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RESOLVED
THAT WE DISFRANCHISE the MEN AND GIVE WOMEN THE BALLOT
What Is Happening.

Resolved, That we disfranchise the men and give women the ballot. If we do that, we stand a chance of bettering conditions. Surely we cannot make them worse than the mess men have already made of our political and economic conditions.

Despite the fact that men think women but a personified frailty and an economic dependent, we have been able to prove our ability to equal man's in every capacity, except in war. I am proud to admit that we are weaker than man, in brute strength.

What have men done in the United States? What have they made of all the natural resources with which this country is endowed? How much are the ten million paupers and the thirty million poor enjoying of this much boasted "PROSPERITY?" Who is it that really enjoys the fruit of our inventive genius?

I'll tell you. It is the man who owns the patent right on our tools and machinery and who has Constitutionally acquired the "earth and the fullness thereof,” which God gave unto man.

Here is a letter from the United States patent office, by which I can prove my assertions:
Department of the Interior United States Patent Office,
Washington,
Miss Esther L. Edelson, September 27th, 1910.
McClure House,
Charleston, W. Va.

Madame:—

This office has received from the Department of Commerce and Labor your inquiry requesting informa-
tion as to the number of applications for patent since 1900, and also, how many of the machines are labor saving. As to the last topic mentioned, the office cannot advise you other than to say generally that all mechanical patents may be classed as covering labor saving subjects. As to the number of applications filed during the years 1900 to 1909, inclusive, I have to inform you as follows, the data being taken from the annual report of the Commissioner of Patents:

Applications filed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>41,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>46,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>49,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>50,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>52,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>54,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>56,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>58,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>61,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>65,839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 537,955

(Signed) R. F. WOOLARD,
Chief Clerk.

Now let us consider the contents of this letter and see what the men voters have done for humanity during their reign of power.

First—In ten years' time we have invented 537,955 devices that, according to the letter, are labor saving subjects. Nor do we stop there. On the contrary. Every year the number of inventions increase by the thousands. Every year we improve our means of production. Every year we make it less necessary to employ human labor by creating substitutes in the shape of machinery. Every year we are better able to harness the machine to the earth for the purpose of producing the necessaries of life.

Within about twenty-five years, if our inventive powers continue, we shall hardly require human labor power for production. In fifty years from now we shall be wondering why humans ever needed to work.

If we now have ten million paupers and thirty mil-
lion poor, in twenty-five years from now, with our present population unchanged, we would have fifty million paupers, forty million poor, three million well off, and a half million owning the United States, part and parcel, unless we change the system of ownership.

Before taking issue with me, see the increase in the number of applications filed for labor saving devices every year. Within only ten years' time we have demonstrated just what the future holds in store for us. The men, since they have the power to make and unmake conditions for the people of this country, had better take heed. The man who is too blind to see or unwilling to look ought to be disfranchised.

"Socialism Will Destroy Incentive."

Here's an old chestnut. "Socialism will destroy incentive." Did you ever hear that one before? Yes, it sounds familiar. Yet, the same letter I have read you, shows that the incentive story has no solid ground to tread on and therefore seeks the Socialist corn.

"In the most prosperous years the greatest number of applications for labor saving devices were invented," says the chief clerk of the patent office.

In 1901 and in 1902 we had prosperity, therefore, the increase in the number of applications is more marked than in the years 1903 and 1904. The latter being closer to the National campaign. Look again at the year 1907 and you find that the increase is comparatively smaller, because of the crisis, than during the years 1908 and 1909.

Do you know why this is so? Because the word prosperity means that more shops are running full time and fewer are closed entirely or "till further notice." Which in its turn means that more workers are employed. More are earning the grocer's bill, the butcher's bill, the rent and perhaps a few dollars extra for some "new glad rags"—that's all they really are—for the family.

During a crisis or panic the people have no incentive to create works of art, literature, poetry, music, inventions, or any of the thousand and one products of genius that help the human family up the ladder of progress. Their minds are occupied with the means of producing
just enough to survive the day. They are concentrating all their thoughts and energies on the one vital question, bread and butter, during the hard times. The problem of how to keep alive until “prosperity” returns becomes the all-observing one. Social consciousness remains with only a minority, and that in a rather secondary degree. That is why we have fewer activities socially and less social development.

When a man’s stomach is empty, his first thought is food and not art or invention. When his clothing is threadbare, his first desire is to find clothing and not machines that will displace human labor. Ask any hobo of the four million in the United States which of the problems is the most vital to him and he will tell you “that of securing a lodging.” All of which is perfectly natural with a society that is composed of mere mortals.

Now, then, after the jobs begin to reappear and the atmosphere shows signs of clearing up, when we no longer need worry about food, clothing, and shelter, we find ourselves demanding better food, better clothing, and better shelter. To obtain these things we must invent the means, the machinery and the tools. We are no longer concentrating upon the animal needs, our minds expand, ethically, intellectually and socially. We paint, we model, we write, we think, we invent and we advance.

If we are capable of showing such tremendous signs of power awakened when we receive only part of what we produce while at work for a private master who might decide to discharge us for political or other reasons, how much more progress might we make under Socialism? For, under Socialism the producers will receive the full social value of their product, will be guaranteed steady work, for the government, will have no fear or worry about the possibility of slack time, illness or old age, will have fewer hours to labor and every safeguard to protect them from industrial accidents. Talk about Socialism destroying incentive. Why, the ages never yet have witnessed such incentive as Socialism will create. Shouldn’t a man be disfranchised who insists upon clapping his hands in approval to the lie that makes him the slave of a bunch of crafty politicians and crooks?
Labor Saving Devices.

Do you remember the passage I read regarding labor saving devices? I could almost write a book on that subject. "All mechanical patents may be classed as covering labor saving subjects." Every one of those devices would do away with some labor. There are 537,955 labor saving subjects invented in only ten years.

Let us analyze this thing. It is worth our time. You know that some machines would displace only an hour’s labor. Some the labor of one worker for two hours. Again, some would displace one worker, others ten, still others one hundred, and there are machines that can displace the labor of four, five and six hundred workers. Let us be ultra conservative about it. As "ultra conservative" as the Vice Commission of Chicago. Let us say that each will displace, on the average, only one worker. What have we? In ten years we find, if all the applications were granted, 537,955 workers out of work. Jobless, unemployed, not because, as the "standpatters" would have you believe, these workless workers are lazy, shiftless, good-for-nothings. But because machinery has displaced their labor and they didn’t have sense enough to own the machines themselves by voting for the collective ownership of the means of life. Those are the fellows I would have disfranchised. Those are the voters who, through their negligence, force poverty and suffering upon helpless women and children.

