

mand of women citizens, as a condition precedent to conceding them the voting right, that they be free of all human weaknesses with reference to civic affairs; and *women* who make that demand are shirks as to their own civic responsibilities and obstructionists as to the civic responsibilities of others.

If those demands were exacted of all citizens, not only would democracy be impossible, but so would every other form of government. There was never a reigning monarch so perfect as this demand requires women to be before participating in the reign of the people.

But, unfortunately, opponents of woman suffrage are not the only offenders in this respect. To assert that women *do* come up to the requirements of that demand, is to argue against woman suffrage as truly as to assert that they do not. For that they do not is the fact. Judge Lindsey showed in his "Beast and the Jungle" how some women are as subservient to the Beast as some men, and he was "roasted" for it by woman suffragists who thought it hurt their cause. They were as wrong as The Remonstrant is.

The primary purpose of the suffrage movement, like that of every other democratic movement, is the improvement of civic conditions through the extension of civic intelligence by use of the human mind on civic problems. To meet criticisms of such a movement with arguments assuming that all woman voters would be civic angels, lends support to the fallacy that none of them would be if some of them are not or if none were quite so.

Why not stand for woman suffrage on broad democratic grounds, letting the opposition meet it on those grounds if they can? Why try to refute tory fallacies with toryistic denials of what may be deplorable facts?



Though The Remonstrant was in error as to the facts it happened to cite about Colorado, it might have cited stronger ones without error. Take, for instance, Judge Lindsey's bill for the protection of children from the vice trust in Colorado. Surely this was more important than a race-track gambling measure. But he had the greatest difficulty in getting the women members of that legislature to introduce the bill. Some of them absolutely refused, and one of them, a bitter opponent of child labor laws, did all she could to secure legalization for the employment of children over thirteen years of age in mining and other dangerous vocations.

Why not recognize the fact—for fact it is,—why

not recognize that under equal suffrage there will be "machine" women as well as "machine" men, as long as there are "machines;" and that well-meaning women voters as well as well meaning men voters will be fooled by those that are not well-meaning? These weaknesses, whether in state or church or business or frou-frou society, are neither masculine nor feminine but human.

In Denver, three progressive women had been nominated for the legislature against the women referred to by The Remonstrant; but the corporations and the vice trust—together with some really good men and possibly some really good women—all of it as human as the apple episode in Eden—combined against them. So the progressive women were defeated by a small plurality, and those whom The Remonstrant sets up as types of womanhood in civic action were elected.

But for that narrow plurality, there might have been no necessity for Governor Shafroth's veto of a gambling measure passed with women's votes, nor any difficulty in securing women sponsors in the legislature for Judge Lindsey's child-labor bill.



There will be "machine" women, reactionary women, tory women, vice-legalizing women, after as well as before suffrage, and some of them will no doubt get into legislatures. But that is beside the question. The question is whether our civic problems shall continue to be "stag"-muddled instead of humanly solved—whether organized society shall be of the bachelor type or of the family type. There is bad in both; but it is not bachelorhood, it is familyhood, that gives hope.

Even in Denver at its worst, let us not forget, Judge Lindsey was re-elected by a clear majority over both "machines," and the women electorate made it possible.

With all the civic frailties they have in common with men, the instinct for right things quickens with women as a mass more spontaneously than with men as a mass. Their moral hearing is less dull, their civic spirit more willing when the clarion calls.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

WOMAN SUFFRAGE AT WORK.

San Diego Cal., Nov. 10.

It is "hats off" to the women of southern California. Obtaining their enfranchisement by the small majority of some 3,600 votes, they at once, even in spite of themselves and their previous attitude, find themselves possessing the balance of power on some very vital questions and being sought after with

great solicitude. The newspapers and interests which had disparaged and ridiculed their suffrage, now thoroughly alarmed about local conditions, are using every effort to prevail upon the women to register and vote, vying in the matter with the oldest suffrage advocates.

The surprisingly large Socialist vote at the Los Angeles' municipal primaries, some 20,183 to the Good Government's 16,790 and scattering 8,570, and the fact that Los Angeles must borrow \$18,000,000 within the next two years to complete her municipal aqueduct, power-plant, harbor, railroad, and other big enterprises before the opening of the Panama Canal, are responsible for woman's glorious though hurried entrance into the field, and some 70,000 have been registered since the passage of the amendment only one month ago, in order to qualify for the elections of December 5th.

