

of members of the white and colored races for the earnest consideration of great national issues which concern both races (p. 153) may now be seen to have been no false move. The malignant comments aroused in the organs of race prejudice in the South and the still meaner trucklers to a false sentiment in the North, proved this.

To draw the fire of the enemy and learn his actual location, is often of vital importance in military strategy. We now know, beyond a peradventure, that race prejudice is shamelessly and brutally invasive; that its essence is virulent hate; that it demands absolute and humiliating surrender of principle from all who cherish a nobler human ideal; that its loud-mouthed pretence of seeking to safeguard racial purity is merely a mask to hide the hideous visage of oligarchic despotism.



The enemies of mankind have always found their account in setting human beings against one another by means of race and caste divisions. It is a very old game, and one that has often been successful.

As long as it prevails, a fearful stumbling-block lies in the path of all social and economic progress. We must fight our reform battle consciously for *all*, of every race, color, creed and social station, before we may hope to win it for any. To begin a campaign for human rights and handicap ourselves at the outset by narrowing our interest to the welfare of one race alone, is to invite and deserve defeat.



It is not sufficient, however, to support legislation which shall open equal opportunities to all races. Such legislation already prevails in Illinois, and yet the Springfield outrages took place. The seat of race prejudice is in our own minds; until it is thoroughly rooted out there will be no lack of Springfields.

True democracy demands that we rate every individual in strict accordance with personal merit, entirely ignoring all accidents of birth and color. As long as we lump together as necessarily inferior, socially or in any other respect, all the members of any given race, regardless of individual development, we have not grasped the rudiments of democratic ideals. This ought to be a platitude so obvious as to render its repetition unnecessary; but unfortunately it is recognized only by the tiny handful who have evolved to the point of doing their own thinking.

The cultured snobbery, which merely puts on airs of conscious superiority, and coldly disparages the efforts of members of the Pariah race

to aspire to honorable recognition, is the same spirit which, slavishly copied by less cultured classes, filters down from stratum to stratum, until in the coarser-veined mob it eventuates in violent outbreaks at the slightest pretext.

To cure this evil we must begin at the top. This is the one remedy which has never been tried, and which alone is fundamental.

It lies within ourselves to begin.

The enemies of race prejudice must take the aggressive, and fight the monster wherever it rears its ugly head. Let us quit truckling and apologizing, and stand for human brotherhood in the full sense, whether it gives offense or not. The spirit of Garrison and Phillips is needed today, to complete the work left half done when their mighty spirits passed on.

Remember Springfield!

JAMES F. MORTON, JR.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE BRITISH "SUFFRAGETTES."

London, August 10.—Mr. Asquith, the Prime Minister, was speaking. It was at a banquet given by the Cobden Club in honor of the delegates to the International Free Trade Congress. The place was the large banqueting hall of the Hotel Cecil, which the Cobden Club had engaged for its members and guests for the occasion, and the floor was full of banqueters from many countries. In the gallery were lady guests, who, according to one of the barbaric conventionalities of our time, had been invited to overlook their lords and masters at their "feed," and listen to their post-provender speeches. Mr. Asquith, who was on the program to propose the toast to free trade, had made an admirable opening, in which he led up to a rhetorical question intended to introduce the reply from himself which he afterwards made with impressive effect. "And now," he asked, in this introductory manner, "what is to be done?" The last word had hardly escaped his lips when a thin but penetrating voice from the ladies' gallery carried to every ear in the hall the disturbing response, "Give votes to women!"

An exploding bomb could have been but little more disconcerting. The Prime Minister paused in his speech, and from the floor of the hall there came some hisses and some cries of "shame;" but there was no "guying," no laughter, none of the ridicule with which such an interruption from such a source in such circumstances would have been received in the United States.

Looking in the direction from which the voice had come, I saw a small woman, elegantly gowned, standing rigid as a marble statue conspicuously against the gallery rail. There was little chance of mistaking her. Simply from her manner she was evidently the interrupter; and she quickly left no room for doubt, for once more vibrating through the hall came the words, "Votes for women!" this time obviously from her lips.

A hotel servant had meanwhile found his way to the gallery. Advancing toward the gentle disturber he spoke, apparently asking her to retire, but she made no move. Then he took her by the arm. She resisted—more firmly, however, than vigorously—and in a moment he had led her away. When that was done Mr. Asquith resumed his speech.