"Ah!" you say, with a sigh of relief, "all those applications weren’t granted." As if it were a blessing that they weren’t. As though humanity could be better off with fewer labor saving devices. As though we could produce the means of life with less effort because we were forced to work longer hours with hand tools, instead of letting the machines work for us.

However, I will admit that unfortunately all the applications were not granted. I am willing to go a step further and say that out of the 537,955 applications only 400,000 were granted. Even my critical friends cannot now find fault with me. Four hundred thousand applications granted, at the rate of one worker displaced, per machine, and we still have four hundred thousand work-
ers jobless, most of whom are willing and anxious to find employment.

Any man who votes for a system of private ownership of the machine that might tomorrow displace his labor and throw him upon the scrapheap as a profitless, worked-out tool, ought to be disfranchised for the protection of the rest of the workers.

**How Many People Suffer.**

It would be sad enough to think that 400,000 people suffer because machinery has been invented to lessen the struggle for existence, but when we remember how many helpless ones at home must innocently share the suffering, how can we help ourselves from condemning the whole system and all those who persist in perpetuating it? A person with a logical brain and sympathy in his heart must be very optimistic to hope for a better future. No wonder men and women commit crimes and suicide when life becomes such a hopeless task.

Vital statistics say that there are five persons in the average family. That statement makes no class comparison. Statistics are not gotten up by Socialists. Evidently our statisticians do not realize that we have classes in our families, as we have classes in our society. Perhaps they do not know that we have a working class family and a capitalist class family, and that there is a world of difference between the two.

There is a reason for this difference. It is not because the wealthy are opposed to Roosevelt and they wish to enforce "Race Suicide" to "get even" with him. Nor is it because the workers love Roosevelt so dearly that they wish to advance his theory and apply for reward. No. The reason is altogether a biological one. It is a biological fact with the insect, the beast, or even the human that the scarcer the means of subsistence the higher the birthrate will be.

Since the workers must struggle for existence they have but little means of developing intellectual faculties, but they do reproduce their families.

The capitalist, since private ownership gives him the opportunity, has grown fat and flabby. Too lazy for work, which is natural exercise, he resorts to golf and
poker, an artificial means of raising an appetite and causing circulation. Nature requires natural activity and not sham, and nature must be obeyed or the culprit pays for his folly. That is why among the capitalists they have but small families. Instead of bringing to the world sons and daughters they adopt monkeys and dogs.

A fair estimate would give the working class family six or six and a half persons and the capitalist class family two and a half or three.

I have purposely dealt with this matter to show that my coming statement is not overdrawn. When we consider that the estimate is not altogether fair on the part of vital statistics, and then we accept the statement that there are five persons to every family, none of my opponents can find fault.

We agreed that only 400,000 applications were granted on labor saving devices and that each device displaced the labor of only one laborer. We also agree that there are five persons to a family. Now multiply five persons by 400,000, who are bread winners, and what do we find? We find 2,000,000 men, women and children, hungry, threadbare, or underfed, underclothed and poorly sheltered, because machinery has displaced the labor of the bread winner. Think of it. In ten years' time we have added 2,000,000 to our hungry list because we have found a way of procuring food more quickly and more easily. Can you see why the Socialists are agitating for the social and not the private ownership of the machinery? Do you understand that when you vote for protection of private property in industry that you are voting against yourself in order to protect the private property rights of your master, who owns the machinery at which you must work if you are to live? Do you see now why the “respectable” newspapers and magazines that you patronize are lined up against the Socialists? It is because the Socialists are opposed to private ownership of those very machines and it is because the private owners of those machines own or control the “respectable” newspapers and magazines. And I repeat that the man who votes against his own interests because “respectable” newspapers, “respectable” politicians and “respectable” capitalists advise him to, ought to be disfranchised.
What Is the Socialist Remedy?

Now you might ask, "how would the Socialists remedy the evil?" The answer is, by owning the machinery and the instruments of production collectively and managing it democratically.

For instance, we now permit a private individual to own the patent right on a newly invented machine. This individual has neither invented the machine nor helped make a model of it. He hasn't even labored when the machine was moved into his factory. Just the same, when the workers operate it he owns the product. Now comes an inventor who invents a machine that would displace the work of one of the two men who formerly operated the cruder machine. The boss purchases it. He has it placed in his factory. The machine can do the work of two men. The manufacturer cannot use more of that special commodity because he cannot find a market for the goods. He therefore discharges one of the employees, while the other goes on working as many hours as he did before and perhaps for lower wages.

Now, if there were a great many horses who could find no masters and would therefore have no means of obtaining hay or oats, they would soon find themselves hungry. Supposing they were hungry for a long time and could find only poor scraps occasionally to keep them from actual starvation. Understand that the horse must have plenty of feed to keep him fat and sleek and if he doesn't get it he becomes thin and lean. Now imagine a master appearing on the scene and saying, "Aha! You horse, because you are a thin horse or a lean horse, I will let you pull my truck, but give you less feed, though you must pull just as heavy a load and pull it just as long." Can you imagine the horse that would stand for it? I can't.

Instead of submitting, I can see the horse kicking up so much dust that the master would never approach him on such a proposition again.

Every time a worker is displaced by a machine he becomes one more member of the unemployed army. Just in proportion as the army grows and there are more unemployed, the masters, who own the jobs, take advan-
tage of our empty stomachs and reduce our wages. If they reduced the price of the necessaries of life, such as food, clothing and shelter, the difference in our pay envelopes would not really affect us. The trouble of it is that the cost of living grows higher, while the wages in the envelope fall or remain stationary. There’s the rub. That’s what I mean by less feed.

The whole unemployed army becomes a menace to the man or woman on the job and when the boss comes around and says, “We will have to cut your wages—less feed—though you are to work just as many hours and under the same difficult conditions, at the same unguarded machinery, which means just as heavy a load and just as long, up a high hill, without even a guarantee that you may always pull a load for me,” what do you do? Why, you bend your head lower and say, “Alright, boss; a little feed is better than no feed at all.”

