti-suffrage Liberals and Irish were to vote against it too, it would fall only 16 votes short of a majority. This gap could easily have been bridged under such leadership for the amendment as George's. It could easily have been bridged, that is, if the weaker supporters of women's suffrage in the House, and the better inclined among its opponents and the neutrals, were not angered into active hostility, as there is reason to fear they may have been, by the tactics of the violence faction of suffragists. If women's suffrage, widely democratic at that, fails at this crisis in Great Britain, the fault will lie at the door of that violence faction for having resorted at the present critical juncture to tactics which, criminal in law and criminal in morals, have also every appearance of having been exquisitely designed to baffle the democratic cause.



It is gratifying to be able to believe that in the United States, where the militant British tactics

\*See *Publics* of Dec. 17, 1909, page 1205; Mar. 4, 1910, pages 210, 211; Dec. 1, 1911, page 1209; Dec. 22, 1911, page 1232; Jan. 19, 1912, page 52; Feb. 2, 1912, page 98; Mar. 8, 1912 page 219.

at first aroused sympathetic interest, this interest is turning quite the other way, as later developments come to be better understood. Mrs. Catharine Waugh McCulloch probably expressed the prevailing sentiment when, as a recent suffrage speech of hers in Milwaukee is reported, she said: "I wish English suffragettes could be persuaded to drop their brickbats. The antics of those British women cannot be forgiven. We could not expect to convert a Wisconsin voter to support the suffrage plank by shying brickbats at him."



### Henry George's Thought in Sculpture.

Miss Ella Buchanan, the Kansan student of sculpture under Charles J. Mulligan at the Art Institute, Chicago, she whose "Votes for Women"\* is attracting deserved attention, has just finished

#### "Progress and Poverty."



"This association of poverty with progress is the great 'enigma' of our times. . . . It is the riddle which the Sphinx of Fate puts to our civilization, and which not to answer is to be destroyed."—Henry George in "Progress and Poverty."

\*See The Public of September 22, 1911, page 971.

a sketch in clay intended to symbolize the great agitational work of Henry George. At the heart of all he wrote or spoke or did, was this one penetrating question: "Why does Poverty keep pace with Progress?" The fact that it does, was to his thought "the central fact from which spring industrial, social and political difficulties that perplex the world, and with which statesmanship and philanthropy and education grapple in vain." All else that Henry George said or did was in explanation of this central thought, and of the necessity and the means of freeing progress from its clinging parasite. Miss Buchanan has seized upon that thought to pay the tribute of an artist to George's work, and of a daughter to the memory of a father who was devoted to George's ideals and ideas. That she has succeeded, both in grasp of subject and in simplicity yet significance of expression, may be inferred but cannot be wholly appreciated from the accompanying side view of her design.



### Good Government in Milwaukee.

Citizens of Milwaukee who really believe in honest municipal government will vote for Mayor Seidel's re-election next Tuesday, or stultify their professions. The opposition, led nominally by the Democratic machine with a Republican candidate, is nothing but a "combine" of both machines and a business organization to restore bad government.



Hasn't the Republican machine given Milwaukee bad government whenever it has had the chance to influence government at all? Hasn't the Democratic machine made municipal government in Milwaukee a stench as far as its aroma could carry? And what is the business association which comes into this delectable "combine" but an aggregation of privilege-seekers and law-evaders? There is not in the whole thing so much as a pretense of promoting good government which isn't a joke among the pretenders themselves.



The sole object of that "combine" is to unify prejudices against Socialism so as to turn the Socialists out of local office—business prejudice, political prejudice, church prejudice, and all the rest. But how can genuine good-government voters, genuine non-partisans, voters who truly believe in divorcing national partisanship from municipal administration—how can any such voter vote against the Socialists in Milwaukee and in favor of this Republican-Democratic-Big-Busi-