This was my first personal experience with the tactics of the "suffragette" movement. I had missed a more emphatic demonstration by coming a few minutes late to the opening session of the Free Trade Congress. Winston Churchill, one of Mr. Asquith's cabinet ministers, was there persistently interrupted by five women who were consequently removed from the hall. A few days earlier, at the Peace Congress, Mr. Lloyd George, also of the Asquith cabinet, had been so persistently interrupted by women "heckling" him with demands for woman suffrage in the midst of his speech that the meeting was brought to a standstill—practically broken up—until sixteen of the invading women had been forcibly ejected from the hall. This last instance was all the more remarkable from the fact that Lloyd George is a pronounced advocate of extending full voting rights to women.

With the public demonstrations of the "suffragettes" I was already fairly familiar from newspaper reports. Their movement upon the House of Commons and their street parades had very largely, if not altogether, enlisted my sympathy. But I was utterly unable to understand the policy of breaking in this way into private assemblages. So I made inquiries. The explanations I got were various and conflicting, but they all pointed to conclusions which I shall try to summarize.

It must be understood to begin with that several factions are concerned in the general movement for woman suffrage in England. Among the rest there are the "suffragettes," the "suffragists," and the Social Democratic Federation. The latter is the English organization of Marxian socialists. It is not a strong body, nor is it influential. The strong socialist movement of Great Britain is less definite in its socialism and more closely in alliance with non-socialist organizations, of which the Independent Labor Party is the most powerful. With reference to the extension of voting rights to women, however, the Social Democratic Federation probably expresses the general socialistic idea, namely that there should be adult suffrage regardless of sex and property.

The "suffragists," more than any of the others, are like our own advocates of woman suffrage. They are out of sympathy with the "suffragette" tactics of disturbance, and on the whole look with confidence to the adoption by the Liberal majority in Parliament of woman suffrage as part of the Liberal program of electoral reform to be announced toward the end of the present Parliament and made the basis for an appeal to the country at the general elections. This organization is the lineal descendant of the movement begun by John Stuart Mill.

The "suffragettes," in contradistinction to the "suffragists," are of two households—the Women's Social and Political Union, under the leadership of Mrs. Pankhurst, and the Women's Freedom League, under the leadership of Mrs. Despard. The latter organization is a recent offshoot from the former. Both

are militant in their methods, and if there is any difference between them on suffrage questions it is difficult to find. Probably there is none unless it may be that which distinguishes the socialistic suffragettes from the others—the Freedom League standing for the most part for unlimited adult suffrage, and the Social and Political Union standing for suffrage for women only on the same conditions that there is suffrage for men. The League broke away from the Union nearly a year ago. The immediate cause of the break seems to have been the urgency of a faction to bring the Union into co-operation with the Independent Labor Party, of which Keir Hardie appears to be most distinctively the leader. Failing in this effort, that faction organized the Women's Freedom League and the other continued with the Women's Social and Political Union.

The militant or "suffragette" movement began very soon after the coming of the Liberals into power. This fact and some others lend color to the suspicion of the Liberals that it is part of the campaign tactics of the Tories for embarrassing the Liberals. They argue that there was no lawless invasion of the Commons when the Tories were in power, that none of the properties of agitation were disregarded then, and that ministers were not interrupted in their speeches at public meetings; but that as soon as the Liberals came into power—though committed to economic reforms and to electoral reforms, including votes for women—these embarrassing tactics were resorted to by the "suffragettes." They assert also that the leaders in the movement are either Tory women or socialists of the type that are more hostile to the Liberals than to the Tories, and that there is abundant reason to believe that the agitation could not be carried on without Tory money. In addition they direct attention to the friendly relations which they observe to exist between the "suffragettes" and the Tories; and they predict that if the Tories should be returned to power at the next elections, the militant suffrage movement would subside and the reforms which the Liberals are now trying to establish, economic and electoral, would "go by the board." On the other hand, it is argued that only by this prodding can the Liberal ministers be made to redeem their pre-election promises.

Were I to venture a judgment in the matter, I should say that a little prodding could do the ministers no harm, and might make them more sensitive to party obligations; but that the circumstances do very strongly corroborate the Liberal suspicions that this movement in its disturbing aspects is of Tory origin and in the Tory interest. Not consciously so, perhaps, for its outbreak almost simultaneously with the coming of the Liberals into power may have been only a coincidence, and its Tory leadership may just as well imply an awakening among Tory women, as something less commendable; but the effect of the movement whatever its intent, must be to aid the Tories at the expense not only of the Liberals and of economic reforms, but also of the cause in whose name the movement advances. To this probability the Tories seem quite alive and are no doubt grateful for it.

