

owner certainly does not, for it is all pay, pay, pay with him, and if he does sell his surplus birds, he will only get back 2s. to 2s. 6d. a bird. But the public gets the benefit, for they can purchase these costly reared birds for the price of chickens. One day those people, the farmers, tradesmen, working-classes, and laborers, will wake up to what they have lost, when they find the country house shut up, and shooting, as it used to be, a thing of the past. They can only then thank themselves, for it is by the votes of these very people that a government was returned to power bent on mischief. To ruin the gentleman and landowner, to upset everything which has done so much to keep good relations between the upper and working-classes, has been their intention. And this is their idea of benefiting the poor, by ruining owners of estates, by killing sport, and by introducing socialism of the worst type.

\* \* \*

### THE SECURITY OF PROPERTY.

From a Speech by Winston Churchill, of the British Ministry, Delivered at Abernethy, October 16, 1909. Reported in Liverpool Daily Post and Mercury of October 18.

The security of property depends upon its wide diffusion among great numbers and all classes of population, and it becomes more secure year by year because it is gradually being more widely distributed. The vital processes of civilization require, and the combined interests of millions guarantee the security of property—I speak of the immediate security of property; but, ladies and gentlemen, the security of property over long periods of time requires another condition. It must be supported by the moral convictions of the people; and if those moral convictions of the nation are to be retained, there must be a constant and successful effort to reconcile the processes by which property is acquired, with ideas of justice, of usefulness, and of general benefit.

A society in which property was insecure would speedily degenerate into barbarism; a society in which property was absolutely secure, irrespective of all conceptions of justice in regard to the manner of its acquisition, would degenerate not to barbarism, but death. And that is, I think, the message, the main message, which is to be found in the heart-stirring speeches which my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer [Lloyd George] is delivering in the country, and which are arousing people to face all sorts of awkward facts which hitherto they have been glad to leave neglected and unattended on one side.

No one claims that a Government should from time to time, according to its conceptions of justice, attempt fundamentally to recast the basis

on which property is erected. The process must be a gradual one, must be a social and a moral process, working steadily in the heart and in the body of the community. But we do contend, when new burdens have to be apportioned, when new revenues have to be procured, when the necessary upkeep of the state requires further taxes to be imposed—we do contend that in distributing the new burdens a government should have regard first of all to ability to pay; and secondly—and this is a newer point—that they should have regard to some extent, and so far as is practicable, to the means and the process by which different forms of wealth have been acquired, and that they should make a sensible difference between wealth which is the fruit of productive enterprise and industry or of individual skill, and wealth which represents capture by individuals of socially created values.

\* \* \*

### SUFFRAGETTE VIOLENCE.

From a Criticism by Edwin D. Mead in the Boston Transcript of October 20, 1909.

It is a great mistake, but I find it is not an uncommon one, to think that the recent violent proceedings in London and Birmingham and Newcastle, the attempted assaults on the Prime Minister, and the rest, really represent the main body of English woman suffragists, or have their approval. Nothing of the kind. These things are condemned by the sensible progressive people of England as emphatically as they would be condemned here. In suffragist circles especially it is keenly realized how damaging all these follies and excesses—yes, and crimes—are to the cause.

I do not speak of the conservative wing; it was with the radicals, scores of them, that we talked everywhere. Read the articles in the London Nation and the News during the last month; these show the feeling of the stanch English radicals towards the recent recourse of Mrs. Pankhurst's women to brickbat arguments. The Nation is the ablest radical weekly journal in London. The News is the ablest Liberal daily. Both have been strong defenders of the radical suffragists, even the "militant" suffragists; but neither of them will stand for this new sort of thing.

No sober person can stand for it, and the strong leaders of the woman suffrage movement in England see clearly that that movement least of any in the world can itself adopt what has latterly become the pet principle of its opponents, that the ultimate political tool and sanction is force. On that battlefield women will ever be doomed to defeat; on the intellectual and moral field their victory is sure and will come rapidly, as victories go in great movements.