Under Socialism, when a machine is invented to do the work with one worker where it formerly required two workers, the people who own the machine cut the hours of labor to just half. Instead of one man working ten hours and the other going jobless, while the profit goes into the pocket of the boss, we Socialists suggest that the men still retain their jobs, but divide the hours of labor, in accordance as the machine saves time.

The bosses tell us that “Labor is sweet.” Well, all we want is to divide some of that sweet stuff with them. Since exploitation will be done away with under Socialism and the present bosses will have no income without working for it, no doubt they will prefer to work and share some of the labor, as the best way of earning a living. All of which will tend to decrease the burden of the present workers by shortening their hours of labor and returning to them their labor product.

Sounds awful, doesn’t it? Sounds like “dividing up, destroying the home, abolishing the church, free love, anarchism” and another million hardships. And I’m willing to challenge any man or woman that you never saw those awful happenings even as much as hinted at in our literature. Not because we hide our intentions, but because you get your information from the other fellow
without giving yourselves the trouble of looking up the facts.

Any man who casts his ballot and says he is not in politics, who takes his advice from an outsider, who doesn’t take the trouble to find out all sides of the great political question, and who thus votes trouble upon himself and a great many other people through stubborn prejudice or avoidable ignorance, ought to be disfranchised.

Dividing Up.

I said we didn’t stand for dividing up and yet I suggested that we divide the hours of labor with the unemployed workers and capitalists. This seems like a contradiction. Therefore, let me relieve the minds of my doubtful friends, by adding that the only divide up we stand for and even favor is the division of labor. But that is not what the opponents of Socialism mean when they talk “dividing up.”

One bitterly cold evening I spoke to a rather large audience, amongst whom were a number of ill clad men. At my urgent request that the audience question me, a man arose in compliance. He wore a pair of overalls, holey shoes, a shirt that had seen better days many years ago, and a big slouch hat, like farmers wear. He was the picture of poverty. I could have vowed that he hadn’t tasted food for six months, if that were a physical possibility. Why, he looked so thin and scrawny that “he’d have had to fall in the water twice to make one splash.”

I believe he squirmed and coughed for about five minutes and then said, “Well, Miss, you ain’t such a bad speaker, no how, and what you teach ain’t bad, but you fellows can’t fool me. I’m on to your game, alright, alright. If you fellows want to divide up, you can’t get me in on none of that stuff.”

Poor fellow. Too bad we couldn’t divide up and give him something to eat and wear.

Socialist speakers seldom lose their patience, but that individual was too much for mine. I couldn’t help but say: “Why, you poor unfortunate, you have nothing in the world to divide up, except your bluejeans, and nobody wants them.”
And it is the absolute truth that I am mostly asked that question by persons who have least to lose.

No, far from trying to divide up, we Socialists are aiming to stop that dividing up game. Every time a worker produces ten dollars' worth of goods and receives less than the ten dollars' worth in pay, he is dividing up with a master. If that isn't dividing up, what is it? I am willing to be informed.

We Socialists say that the earth is useful only because human labor helped to make it so. Consequently only those who labor, with hand or brain, are entitled to the earth's bounties. Twenty-two million, nine hundred and ten thousand, seven hundred and forty-eight acres of good United States land are owned by the foreign nobility and foreign real estate syndicates. Where did they get it? Did they put it there? Then why should they own it? Why should we divide up with those royal snobs? Why shouldn't we own the whole earth, not a division or a share, and why should any man vote that the other fellow own the earth when he might own it himself? The man that votes to be the underdog doesn't deserve the ballot.

**Another Reason**

There is still another reason why some men should be disfranchised.

Volume 57 of the United States Census offers the following for our enlightenment:

Every worker, on the average, produces ten dollars' worth of goods a day and receives for his product $1.52 a day, skilled workers included; $1.60 a day for officials and foremen and all other employes. This, of course, does not include stockholders who get dividends (dividends).

Women are accustomed to buying bargains, because they must make two ends meet for a big family on ten dollars a week. They know that by saving a nickel on a pair of shoes, a penny on five pounds of sugar, another penny on five pounds of flour, and so on, that at the end of the week they can save a quarter of a dollar, and might be able to buy half a dozen eggs, or half a pound of butter. Ask any woman if she was ever able, with all her experience as a bargain finder, to buy ten dollars'
worth of goods, even at a fire sale, for one dollar and fifty-two cents. I am sure she would say “Impossible.”

There, now, you voter. If you produce ten dollars’ worth of goods and receive in return only one dollar and fifty-two cents for your product, you can buy back only one dollar and fifty-two cents’ worth of it. Eight dollars and forty-eight cents’ worth of your product is wasted through our imperfect system of distribution or goes for “monkey dinners” and “dog funerals,” the maintenance of capitalistic and public institutions, the navy and army to butcher “foreigners” in order to swipe some foreign market on which to dump some of our “surplus” bread and butter. The rest becomes “overproduction.”

Overproduction means that you have been good, industrious fellows and have produced more than we really need just now. Therefore, you must go without eating until the shops reopen, after the surplus has been profitably disposed of by the masters. Of course, you understand that this doesn’t mean that you can simply quit working until all the people have consumed the surplus. No, that would be Socialism. And Socialism is wrong: “Impractical.” “A Dream” of about thirty million “half crazy, discontented grafters.”

What you want is something P-R-A-C-T-I-C-A-L. The capitalists give you something very practical. They want you to put a tight belt around your stomach to keep from feeling hungry, until they get rid of the oversupply that you are starving for. That’s practical.

We Socialists have never been able to agree with any college professor who explains overproduction as a case of prosperity, at the time when thousands of people, nay millions of them, are starving.

When all the people have so many of the things they need and then some, we may call it overproduction. But as long as there is one man, woman or child that is hungry you cannot have too much bread.

The most unpleasant part of the whole business is that the bigger the surplus the more people must go hungry and the longer must they go hungry. That is what the capitalists and their upholders call “overproduction.” That is what the Socialists call “underconsumption.”
When we reach the stage of "overproduction" men and women find themselves laid off from work, with very few possible means of an income. The workers, who are in the majority, must have money with which to buy goods, or there comes a panic. Business falls into a state of stagnation and things grow from bad to worse. It is then that the unemployed are in a miserable condition.