To recur, however, to the justification for such conduct in private assemblages as that which I mentioned at the beginning of this letter, the "suf-

fragettes" argue that these assemblages are public and not private; but with my American notions of such things I found great difficulty in apprehending the subtle English distinction of "public" and "private" in politics. Among us, a political party hires a hall for a meeting or a banquet, and for the time being that hall is theirs—their very own. Though they invite the general public to attend, and though one of those who participates as a speaker be a public servant, even a cabinet officer, the invited public are simply guests whom the host may expel if they don't behave. They have no right to interrupt or disturb. Consequently no well-disposed person in the United States would do at a peace congress, or an economic congress, or a club banquet, or a public meeting under any auspices whatever—even though the President were a speaker—what those ladies in London did when ministers, and in one case the Prime Minister, were speakers. But the friends of those ladies defend their conduct on the ground that a meeting at which a public servant speaks, is a public meeting in the sense of being a meeting at which he may properly be interrupted with "heckling" questions from anybody in the audience.

This notion seems to rest upon the fact that English political meetings are public meetings in a very different sense from ours. The public attend them not as guests of their promoters, but as a right. And any meeting, whether political or not, which is attended by a cabinet minister who is to be reported by the newspapers is a public meeting in this amazingly comprehensive sense. Not only may hostile auditors "heckle" speakers at such a meeting, but they may insist upon admission—even though the meeting be held at a private residence, as "suffragettes" contend—and being admitted may amend or vote down resolutions in behalf of which the meeting has been called, as well as interrupt the speakers with irrelevant questions to the point of breaking up the meeting.

To appreciate the situation in this respect an American must have recourse to his imagination. Suppose a Republican meeting, advertised to the public and thrown open to the public, to which reporters are invited, which is held in a hall paid for by the Republican Committee, is presided over by a Republican, and is addressed by President Roosevelt as the leader of his party, holding similar responsibilities as a public servant in our country to those that Mr. Asquith holds in England. What should we think if Democrats, or Socialists, or Prohibitionists, or even voteless women, went to that meeting in such numbers and acted in such a manner as to silence Mr. Roosevelt, defeat the Republican resolutions, and substitute Democratic, Prohibition or Socialist resolutions as the sense of the meeting? We should probably make short work of them. The police would hustle them out if they were men, and the audience would "guy" them out if they were women. Yet precisely this sort of interruption is claimed as a right of the citizen in Great Britain.

It would be the same if the meeting were a party convention, or a peace meeting, or a protection meeting, or a banquet of a protection club, to be addressed by the President. The only condition is that the meeting is public, not private; and the only necessary test of its public character is the presence

of a public servant who is to make a speech to be reported by the newspapers.

It is upon this understanding of the rights of public meeting that the "suffragettes" defend their interruptions at the International Peace Congress, the International Free Trade Congress and the Cobden banquet. They say that men have the right by English custom to do this, and that they intend thereby to assert equal rights with men.

Breaches of the law they admit, but they argue that men have in that manner secured all the reforms in their favor that they have secured at all, and if women would win they must do likewise. They make no protest against arrest. On the contrary, they court arrest. They say that while the voting right is denied them they are outlaws, and they are acting out the character of outlaws. Their object, summed up in a word, is to make the men "sit up and take notice." These elegant English women don't express it in that phrase, but they mean what that phrase means to us.

This is all quite incomprehensible to Americans; but it is another instance of what I have called a "difference," as distinguished from a superiority or an inferiority. While I can recognize the difference simply as a difference, and silence all my rising sentiments of disapproval with the plea that this is the English way, which may or may not be better than ours though different, yet I find it quite impossible to sympathize with these feminine disturbers of other people's rights of assemblage when they say that American women suffragists would adopt the same tactics if they were not spineless creatures.

It is interesting, not to say instructive, to notice that if the "suffragettes" were successful, very few women outside the propertied classes would derive any electoral benefit. What they are in effect demanding is not votes for women, but votes for women of property. Specifically, it is true, their demand is for votes for women on the same terms that men have votes. But the votes of men are determined by property qualifications. Some of these qualifications are very slight, to be sure, nothing more being required than that the voter shall pay a moderate rental for lodgings. But this voter's wife would have no vote if the suffragette movement were successful, for she would not be a rent payer. Even the wives of the well-to-do middle classes would have no votes unless they owned property in their own right. They would not be rent payers, and their rent-paying husbands would vote for them. Widows, and unmarried women who should pay the small rent now requisite for manhood suffrage, would have the vote if the "suffragettes" triumphed; but apart from these, the vote would go only to women of independent landed property. The great mass of British women would still be without the vote. The husbands and fathers among the working classes would continue, as they do now, to "vote for the family."