Naturally condemnation of such able and devoted leaders as Mrs. Pankhurst is not pleasant and

is not easy. Mrs. Pankhurst and her associates are deserving of the highest honor for their zeal and their great achievements for the cause in the last half dozen years. I wish that half of their critics had a record of devotion half as good. They have inspired thousands of women as they have never been inspired before; they have raised a regular army for the cause, raised large amounts of money, and organized the most vigorous propaganda the cause ever had in England. The cause will never again drop back into the indifference from which it has been raised so largely by their consecration and energy. I am of those who believe that, up to the time of the late personal assaults, the Government not only tactically blundered in imprisoning the "militant" women in the manner and on the basis on which it did it, but that it would not have dealt in a similar way with an equal body of men doing similar things. These women have our legitimate sympathy and support. Their strong positive services will be remembered and will be influential long after their mistakes are forgotten. But their mistakes are grievous—it would be foolish and pusillanimous for their friends not to be outspoken about it—running at last into a fanaticism and lawlessness which many feel make their activity for the moment a greater hindrance than help to the cause.

The change in sentiment in thoughtful London circles in the last year is marked, and is very painful. Instead of the confidence and enthusiasm which we found in all progressive places two years ago, in the Liberal newspapers, the Liberal clubs, and in advanced social circles generally, we found this autumn confusion, scepticism and dismay. Political friends and the average man have alike been alienated by a sustained course of proceedings conspicuously unwomanly and unfair. No opinion was expressed to us oftener than that woman suffrage would not begin to receive the vote in Parliament today that it would have received two years ago; and the disaffection which the recent violences have engendered in the man in the street and the woman in the home is deeper than that in the House of Commons.

I cannot illustrate the feeling among the best English friends of woman suffrage better perhaps than by reference to some strong London leaders well known here in Boston.

No one who heard Rev. Silvester Horne at the meetings of the Congregational Council here a few years ago needs to be told of his high position in the London pulpit; there is not, to my thinking, a better preacher in London, and there is certainly no abler or more courageous champion of good causes. He is one of the most earnest advocates of woman suffrage; and he deplores these recent excesses.

The same is true of Mrs. Byles, whose strong addresses here at the time of the International Peace

Congress are so well remembered, and who has been for years one of the leading woman suffragists in England. At the very time we were in London she was writing to the newspapers her strong protests against these proceedings, and many were joining her in public expression of their sense of the deep injury which the course was doing the cause.

Herbert Burrows was another of the able English speakers here in 1904, a zealous suffragist and a trenchant writer for the cause, who draws the line at the new departures.

I think we have never had an English suffragist in Boston who appealed to us more strongly than Mrs. Philip Snowden, who was here last winter, wife of the well-known Labor representative in Parliament. Her personal charm, her eloquence, her zeal, her justice and her common sense combined to make a deep impression upon every audience which she addressed here, and it was so in New York and everywhere else. She is a warm friend and admirer of Mrs. Pankhurst, highly appreciating her achievements; but she holds the new policy mournful and disastrous, and she told us that a great organized protest against it by leading English women was under discussion.

I might multiply such judgments, most earnestly expressed by leading English suffragists; but I mention here simply persons well known to our Boston suffrage circles. I wish to defend the English suffragists stoutly from the notion, which I find rather widespread, that this new policy of violence represents them as a body, or has their sanction. Every level-headed person among them with whom we talked felt it to be as vulgar, fanatical and wrong as any of us here would deem such proceedings—and just as prejudicial to the good name and real progress of the movement.

It stands to reason. All talk about such violence having a justification in England which it would not have here, by reason of the different conditions of English political life, is nonsense. England in respect to all the essential conditions of political agitation is just as free as we are; and the suffrage cause, in my judgment, is much farther advanced, much more hopeful of early success, there than here, in no sense desperate. It is hardly a generation since any general suffrage for men in England came in; not a quarter of the men who now have the suffrage had it in 1866. Somebody may say that a lot of them raised a good deal of a row, tore up Hyde Park fences and what not, in agitation for it. So they did. So meetings to protest against the Boer war were brutally broken up again and again by the English jingoes eight years ago; and meetings to protest against the Budget were repeatedly broken up or turned into pandemonium by radical English workingmen and others—with whose zeal for the Budget, if not with their way of showing it,