Supposing one grows very hungry, almost desperate, and should attempt to appropriate some of that surplus, he would be arrested at once and branded as a thief. Should he beg he would be branded as a pauper. He and his posterity would henceforth be disgraced. If he should happen to read in the "respectable" papers that there is plenty of work everywhere else except in his own particular town and, having no money, should decide to reach one of those prosperous towns via freight, he might be arrested for vagrancy. Not being bold enough to steal, humble enough to beg, nor reckless enough to risk his life en route a "side door sleeper," and should therefore decide to starve without letting anybody know his affliction, likely as not all his neighbors will condemn him as a lazy, shiftless, good-for-nothing, who would rather starve than go to work. There is still one other alternative. He can jump into the lake or hang himself, but should he be caught he will immediately be arrested and convicted for attempting suicide.

That's the system. Because you have produced too many luxuries you can neither live nor die.

Under Socialism, if the people were industrious enough to produce a surplus, they would stop working and worrying. They would have parties, picnics and pleasures. Why not? They having produced a surplus, no one is more entitled to the product than they.

The condition under capitalism is something like this:

Because his closets, pantries and cupboards are overfilled with the best, most nourishing, most palatable, most desirable and most healthful foodstuffs, therefore your neighbor is afraid he might have to starve. Or, because his trunks are overfilled with the most comfortable, most durable, most stylish and most desirable cloth-
ing, therefore he appears before you in patched up trousers and torn shoes. If your neighbor really came to you with such a statement, you would at once decide that he is crazy and fit for an insane asylum. That is almost the situation we are faced with every time we have a crisis or panic. Because the granaries are bursting with abundance and the markets overflow with commodities, those who have produced this wealth starve in the midst of plenty. The man that votes for such an insane system should surely not be trusted with the making of our economic and political administrations. For that man cannot be a good citizen who is so heedless of his fellows' welfare, even though he may be ever so religious.

And the Church Question.

I mentioned the word religious and a few of my unconverted friends visibly trembled. It reminded them of the "Socialism will destroy the church" argument.

This is an argument whose locks are gray with age. At the same time we Socialists will be faced with it so long as our philosophy is opposed in the name of religion. I want to be thoroughly understood on this proposition.

In most cases the church is fighting Socialism. If one of our newspapers or speakers ever speaks of the church it is always in retaliation of attacks on Socialism or in its defense. Never to begin a quarrel. Ours is an organization composed of workers and I do not believe that the workers have so much cheek that they need always to be slapped. We refuse to "turn the other cheek" to be slapped by parasites and vampires. And when we ask for bread and butter as reward for our labor, no God, no church, and no man has a right to oppose us.

As regards our position on the religious question, we insist upon remaining neutral. We insist that the church and the state ought to be separate if the people are to enjoy religious democracy. For so soon as the church and state combine, the church inevitably sells the state. Read the history of the world for evidence.

Besides, Socialism is a universal political party. As such it must keep clear of all national, creed, color and race lines. If the Socialist party were to affiliate with
the Catholic church tomorrow, the Protestants, the Methodists, the Universalists, the Episcopalians, and other Christian creeds, the Hindoos, the Mohammedans, the Jews, and the non-religious, would have to forsake the Socialist party and give up their principles unless each forsook his respective religion.

"The Lord helps those who help themselves." As you pray the Lord helps you. As you vote you help yourself.

Have you ever asked the Republican or the Democratic parties just how they stand on the political and religious combination? Have you ever denounced the Republican party because Robert Ingersoll was a staunch adherent to it? Will you now go back on the Democratic party because the McNamara brothers are Democrats? Are you also going to condemn the Catholic church because the McNamaras are Catholics? Of course not. You elect a great many officials who are neither church members nor Socialists. You do this, not because of religious scruples, but because they belong to a more popular party.

However, I will confess that there are Socialists who do not go to church. I will also confess that some of them question the existence of God. You would do the same under the same circumstances.

Now let me explain it. In my short career I have seen all kinds of devils, but have never had the pleasure of meeting any angels or saints, and for that very reason I decided to make an investigation. You know that the truth bears investigation. The lie doesn't. If the church is devoted to truth, then it need have no fear. No matter whether Socialism succeeds or fails, the church remains intact.

This is what I found as a result of my test. Our church leaders are divided in three classes.

To the first class belongs the minister or priest who attends the seminary for about fifteen or twenty years. During all this time his main business is to study the Heavens and its direct opposite. He never has time to reach the happy medium, the earth, being too absorbed in his studies of the two other extremes. He may be an
honest and well meaning man, but he simply neglected the present for the future.

Imagine one of his followers asking him for advice as to how to secure bread and butter honestly without begging or stealing. He has perhaps a hard luck story to tell. He might say this: "Father, I have been out of a job for the past few weeks. I have been unable 'to save for a rainy day' because it rained about four days out of the six by way of part time work instead of the full week. Now I have tried, with all energy, to get a job, but wherever I go they give me a discouraging answer. My wife and my children are hungry and I feel as though I have no more strength left to continue the battle. Do advise me as to how to get bread and butter for my wife, my little ones and myself."

Such a minister or priest might make the sign of the cross over his follower's head. Offer a blessing for him, tell him to get down on his knees and pray to God with all his heart, and when he dies, in the hereafter, angels will serve him with plenty of bread and butter on silver salvers in Heaven.

If that particular follower should happen to know something about Socialism he will no doubt find a better solution for his bread and butter problem. The church cannot save the souls of men whose bodies decay. 'And the question of saving bodies should be as much a part of the church as is that of saving souls, if the church is at all interested in such questions.

There is another class of ministers and priests who are perfectly familiar with our world and its needs. And in spite of their divine inspiration they are all too human.

The capitalists let no opportunity slip by without an attempt to make it their opportunity. The church is the place where the toilers go for spiritual uplifting. If the church or a part of it can be made to operate beneficially for the capitalist class it is worth a good price.

The way to go about it is to offer some church leaders who are worldly wise a good salary and a soft snap in exchange for a few misleading statements about the workers or their interests. The minister considers the problem thus. "If I lie for a salary, when I die I shall surely go to Capital H, with three dashes. However,
if I refuse to lie, I lose the salary, and then I shall have Hell on earth." After due consideration he may decide to postpone Hell and enjoy himself all he can while here. To do so, he must get into his pulpit and defend the capitalist system.

He tells you that Socialism is "free love, anarchism, breaking up the home, destroying the church, dividing up and UNCONSTITUTIONAL."