"Suffragettes" reply to this objection, that the admission of propertied women to the voting franchise would be an entering wedge, and that all other women would then be enfranchised in due time. But to me it seems that this movement, however democratic its purpose and professions, is likely to be at best, in its effect, a movement merely for the establishment of woman suffrage upon a property

qualification which would be, for all but widows and unmarried women renting homes or lodgings in their own names, a property qualification of widely prohibitive dimensions. It would add largely to the class of voters who oppose the extension of voting rights to the working masses, and thereby make harder than ever the extension of suffrage to all women.

The probable electoral program of the Liberal party is more likely, in my judgment, to secure voting rights for all women, than are the tactics of the "suffragettes."

L. F. P.

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Tuesday, September 1, 1908.

Bryan's Speech on Trusts.

Having discussed the tariff in his Des Moines speech (p. 516), Mr. Bryan discussed trusts in his Indianapolis speech of the 25th on the occasion of the notification to Mr. Kern. In the course of this speech he said:

I have, in discussing the tariff question, presented one of our remedies, namely, the removal of the tariff from imports which compete with trust-made goods. This, we believe, would greatly lessen the extortion practiced by the trusts and bring about the dissolution of many monopolistic combines. But we are not satisfied merely with the lessening of extortion, or with the dissolution of some of the trusts. Because the private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable, the Democratic party favors its extermination. It pledges itself to the vigorous enforcement of the criminal law against trust magnates and officials. It is impossible for the Republican party to enforce the present criminal law against trust officials; these officials are intimately connected with the Republican party in the present campaign.

The speech then proceeds to explain that the Democratic platform does not stop with the enforcement of the law, but demands such additional legislation as may be necessary to make it impossible for a private monopoly to exist in the United States; and that it proposes, first, a law preventing a duplication of directors among competing corporations, and, second, a license system regulating corporations doing an interstate business. On the second proposition Mr. Bryan dwelt at length. Both speeches are published in full in the Commoner,—the tariff speech in the

issue of August 21, and the trust speech in the issue of August 28.

* *

Mr. Kern's Notification.

In the presence of 15,000 persons at Indianapolis on the 25th, Mr. John W. Kern was formally notified of his nomination (p. 467) for Vice President by the Democratic convention. Mr. Bryan was present, and after Mr. Kern's speech of acceptance, he addressed the assemblage.

* *

Independence Party Notification.

The nominees of the Independence party—Higgen and Graves (p. 417)—were formally notified at New York City on the 31st.

* *

Negro Opposition to Taft.

The Negro National Anti-Taft League (pp. 362, 519) has established headquarters at 3160 State street, Chicago. The battle ground States, in the view of this organization, are West Virginia, Delaware, Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and Missouri, and reports show that Mr. Taft's cause in these States can be made hopeless by the opposition of the Negro vote. According to a League report of the 29th—

A card canvass was put in operation two days after the Denver convention, and 81 per cent of the colored voters polled in the battleground States declared themselves as unconditionally opposed to the election of Mr. Taft. Volunteer workers, both male and female, are generously aiding the propaganda. Our organizers and promoters are invariably citizens with property and other interests at stake. It has been plain to us that outside interference, no matter how well meaning in purpose, can only result in confusion. Among our workers may be noted 350 clergymen, several Negro bishops, 200 school teachers, 100 lawyers, and nearly 300 physicians. Every profession and industry in which our class is represented is enrolled upon our books. As fast as is practicable, these voters are welded into ward and county organizations, with the voting precinct as the base, thus economizing labor and expense and avoiding useless friction.

Commenting upon the subject, one of the executive committee, Mr. Thomas Wallace Swann, writes:

The Democrats have a splendid fighting chance this year to win the Negro to their cause. The mass of Negroes distrust the Democratic organization, though they manifest the highest confidence in Mr. Bryan personally. Campaign committees are at best like the man from Missouri—you must "show" them! It is, however, a fact of vital importance that all funds used by this anti-Taft bureau, for the period which this report covers, came out of the pockets of Negro men and women. Nearly two thousand dollars was raised by contributions and temporary loans. Not a single Caucasian penny is