I warmly sympathize—while we were in London last month. Such outbursts are occasionally to be expected when feeling runs high. But these proceedings were not encouraged, and were not sanctioned at headquarters; the Budget League, when charged with winking at them, instantly and indignantly repudiated and condemned them. The St. James Hall women, on the other hand, not only sanctioned the throwing of stones at Mr. Asquith through the windows of his own country home, the assault upon his train with brick-bats, and all the violences at the great Birmingham meeting, involving not only danger to the speakers but indiscriminately to the innocent thousands present—I think our people do not know the lengths to which this thing has gone—but gloried in it, and when the perpetrators were locked up called them “martyrs.” Right or wrong, the leaders are responsible.

To one who realizes how the various progressive political causes hang together, it is a source of double disappointment and chagrin that the Ministry which these women have elected to hinder and harass is precisely that which is at this moment in a hard and heroic struggle for the greatest measure for liberty and equality which has been submitted to the English people for almost a century. It is not strange that, in the face of this, and of the fact that the particular bill which they propose would confer suffrage only upon a limited privileged class of women and probably strengthen the Conservative vote, the charge that they are a tail to the Tory kite should be as common as it is. The charge is a slander; there is not, I believe, a shadow upon the disinterestedness and singleness of purpose of Mrs. Pankhurst and her associates. But the disproportion of it all, if these women are real Liberals at heart, is melancholy.

The Transcript published last Wednesday the truest account of the present Budget campaign in England and its deep significance which I have read in any American newspaper, from the pen of Herbert W. Horwill; and at almost that very moment we were reading of a flock of women trying to assault the leader of this great campaign, a sincere woman suffragist withal, Mr. Lloyd-George, at his Newcastle meeting.

This new policy of violence is to be sharply distinguished from the “militant” measures of the preceding years, the pressing of petitions and the breaking up of meetings. But even for this last is anything really to be said by serious and sensible people? I think not. It is a policy which cannot be reduced to a virtuous general principle; and I have no right to resort to tactics for my cause which I am not willing another shall adopt for his. The general exclusion of women from suffrage is a rank injustice; the present industrial inequities, condemning thousands to such undeserved and hopeless suffering, are yet more flag-

rant; the waste of the people’s money on great battleships which are chiefly a menace and not a defence is an appalling thing; and in England especially I am always tempted to say that the unlimited toleration of the dramshop is worse still, but shall I say that so long as Congress goes on voting big battleships I will help break up every meeting where an Administration man speaks? Shall my temperance brother say it? Shall the labor leader? It would be the end of free speech; it would mean the wanton destruction of the painfully evolved machinery by which we have made our political progress; and it would mean the rapid return toward anarchy and barbarism. There is just one road for us all in democratic countries like England and America, however dear and cardinal our causes, and however hard to brook defeats and delays. It is the road to the minds and consciences of the masters, of Prime Ministers and Congressmen; the road lighted by Lincoln’s confidence that, although you can fool some of the people all the time and all the people some of the time, you cannot fool all the people all the time or permanently.



## THE WORLD’S ONE PHILANTHROPIST.

William Marion Reedy in the *St. Louis Mirror* of November 11, 1909.

A man named John Stewart Kennedy, of whom no one ever heard before, died in New York the other day, leaving a fortune of \$70,000,000, of which he bequeathed \$25,000,000 to various charities, religious missions and so forth. Upon his memory is poured forth much praise. And for honesty of his motive one can only speak praisefully. A man has a right to do as he will with his own, provided his disposition of his wealth does not harm others.

It is in order though to state that gifts like those of the late Mr. Kennedy, well-intentioned though they be, do not reach the conditions the donors wish to ameliorate. Charity does little good. What the people need is justice. I am aware that pending the establishment of justice there are many who cannot wait. Their charity may help some, but never much, permanently. The spread of education and of religion is a desirable end, too, but, alas, education seems not to be efficacious towards morality or to making a living, and religion puts off too many people seeking happiness here and now, with the promise of felicity in a very uncertain hereafter. A great deal of the money given to philanthropic ends in these days is wasted upon the symptoms, not upon the disease of poverty and wretchedness.

The one man in the world who seems to me to have the right sort of philanthropy is Joseph Fels,