The Socialist hearing such misstatements from the pulpit is thus driven from the church, perhaps never to return. His faith is shattered. He may even become an infidel or atheist.

To the third category belongs the priest or minister who through some means or other learns the truth about the temporal needs of his flock, and who is willing to preach it even from the mountain tops, if necessary. Such a minister, however, is far from satisfactory to those who finance the church. The man who knows the truth and becomes inspired by it cannot be daunted. He will face all hardships and brave even the storm of a board of directors' wrath. He will therefore take advantage of the pulpit to preach his sermon about the truth. At the end of his first attempt he will be warned. The second time he will be threatened. Should he persist in his teachings the board of directors enforce upon him the recall. In other words, they compel him to resign. The next day the "respectable" newspapers will appear with the following announcement: "Reverend So and So was obliged to resign from This and That church because of failing health."

Socialism is based on scientific fact. It does not appeal to imagination. It is not something one can believe or disbelieve, any more than one can believe or disbelieve that stars are in the sky when the night is clear. You either see the stars or you are blind to their existence. The same with Socialism. If you know the facts and are true to your convictions, you are a Socialist. If you fail to know or understand the philosophy of Socialism, you should be fair-minded enough to acknowledge ignorance of it.

Since Socialism is based on scientific fact and religion is based on theology, the two can hardly be identi-
cal, and one should no more expect that Karl Marx ought to incorporate a code of religion in Socialism than that Thomas Jefferson ought to do the same in Democracy.

Because one's religion is altogether a private matter and has no actual effect upon society, no matter how or when he prays, or even if he doesn’t pray at all, his religion should not be mixed up with politics. As a man casts his ballot so he helps to decide the standard of living of a whole community or nation, therefore politics cannot remain a private matter. The minds of many people seem to be confused about this matter. They think that politics ought to be their own business and religion everybody’s.

If the church has a mission to perform that is sufficient in itself. It must not interpose with politics. As Socialism has its mission to perform it does not wish to meddle with religion. At least, if the church finds itself involved in politics, let it not go against the tide. Let it face the proposition bravely. Let it study Socialism without bias. Let it declare itself solidly for and not against the majority. Then only will it be able to say to the world, “We have helped save humanity from destruction by offering resistance to vampires who were nourished with the blood of their fellows.”

Otherwise we Socialists, as an organization, do not object to your praying. As far as we are concerned you may pray all the hours of the day, but we warn you politically, when you get down on your knees in supplication, for God’s sake put your hands in your pockets so that the other fellow may not steal your small change.

The man who wants his religion to interfere with his politics and lets his politics control his religion ought to be disfranchised. He has no right to the use of that of which he does not understand the value. That man surely does not understand the value of the ballot who permits himself to be made a slave by voting for slavery.

Each individual in a community, state or nation should have the privilege to help make the conditions under which he is to live and the laws by which he is to abide. A child is not expected to help advance the nation’s welfare, because its mind is not sufficiently mature. The man whose mind is so immature that he would boast
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of being uninterested in politics, which is the method of
determining his economic and social life, has no more
right to the ballot than the child. He should be disfrac-
chised and his vote should be substituted by that of the
woman's.

Woman's Work the Wash Tub.

How horrible! How awful! Woman in politics
when "her place is at home." "Good little girls and
women should be seen and not heard." Their place is in
the kitchen, by the cook stove and wash board. Politics
would take them away from the home. They would be
loafing around the saloons and gambling dens, maybe,
like the men sometimes do.

No, save the race; help keep woman away from the
polls. She might want to become the President of the
United States if you let her take one political step alone.
"Woman's place is in the home, where she belongs."

Now, gentlemen, if woman's place is in the home,
why don't you marry us? Why do you permit nearly
seven million women to crowd you out of your jobs in
the mill, the factory, the shop, the store, the office and
the business and professional fields? If woman's place
is in the home, why should so many of us have to work
for a living? There is one of two reasons. Either you
fail to do your duty by the woman in industry or you
have made such a mess industrially, as well as politically,
that woman had to come in to help you out.

It makes no difference whether it was through your
carelessness for her welfare or your inability to provide
for her protection, the truth is she must henceforth shift
for herself politically, as she is already doing industrially.

And let it be understood, but few women would pre-
er a job in a filthy factory or sweat shop—the kind
capitalism affords us—to a decent home with a loving
husband. Not many women would prefer to stand ten
hours a day in a department store, waiting to fulfill the
whims and wishes of the fine ladies who can afford to
buy things, in preference to waiting on her own sweet
babies. And though the business and professional life
may not have so many hardships for the woman as has
the factory and department store life, yet many women
thus engaged would trade positions with some of the happy wives and mothers of the middle class.

The truth of the matter is that woman had to become an industrial factor as a fulfillment of the demands of evolution. There was a time when her place was really the home. She had her spinning wheel at home. There she spun the cotton cloth and homespun and then made the family clothing from it, also at home. Even if the clothes were not exactly custom tailored, everybody was satisfied. They were obliged to be. It was then the fashion to have the clothing made at home because the garment industry was still undiscovered.

Now inventors have turned the spinning wheel into great power looms. These in turn they placed in large mills. The spinning wheel has become an old relic. As cloth must be made and the power loom is no longer in the home, woman was kidnapped by the owners of the mills to operate these vast power looms. Moreover, large factories were established where is being made the family clothing that was once made in the home. There, too, women operate the machinery, in the noise and heat of an overcrowded industrial prison.

As another illustration, take the washboard. Once we used it in our kitchens, where we did the family washing. Now these small boards were supplanted by large machines, which in turn were placed in large institutions, called laundries. With them from the home went woman, but instead of doing only the family washing she now has to wash the clothes of many people. Sometimes, too, the people may not be very healthy. Once in a while they may be diseased. Tuberculosis, typhoid, pneumonia and a great many unnameable diseases carry germs with them. They leave their death marks wherever they go. The clothes their victim wears is saturated with their poison. And they generally serve a death dealing blow to those with whom they come in contact.

The women in the laundries handle these germs every time they touch the clothes in which the germ dwells. They are therefore exposed to diseases of a varied nature and description. There is the possibility of avoiding this hazardous task by disinfecting all laundry before human hands touch it. But this would be too cost-
ly to the owners of the laundry machines. Girls are comparatively cheaper than would be the chemicals and a vat. The latter would reduce profits, the former are plentiful.