In San Diego a \$1,000,000 bond issue, a now-or-never opportunity to obtain a municipal harbor, and requiring a two-thirds vote of all the ballots cast, has also made the votes of the women of vital importance. A large registration is the result. In both cities schools for voters have been established to instruct women in the proper method of casting a ballot. Serious-faced women compose a large proportion of all public meetings.

But the path of the women may not be all roses. Apprehensive interests which fought the suffrage amendment, now taking advantage of the small majority in its favor, threaten a referendum on the subject in 1912, and count upon the vote of the women who have all along opposed or been indifferent to suffrage to destroy their new political freedom. It will not be difficult for the Interests to obtain the necessary signatures; but women, having been given the ballot and tasted its power and influence, will they now allow themselves to be disfranchised? Quien sabe?

SEYMOUR W. TULLOCH.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

THE UNIVERSALITY OF DEMOCRACY.

Chicago.

Every good cause suffers as much from the bad arguments of its advocates and friends as from the weak and illogical reasoning of its opponents. The social reformer is by no means exempt from the faults and inconsistencies incident to our imperfect human nature. The ability to think clearly on one subject and the courage to espouse a difficult cause are not always accompanied with mental breadth or deep sympathies. Too often the merits of great leaders are those of the special pleader, who may be useful, even highly efficient, but whose spirit is essentially partisan and who has little moral perspective.

+

Woman Suffrage presents no exception to the rule. Its advocates often employ as bad arguments in its support as any that are offered against it from press or platform. An example is found in some recent utterances of an able leader in this field: "Let the Negro alone. It will offend the South. All colored

men are opposed to woman suffrage." These words have the commander's imperative ring. One wonders who could have touched upon this theme on a suffrage platform in more challenging terms, but let that point pass.

"Do not touch the Labor question. It will offend our capitalist friends." The same kind of warning might be spoken against affiliation with the temperance cause, the tariff or Singletax, since in every case we run the risk of offending some one.

There are times and places, we will agree, when a particular subject has the right of way and the platform must be yielded to the occasion and the main issue. A temperance gathering cannot spare time for a discussion of the tariff, or a Singletax conference for an argument on temperance or suffrage; but that would not be a very enlightening discussion of any of these issues which eliminated comparison or ignored the vital relation of each to each. Every social question of the hour is but a phase of one and the same subject—our growing democracy. The suffrage, the labor and the race or color questions reveal a like situation among different groups suffering the same kind of social injustice, choosing different methods of relief. The analogies between the woman and the color problems in this country are particularly strong and striking and show how human and generic is the special issue of each.

Moreover our politic concern for what shall and shall not be said on a particular platform is politic and not philosophic or even rational. Our reform conventions suffer from a narrow and *ex parte* treatment of a single issue. A philosophic temper as well as a warm all-round humanity is conspicuously absent at times. Social progress is not to be measured in terms of a single propaganda or creed.

Woman suffrage is but one line of march towards the goal of true democracy, yet the proportion of sincere intelligent democrats in the suffrage ranks is not large. We may well look with dread and discomfort on many of the aspects of this movement in this its day of rapid growth and popular favor. Women are as yet preferably aristocratic, exclusive and conservative. Their prevailing attitude in the work of social relief and uplift in which they are so busily engaged is that of class assumption and patronage. The mainspring of action is an intense, easily aroused and easily diverted sympathy. The motive which springs from a conviction of justice or the essential worth of human nature *per se* is one she is reluctant to accept, nor is it any answer to say that the same is true of men.

+

How many women suffragists believe in their good cause as part of a general forward movement seeking the complete emancipation of the race with equal opportunity for all? Very few.

Yet woman suffrage has worth and meaning only in its relation to suffrage at large, to that growing ideal of freedom of which the ballot is one form and symbol. Unless women can rejoice and feel their cause strengthened in every gain in manhood suffrage they have not gone far in true understanding of the cause in which they are so heroically engaged.

Over and over again do we hear from the suffrage

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY