

with such social affairs. It is known that the relatively superficial problems of previous politics are tending to yield place to the more strenuous questions of social organization—of questions involving the welfare of the masses whom well-to-do women have hitherto only touched with their finger-tips, in occasional charity. In the discussion and handling of these great problems women must come to the front, and this the labor organizations largely recognize.

Fourth, while nothing is more intangible than the attributes of popular sovereignty, nothing is more far-reaching, more profound, more intensely effective in its influence. "You will never conquer Rome," said his ambassador to Pyrrhus, "for there everybody walks about with such an air as only princes wear with us." In all industrial, social, and intellectual work, women need this powerful invigoration, which has proved absolutely indispensable to the development of powerful character and effective action among the average masses of men. On the theory that women did not exist except in relation to the head of a household, it was logical to leave them untouched by the immense educational power of the suffrage. At present, when—whether we will it or not—women do compete in all employments with men, they cannot afford to be so deprived. They cannot afford to submit to the disadvantage of an habitual inferior *a priori* estimate of themselves and their work, such as is inevitable where the definition of a social unit is—a person who can cast one vote. Then, every one who cannot do so is inevitably, however tacitly, classed as less than a person; as the fraction of a unit.

Finally, society demands an increased brain-power, both for actual work and for transmission by inheritance. Whatever, therefore, experience has shown has a tendency to increase brain-power, the women of to-day require for themselves, and the society of to-day requires for them.

II.—A Plea for Postponement

By Maud Wilder Goodwin

As I journeyed last summer on a railroad which wound ribbon like in and out among the New England hills, I noticed frequent signals bidding the engineers "go slowly around curves." It was a wise warning, and one that might well be repeated in the halls of the Constitutional Convention when it meets this month. Equal suffrage for women is a curve at a sharp angle, and no man can foresee whether landslides and broken bridges lie beyond the turn, or whether the road stretches smooth and clear to the gates of the ideal city. Delay is not dangerous; haste may be.

The most successful legislation in American history has been that growing up slowly out of experience rather than any springing from the brain of statesmen or philosophers. The constitution devised for Carolina by Locke and Shaftesbury proved a total failure, and gave way to the body of laws found practically effective by the colonists. The Constitution of the United States, called by Gladstone "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the mind and purpose of man," was, in all its successful features, adapted from those which had been tried in one or more of the thirteen Colonies; while the Electoral College, which did not grow out of any root in American soil, has wholly failed to carry out the intention of the inventors.

In all social and political changes the unforeseen and indirect consequences are the greatest. The predictions of the wisest, based upon general principles, are at the best only guesses. The only trustworthy guide is that of an actual experiment where theory has been put to the test of fact. This test of experience we citizens of New York shall be able in the not distant future to apply to the problem of woman's suffrage. Our federal form of government gives us this opportunity. We have forty-four States, each engaged in working out the problems of government in its own way, and we may profit by both the successes and the failures of our neighbors.

It is important to the suffrage cause, as well as to the safety of the country, that it should be tried under the most advantageous conditions, in the place where the aver-

age of intelligence among women is highest, and where the comprehension of American institutions is most thorough. New York, with its enormous foreign population and the choking masses, unenlightened and un-Americanized, in its great cities, does not offer favorable conditions. The Western States, on the other hand, represent a population drawn largely from the New England of former days, and filled up with the children of men and women who brought to pioneer life the culture of an older civilization. Here, if anywhere, equal suffrage will be successful, and here it is being, or is about to be, tried. Women already vote in Wyoming; and Colorado and Kansas are granting them the franchise. New England is adopting a limited suffrage, confined at present to school-board questions; and outside our own country, New Zealand is trying the experiment of equal franchise.

In a few years, therefore, we shall be able to judge with reasonable accuracy what fruit this new plant bears in various communities and environments. Surely, twenty years is not a long period for deliberation over the greatest change ever proposed in government—a change which, when made, can never be undone.

The delight of *doing* appeals powerfully to human nature. Enthusiasm goes to meetings, while Deliberation sits in her solitary corner. Enthusiasm marches, while Deliberation stands still. In many cases Enthusiasm has the best of it, and, even with a wrong start, has retraced her steps and set off on the right track before Deliberation has bestirred herself. Yet, when we stand face to face with an unchangeable decision, Deliberation is the safer counselor.

The extension of the suffrage is irrevocable. When we speak of it as an *experiment*, we give a false impression of a movement as uncontrollable as an avalanche, which, once started, must inevitably sweep women on to equal responsibility with men in all the functions of government. Twenty years is not too long to weigh the arguments for and against so mighty a change. A considerable number of the signers of the present petition would be as much disturbed as surprised if the word "male," as an adjective qualifying voter, should be at once struck out from the Constitution. They wish only to put themselves on record as, in a general way, favoring equal rights for women, and they believe that the agitation started now will have no definite results before the meeting of the next Convention. But no one can guard against an answer to prayer, and it is quite within the possibilities that the present Convention may make the proposed amendment. The question, then, becomes a vital one, whether the times are propitious for a social and political upheaval; there is force in the point made by the anti-suffragists that they deprecate revolutionary legislation at a period when the State is struggling with so many difficulties and dangers. When it is so hard to deal with known factors, are we wise in seeking to introduce, at a critical time, an element unknown and unknowable?

If the voting of women does not alter results, the effect, so far as the State is concerned, is simply the further encumbering of an already too cumbersome machinery. If it may fairly be expected to work changes, it rests with those who favor the extension to prove that those changes will justify what every one recognizes as, in itself, an evil—the doubling of the number of voters. It may be that the broadening of women's intellectual horizon, the deeper sense of responsibility for the common weal, will prove compensating advantages, though I think we may fairly count upon these in the process of evolution, with or without the ballot.

We Americans share the delusion which Matthew Arnold attributes to his fellow-countrymen, that "the having a vote, like the having a large family, or a large business, or large muscles, has in itself some edifying and perfecting effect upon human nature." But, granting the subjective advantage of the ballot, it is still a question whether the majority of women desire it, and, since the privilege assumed by some becomes a duty practically obligatory upon all, it is only fair that time enough should be granted for a full and free expression of opinion.

Universal suffrage is so natural an outgrowth of democ-

racy, and we are all so confident that democracy is the ideal form of government, that the ballot in the hands of women is probably to be reckoned among the forces of the future. Whether it is to be a blessing or a curse may depend upon the calmness, the wisdom, and the moderation with which it is introduced, and the educational tests and other safeguards with which it is hedged about. It is a hopeful sign that our best citizens, both men and women, are thinking earnestly and dispassionately over this movement, which they recognize as part of a great current which cannot be arrested, but may be directed.

Achilles ponders in his tent;
The kings of modern thought are dumb.
Silent they are, but not content,
And wait to see the future come.



The Coal-Miners' Strike

By Prof. Edward W. Bemis¹

The present coal strike of over 140,000 coal-miners, with promise of additions soon, among a mass of men hitherto mostly unorganized and among the most ignorant and poorest-paid labor, brings us face to face with a situation as grave as that which confronted England last summer. The problems of labor are the same the world over, and the most advanced nations must confront and settle these problems first. Shall we find as broad-minded a spirit among our governmental leaders and wealthy men as England discovered in the person of the millionaire politician, the Earl of Rosebery, and his friends in the settlement of similar difficulties across the water? The question must be soon settled. If any strike was ever justified, this one is. Of 500 workers in the bituminous coal mines, rated as typical in Ohio, Indiana, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Alabama in 1890 by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, 86, or 17 per cent., earned under \$300, and 166 others, or 33 per cent., earned from \$300 to \$400 per year. Over half of the 500 earned under \$400, and 79 per cent. earned under \$500. Four hundred dollars, or \$8 a week, and even \$500, or \$10 a week, is not a liberal sum for the support of a family. Even if we add the earnings of the other members of the family, 29 per cent. of the 500 families received under \$400, and 59 per cent. under \$500.

According to computations of the writer, based on the census of 1890, as given in the bulletins, the average wages of the 24,323 miners in Illinois were only \$6.87 a week; of the 19,591 Ohio miners, \$6.76; of the 53,780 bituminous miners of Pennsylvania, \$7.55; and of the 70,669 anthracite men, \$6.21. The report for 1892 of the Ohio Bureau of Labor Statistics confirms this, for it gives the average weekly earnings in 1892, in that State, as \$6.67. In most States wages average about \$2 a day, when the men have work, but this is usually not over 200 days in the year. The influence of high charges in the company stores in further diminishing these meager wages need not be described. The Illinois Supreme Court, two years ago, blind to the opposite decisions of Eastern and English courts and the dictates of common sense, refused to sustain a law against them, because an interference with the "freedom of contract" guaranteed in the Constitution.

Since these figures were gathered wages *have been reduced one-third*, at least in Ohio and western Pennsylvania, on each ton of coal, and the number of days of work per week has decreased one-half, so that despair is written on the countenances of thousands of our miners. I lately saw the payroll of one of the large Ohio mines, which showed the wages for the two weeks of April as in most cases from \$4 to \$18; though, in that particular mine, wages had previously varied but little from \$2 a day for 200 days in the year. What were the causes of all this? A little history may well be given.

According to the census bulletins, the output of anthracite mines, mostly in eastern Pennsylvania, was 45,544,970 tons, and the number of operatives 70,669. The output

and the number of workers for the calendar year 1889 in the bituminous mines, where alone there is any strike at present, was as follows:

District.	Number of Employees.	Output in Short Tons.
Illinois.....	24,323	12,104,272
Alabama.....	6,762 (?)	3,378,484
West Virginia.....	9,952	6,231,880
Kentucky.....	5,260	2,399,755
Tennessee.....	4,180	1,925,689
Virginia.....	1,555	865,786
Georgia and North Carolina.....	740	226,156
Ohio.....	19,591	9,976,782
Indiana.....	6,532	2,845,057
Pennsylvania.....	53,780	36,174,089
Maryland.....	3,734 (?)	2,939,716
West of Mississippi.....	30,105	16,067,500
Total.....	172,574	95,135,165

The miners, after many factional struggles between branches belonging to the Knights of Labor and others organized on trade-union lines, came together in an impressive scene in a convention in the City Hall of Columbus, O., on the morning of January 23, 1890. The organization of United Mine-Workers was then formed, with John McBride as President, only about two years after a similar federation was perfected among the English miners. Yet the American federation was reported in the New York "Tribune" Almanac for 1894 by the Secretary of the American Federation of Labor as embracing last fall only 20,000 members. The growth since then has doubtless, for the time being at least, placed it even ahead of the Amalgamated Association of Carpenters and Joiners, hitherto, with its 57,000 members, our largest trade-union. Mr. McBride, by the way, was instrumental in having Ohio adopt her famous law for public employment bureaus, and was chief of the Ohio Bureau of Labor Statistics in 1890-92. In October, 1885, after a series of fearful strikes in southern Ohio which has made the Hocking Valley forever famous, Colonel W. P. Rend, of Chicago, a well-known operator, and officers of the miners' unions met at Chicago to arrange a compromise. In the forenoon only three operators attended, but after dinner more were induced, by the urgent solicitations of Mr. Rend, to come in, and the conference adjourned to meet at Pittsburg in December. A larger attendance was there secured, and another adjournment was had to Columbus, O., where, in February, 1886, an agreement was reached by a majority of the soft-coal operators of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and West Virginia to fix a scale of wages for the year according to an agreed-upon basis. The rates differed roughly with the difficulties of mining.

But while the operators in Ohio have always lived up to the agreement, and were able to advance wages from 60 to 70 cents a ton and live in peace with their men, the inability of the unions to organize and bring into line the unions of southern Illinois gave a pretext to the northern Illinois operators to withdraw and cut wages in 1889, as is vividly, bitterly described by Mr. Henry D. Lloyd in his "Strike of the Millionaires Against Miners." Indiana followed northern Illinois, but Ohio and western Pennsylvania continued faithful most of the time, and met in yearly conference over wages and other conditions of employment.

The miners of western Pennsylvania had agreed through their organizations to receive from their employers 79 cents a ton for coal for the year ending May 1, 1894. Ohio miners, because of slightly better conditions for mining, had contracted with their employers to receive 70 cents in most of the mines. The depression in general business last fall caused the shutting down of the iron-works about Pittsburg, and the trouble began. The fault seems to have been wholly the employers', if my informant in this matter, himself a prominent coal operator and employer of over 2,500 miners in that and other fields, is reliable authority. Many of the Pennsylvania operators deliberately broke their contract with the miners' organization by cutting wages from 79 cents to 69 cents, in the hope that by so doing they could secure a monopoly of the coal market. Unfortunately, the miners' organization in these mines was too weak to protest. Thereupon Mr. John McBride, President of the Miners' Union, who has won a high reputation for fair dealing with the coal operators, and came

¹Of the University of Chicago.