Capitalists make improvements only when they are obliged to. They are under no obligation to make improvements for women workers, because women are neither organized politically nor industrially. When the union, the industrial organization, makes demands for industrial betterment, the employer is sometimes forced to make some concessions. He is more frequently forced to concede when the organization is that of men. Men having political power, if they know how to use it, might make their demands felt from the ballot box. Women are denied that right because, though nearly 7,000,000 of them are at work, "woman's place is in the home."

If women could legislate they would enact laws to make their work less hazardous, their hours of toil shorter, consequently less nerve-racking, and their wages higher, to make prostitution for a living unnecessary. If they found themselves opposed by the masters who dominate the existing system, they would vote for the overthrow of that system.

The capitalists are good business men. They know that from a business point of view they are better off without the women voting. That is why they are opposed to woman's enfranchisement. That is why they use the bug-a-boo to frighten men and women from favoring woman suffrage. They would rather support her in prostitution than to have her earn her economic independence through political emancipation. And they will grant her the ballot only then, when, through lack of political experience she might defeat Socialism.

And why defeat Socialism? Well, because Socialism insists upon doing away with the profit system. Where the woman's vote would decrease private profits, Socialism would abolish it altogether.

Under Socialism it will not be necessary to roast, and fry, and broil in a poor man's poor kitchen, as we used to do of old. We have capitalism to thank for teaching us the fact that we are economically as capable as the men and maybe more so. The profit system has
forced woman into the industrial field, where she has learned, at great expense and suffering, the value of economic independence. When the factory and shop will be improved, machinery guarded, hours of labor shortened and wages increased, then the work will no longer be obnoxious to either man or woman. It will not be necessary to toil and sweat for a meager existence. Work will be no burden and labor will become really sweet. Then woman will cease to be man’s slave. She will be his equal. She will no longer be dependent upon him, but will learn to decide for herself just what she wants and when she wants it.

Let it be understood, right now, that it was not a matter of charity or democracy that prompted the capitalist to employ woman in his shop or factory. Nor was it necessarily sentiment. The whole reason is explained in one word, PROFIT.

The average wage per day of the man is $1.52 and that of the woman is $1.00. As there are nearly 7,000,000 women in industry today, 52 cents per woman profit each day is worth some consideration. That is exactly what prompted the capitalists to employ women. As machinery was invented to require less efficiency, men lost their jobs. As an increasing number of men lost their jobs and joined the army of the unemployed, those who were employed were obliged to accept a lower standard of living or be displaced by one of the unemployed. With the income decreased (I am speaking of the cost of living) it became impossible to support the grown up daughters. They were forced to go to work to shift for themselves. When the husband lost his job and the family was faced by want, the wife was obliged to take her husband’s place, even at lower wages. For the same reason is the child displacing both his father and mother. He works for still lower wages. He is still less capable of offering resistance. It is not sympathy for the child in want. It is absolutely the profit that can be made out of the child’s life, even though the child be crushed.

Mrs. Raymond Robins is quoted as saying: “It requires about twelve dollars a week for a woman to live in ordinary decency.” I can see where she is right. There are some men who no doubt fail to see why this is so,
when they can get along with seven dollars a week and they are men. Precisely because they are not women they require less to live on. It is questionable whether to live on seven dollars a week is really indicative of manhood.

Here are the reasons: When a man is at the end of his resources he can go into a saloon, buy a glass of beer and get a sandwich, besides, all for a nickel. Can a woman do it? Indeed not. What would the community think of her? She must go to a restaurant and pay ten cents for a glass of milk and a sandwich. What is more, men get more value for the nickel than women do for a dime, because there is plenty of foam on his beer, while her milk is skimmed. When a man has no more than fifteen cents to his name he can still find a place to sleep. He can go to a cheap lodging house and remain all night without losing a bit of self-respect. Nobody will look down upon him or consider him immoral. What would you think of a woman who did the same thing? Why, you would at once condemn her as an immoral creature, and all the “respectable” people of the town would speak of her only with scorn and contempt.

Besides. Woman is an economic commodity on the market, like your hat or your overcoat, gentlemen. If you should happen to pass a clothing store and see an attractive hat or overcoat and decide that you need those garments, provided you have the price, you will purchase them. If you should happen to make the acquaintance of an attractive girl, who is well dressed, you will decide to marry her, provided you have the price of a meal ticket. But you would no more be seen in company with a girl who never changed her styles than you would be seen dancing a cake-walk with a corpse. A woman who hasn’t style enough to make herself attractive is half a corpse, anyway. Where a man can wear the same old suit for an entire year, the girl who wants company must have change of dress and shoes and hat every little while. Those are the reasons why the woman needs more money to live on. When she gets less she must depend either on a male relative or she is forced to go under the city lamps.

Aside from that, however, we women are not op-
posed to having a home. In fact, most of us would be satisfied with a bald-headed, squint-eyed, hunch-backed, bow-legged, any old kind of a duffer, for a home. But, gentlemen, you can’t give it to us, because you haven’t the price of a permanent meal ticket.

As long as women work without having the power to legislate, they will have to work for lower wages and be one of the factors that helps to keep the standard of living down. For we must always bear in mind that the manner in which we live is decided by the amount we have to spend on living. For the same reason the social life of a people is determined by the means they employ to obtain subsistence.

However, if you gentlemen insist that our place is in the home and if you find it impossible to support us and give us a home, you should help us get into politics, to legislate for one. The man who resigns himself to a hall room in a boarding house because he earns too little to provide himself with a home where he would enjoy the family blessings, ought to be disfranchised. The woman ought to be given the ballot so that she might protect herself against the tyrannies of private greed by legislating for better working conditions. She should also be given the ballot in order to vote out of existence the ravages of prostitution which are caused by the profit system. In order to help raise the standard of living by politically forcing an increased income and thus helping men in their struggle, is another reason why women should be given the ballot. And lastly, women should be given the ballot so that they might enact a law forcing those men to marry and support them who insist that “woman’s place is in the home.”

Unsexed Women and Politics.

Because “Taxation without representation is tyranny”; because nearly 7,000,000 women are forced to work for a living; because so many of them work at tasks that injure them organically and make motherhood impossible; because they have no means of redress and are therefore forced into prostitution; because there can be no true democracy and no real liberty where intelligent adults are disfranchised; because all women should not
really be classed with lunatics, criminals and sick kittens as a matter of justice; because they are the mothers of the human race and because they have it as their duty to raise sons, future citizens, which they could not do intelligently so long as they may not participate in the questions that involve citizenship, that is why women may have a just claim to the ballot. The only objection is that it might "unsex" them.

As though that would make any difference. There is no law on the statutes that a woman must become unsexed in order to vote. There is also no physical law to the same effect. But, if it should happen to be a natural law that to cast a ballot one must become unsexed, then I have only this to say: Gentlemen, for your own sakes, let the woman get the ballot at once! It is dangerous to prolong the agony! For by the same logic, since you have cast ballots for so long a time, you must be unsexed and are no doubt mismated these many years.

Anyway, whether the sex question would have any real effect upon the human race or not by woman's enfranchisement, the evil or good effects would have to fall to the woman who used the ballot. Those women who do not care to become unsexed and who are not interested in politics, need not bother about voting. They have the option of remaining pure and beautiful as the dolls that are used for trimming Christmas windows. But those of us who do not care for our beauty should have the right to dispose of it, if we are willing to exchange it for the ballot.

The wives of capitalists need not vote, because they are already supplied with all the luxuries that wealth can buy, from monkeys and dogs to chauffeurs and other flunkies.

The women who oppose woman suffrage for the same reasons that they might oppose the sun or the stars are unfortunately too ignorant or illiterate to understand the true meaning of the term and what benefits political emancipation would bring them. They might learn, unless capitalism with its heavy hand has stunted those poor women beyond redemption. However, "where there is life there is hope," and we intelligent women, who have at stake the future welfare of the whole human family,
are in hopes that some day both men and women will be equally "unsexed" in order to be of mutual benefit. On that day we will be able, with song and cheer, to usher in the Co-operative Commonwealth.

The Co-operative Commonwealth Retarded

The Co-operative Commonwealth cannot really come until women understand the full significance of the use as well as the need of the ballot. Woman Suffrage will not bring Socialism, but Socialism will be retarded in its progress unless women are politically emancipated. Our Comrades ought to take notice of that fact. The capitalists have put that down on their daily calendar of routine.

Our men Comrades leave their own wives and sisters in political darkness while they walk a mile to convert a voting neighbor. The women folks soon find themselves neglected by their male relatives and thus are given more fuel to feed their prejudice that will burn up their reason. Where they formerly disfavored Socialism, they now bitterly oppose it.

When the capitalists begin to fear that their day of reckoning is fast approaching, in some cities or states, they hastily turn their papers and other mouthpieces over to the woman's service. Though they are not in favor of granting woman the ballot on the ground of future danger to themselves, still they would much rather have woman suffrage than Socialism, the latter being an immediate danger.

Because the woman is neglected in the home she is not educated to the full understanding of the use of the ballot. When she is finally enfranchised the opponents to Socialism invite her to pink tea parties and gatherings of the "upper crust" and explain that since all women are emancipated they are naturally all sisters on an equal plane. This is the reason why they must all vote the same ticket. Since the women of the wealthier classes are better educated and since they are so patronizing to the poorer women, it follows that the poor women must vote according to the direction of the rich ladies.

In that respect women make the same error as the men have been making all these years, with the exception that while the men sell their votes, the women at
The wrong end of the polls are deceived because of their inexperience.

To prevent such misleading methods, women should know exactly what their interests really are, and when they have the privilege to help better conditions by the power of their ballots they should be educated to use that power to their own interests. Then our nobility and blue blooded parasites of other countries will have to look elsewhere for heiresses whose fortunes were made by the sweat of the brows of their less favored sisters. And when the woman of the working class will learn the message of Socialism, patronizing heiresses will be unable to dupe her with pink teas and sisterly equality.

All other conditions being equal with the man's and woman's honesty as regards the selling of her vote being superior to that of the man's; Socialism will approach on speedy wings.

Cleaning Up.

Oh! No! Women should keep out of politics because "politics are too dirty for women!" Quoted from the average man by the average man.

I for one heartily agree that politics are too dirty for women, but I also recognize the fact that they are so dirty because women have been kept out of it all this time. What is more, politics will never be an iota cleaner until women come in to clean up the political mess men have made.

I can prove it by taking an example of the average man when his wife becomes sick. We will have to refer to days gone by. I mean the time when eggs were so cheap that every "wise guy" and every "standpatter" could afford to pelt a Socialist speaker with them. That time the working man as well as the rich man could enjoy the luxury of eating eggs.

Now, if you will follow me to a home where the wife, Mary Ann, is sick and there are no maid servants, and the husband must become the housekeeper, I will show you how man is incapable of cleanliness. Understand, we are not talking about chewing tobacco and spitting the juice all over creation. Nor about cigarette ashes all over the furniture. We will just compare the
difference between the man and the woman, both of whom can participate in the same activities.

Supposing Mary Ann, one morning, finds herself so sick that she is unable to rise. Her husband, good naturedly, assumes to prepare his own breakfast. He rises at four in the morning and puts three eggs in hot boiling water, where he lets it boil till eight. When eight o’clock arrives we see him with a hard boiled egg in his hand asking the following questions: “Why, Mary Ann, I put them eggs in the boiling water at 4 o’clock this morning and I let them boil all the time and they are still hard, how do you git them soft?”

When Mary Ann explains the ease with which eggs can be prepared for any meal, we find our good natured neighbor adopting the egg diet exclusively. He has three eggs for breakfast, three eggs for dinner and three eggs for supper. Now, suppose his wife is sick for a whole week. If he has nine eggs a day, you can stake your belt buckle that there will be sixty-three egg shells all over the stove, the chairs, the table, the floor, the sink, the pantry, in the bedroom, on the dresser, the bed, the carpet, the chairs, the window sills, in the dining room, on the sideboard, on the table, on the couch, and on all the chairs, and in the parlor, on the mantel-piece, on the sofa, on the rug, on all the furniture, and if he had a piano, egg shells would be all over the piano and the piano stool.

The house becomes so dirty that Mary Ann is obliged to get out almost on all fours to clean up. Now, then, if in one week a man can get an ordinary house so dirty, how dirty must be that vast political institution called politics, since men have had exclusive control of it for these many years?

As a matter of justice to the whole human family, women must get into politics to clean up. And I favor the disfranchisement of men so that they are kept out of bossing the job, while the women are working.

Another Reason.

There is another reason why women should vote and that is because they are superior to men in everything. This I can prove by the Bible.
The Bible tells us in Creation, that when God made Adam, man, He made him of clay. Clay has a peculiar tendency. When it gets wet it becomes soft and mushy. The capitalists know that, that is why, on election day, they manage to find enough “soft” men to soak and make mushy.

When God completed His first job, that of making man, He set to work to make an improvement. He was so discouraged by His first attempt that He decided at once before the day was over to make another effort. He set to making woman, an improvement on man, even as the Bible says.

Man became so conceited that he claimed woman as part of his body. He made records to the effect that woman was made of his rib and for ages we labored under the delusion. Now comes medical science and disproves the entire theory. It dissects man and finds him in possession of as many ribs as has the woman. Both men and women, for a time, remain in the dark as to what product God used in the creation of the fairer sex, for we know that He made her of better material and not of man’s rib. Also we know that He would not have thought for a moment of making her of common clay.

This uncertainty troubled me not a little, but being of a somewhat observant turn of mind I watched and discovered. Here are my findings:

Since the average man lacks backbone, woman must have been made of the backbone.

The subject of my talk is based on that very reason. Men are too weak and “soft” to admit when they fail to understand a proposition, because they flatter themselves with the faculty of “knowing it all.” They also assume that they are infallible. They are incapable of making a mistake.

On the other hand, we women admit that we do not know everything and we are always prepared to learn, which shows that we have backbone enough to be honest about it, without assuming a “swelled head.”

Moreover, since we are willing to learn and are made of backbone, after we have found out what is good for us, we will have backbone enough to stand by our principles and not sell out for a glass of beer and a stogie.
We will have backbone enough to vote for what we want and help with our individual ballots to get it, instead of doing as the men do, by voting for what they don’t want and get it, lest, by voting for what they do want, they won’t get it.

Last of all, because we now have 10,000,000 paupers, 30,000,000 poor, 4,000,000 hobos, 1,500,000 prostitutes, about 7,000,000 overworked women in industry, millions of unemployed men and nearly 2,000,000 underaged children at work, which shows their incapability in politics, therefore let it be resolved that we disfranchise the men and give women the ballot.

Socialism Will Make Graft Impossible

There are only two ways of owning and controlling the industries. One way is by permitting the few to own the machinery and boss the job while the other fellow is working. The other way is by all those who are a part of society to contribute to its welfare by helping to carry its burdens and in return receive the full social equivalent of their product because the machinery becomes socially owned and the bosses are abolished.

Private ownership has been tried universally and with the same unhappy results. Public ownership is the next step in industrial evolution and has as yet never been tried. Because it stands for democracy in production and distribution it bids fair to be successful.

Under private ownership of the means of production and distribution, graft, corruption, and fraud is inevitable. Men try to beat their neighbors in order not to get beaten. Under public ownership in the means of production and distribution it will be impossible to beat the other fellow out of any portion of his labor because we must all be equal masters.

For illustration: An Irishman was once arrested for stealing a cow. He came to a lawyer and asked him to plead the case. The lawyer, who at first refused because all the evidence was against the Irishman, finally acquiesced.

During the trial there was the judge, the jury, two witnesses against Pat, his opponent, two lawyers, and a
number of people whose curiosity was aroused in the case.

The two witnesses, under oath, testified and proved conclusively that they not only saw Pat steal the cow, but that they knew where the cow was hidden at that particular moment. During the cross-examination the testimony was corroborated. The case was decidedly against the Irishman. Then the judge solemnly arose, issued his directions to the jury. The jury adjourned and returned a few minutes later with a verdict, "Not Guilty."

Pat made for the door and so did the lawyer. In the lobby his lawyer said to him, "Say, Pat, I'll give you ten dollars besides the ten you owe me for the case if you can tell me how in the face of all this evidence you came away 'not guilty!'"

Whereupon Pat threw out his chest and said: "Begorra and it pays to be a shmart man, I tell you. Begorra and it pays to be a cliver Oyrishman! Why, you know, everyone one of the twelve jurymin and the judge got a bucket of the milk, so I got away with the cow."

So long as the cow, the social means of production and distribution remains in the hands of a few, whether their ownership comes through usurpation or stealing outright, or whether it comes through inheritance, the owner needs only hand out a couple of buckets of milk and the social cow is decided in his favor.

When the cow will be socially owned it will be unnecessary to hand out a bucket of milk to have the judge or jury or any official decide the ownership of it or make the laws about it, for the benefit of the few. Then will graft, corruption, vice and fraud be abolished.

Press Comments on Work of Esther L. Edelson

Picquant in speech, eloquent in her appeal and attractive in personal appearance.—Waterloo, Iowa, Daily Courier.

Miss Edelson is an intellectual young woman, has a splendid command of English, and is an orator of abil-
ity. Her arguments are clearly, concisely and forcefully presented.—Freeport Daily Bulletin, Ill.

An especially forceful address by one of the foremost female exponents of Socialism and unionism.—The Freeport Daily Journal, Ill.

She tells the story of the working class, with the enthusiasm of a heroine.—Joliet Justice, Ill.

Has a fine command of language and weaves powerful sentences, with a wonderfully strong voice.—Lincoln Morning Star, Ill.

A brilliant and versatile young woman.—Parkersburg Sentinel, W. Va.

It was a fiery address, full of wrath against oppression—Elgin Daily Courier, Ill.

She received the undivided attention of her audience for over two hours.—The Clinton Review, Ill.

A little woman of unusual ability, whose fiery eloquence moved the audience to demonstrative enthusiasm.—Illinois State Journal, Springfield, Ill.

She held the undivided attention of a crowded house as she expounded the principles of Socialism.—Elgin Daily News, Ill.

Her satire, wit and burning words can never be removed from the minds of those who heard her.—Joliet Justice, Ill.

A pretty young woman organizer of unusual ability.—New York World, New York.

It was the most convincing, frank and fearless speech we have ever heard.—The Labor Argus, Charleston, W. Va.

Active, vivacious and witty.—The Reading Eagle, Pa.

Eloquent in word and gestures. Spoke earnestly, bravely and sweetly.—The Amsterdam News, New York.

Besides being a fluent speaker she is a writer of no small ability.—The Cumberland Daily News, Maryland.

She certainly handed out some hot shot to the satisfaction of her audience—The Labor Argus, Charleston, W. Va.
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