TO THE WOMEN'S SOCIAL AND POLITICAL UNION.

I HAVE never been desirous of experience for experience’s sake, but I would not willingly part with the bitter-sweets of the past few days, and the decisions to which they have brought me.

With the full consent of my colleague in the present enterprise I emerge for a moment from the impersonal attitude of joint-editorial responsibility in order to clear up certain seeming anomalies in a vivid situation: a situation which you, recent events considered, have created equally with us. It must necessarily be that I shall have to make frequent use of the personal pronoun. The more carefully you read what I say, the more easily will you see that the personal equation is not mainly in my mind. You will see that great impersonal considerations are at the bottom of the present state­ment, which on purely personal grounds I should never make. The only people to whom an apology is necessary for the making of this statement are the many readers of THE FREEWOMAN who are not members of the Women's Social and Political Union.

For a number of reasons which need not be set down here I was not a contributor to the two first numbers of THE FREEWOMAN, although I was aware that the present militant policy of the Women's Social and Political Union would be reviewed adversely in the first copy of THE FREEWOMAN. At the very moment at which some of you were inditing a remarkable correspon­dence to me, I had barely begun to make the acquaintance of paragraphs which roused you to curses loud and deep. As post succeeded post, it was evident that what angered you most, in the first place, was the question of the Editors’ recent connection with the Women’s Social and Political Union, in consequence of which brick-bats labelled “disloyal,” “spiteful,” and “traitor,” were hurled at both of us; and, in the second place, some of you could not get over the fact that you had actually received a signed invitation from me to become supporters of the paper. Because of this you did not hesitate to make use of the innuendoes of “dishonesty” and the like.

Now it stands on record in the official W.S.P.U. history, The Suffragette, written by Miss Sylvia Pankhurst, that my colleague and I are not much like either cowards or traitors; but that we possess qualities which were greatly in demand during the stormiest days of the W.S.P.U. With this record in mind, what to me is the significant thing about the letters I have received is that they are, uncon­sciously, so glowing a commentary on the current social philosophy of the writers. The now-I-know-you-as-you-are attitude arrived at in face of sudden difficulty postulates at once the belief in the funda­mental badness of the human heart. I refuse to acquiesce in that belief. But it is a belief so largely held, and therefore so readily acted upon, that stout hearts indeed are needed to combat its sinister influence. For, mark me! because the “truth” expressed turned out to be other than the “truth” expected and wished for (and I understand this: we like to read what supports us), libel and slander become the order of the day. The comrades and friends of one hour are the degraded beings of the next. What forms of friendship are these that are to suffer shipwreck at the first seeming assault?

As for the occasion I cannot help feeling very glad that the storm, if storm there had to be, should burst on the first number. In face of the obvious prospect of readers likely to be lost by too plain­speaking (those of untempered partisanship, or those who read public criticism in the light of per­sonal attack), the courage and sincerity of the printed page, and hence of the writer, are indis­putable. What member of the W.S.P.U. dare assert and defend, on higher grounds than those of immediate party advantage, that what a former colleague is prepared courageously to express and uphold shall not be expressed and upheld? In view of the un-
sporting attitude which is evidently abroad, I think it most essential that a vehicle for the expression of uncompromising and sincere opinions should exist.

One correspondent thinks I have changed my views on the necessity for Women's Suffrage. "My views on Women's Suffrage, and my belief in the immediate necessity for Women's Suffrage, remain unchanged," as I said in the *Standard* only the other day. There are many roads to Rome. There are many roads to a fuller realisation of the varying aspects of that ideal we call Truth.

Still another correspondent asks how he could be taken in by that "lying little hypocrite," Mr. Lloyd George. Her argument is that if I would only look at this wretched man as he really is, and examine his record, I could not trust him. Her own feeling is one of utter contempt for him. The plain truth is that I do not share such a view either about Mr. Lloyd George or any other "opponent" of the cause of Votes for Women. Personally speaking, I have always found the needful inspiration for strenuous work for the Vote in the idea itself. Moreover, but for the accident of continued temporary ill-health, I should most probably have been campaigning on the present situation myself. And I am quite sure that my attitude would have been that of a joyful challenge to Mr. Lloyd George: You want more of us to have votes? Very well, then, we will see that you give them! To believe unduly in the powers and machinations of a supposed enemy is to create the very psychological atmosphere in which defeat is possible. It belongs to a pessimistic frame of mind altogether alien to the joy and enthusiasm and spontaneity of earlier days in the militant agitation. It is the way of fears and doubts, and negations and hesitations. It is the sub-human way. Let the belief in the impossibility of defeat reassert itself. We will have the vote! That was the feeling inspiring the militant movement as I know and remember it. That was the magnificent way. That was the royal way. That was the triumphant way. It was the way of glorious affirmation.

A final matter: because of the attitude of The *Freewoman*, a friend who is anxious for my reputation, promises "enemies," where before these were "friends." My friend's fear is prompted by the view that enemies are bad things in one's life. Without on the present occasion expressing an opinion one way or the other on a very important aspect of life, let me comfort my anxious friend by the declaration that so far as I am concerned I flatly refuse to accept any "enemies" on conventional melodramatic lines. For every insult they offer I will make them a gift, and for every blow they deliver I will do them a kindness if I get a chance. So I warn them in advance! MARY GAWTHORPE.

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

We regret to be compelled this week to use so much of our space in reply to personal questions, which to the majority of our readers must appear to have only the secondary value of personal interest. We consider that this attitude has been forced upon us by the over-zeal of certain members of the Women's Social and Political Union, who took our first impersonal reference to their political policy in a personal spirit. We point out to them that personal attacks necessitate personal replies, and such personal replies will not fail to be forthcoming in the pages of *The Freewoman*. As we pointed out before, our review waits upon events, and will continue to do so, and, as occasion provokes, we shall give unrepressed expression to our own opinions. *

This week Miss Mary Gawthorpe makes her first contribution to the pages of *The Freewoman* in an article addressed to the Women's Social and Political Union. For the first and last time, the joint editorial attitude is made separate. This course is adopted on this single occasion as an appeal for the most questionable methods which have been used by certain persons, whereby they have endeavoured to exert influence upon editorial policy through private and personal channels. We have made this arrangement in view of events of the last few days. We ask the consideration of readers other than members of the Women's Social and Political Union, for giving so much attention to criticism of this particular political body. The editorial on "The New Morality," which was indicated last week, has been left over until our next issue.

The lady who penned the offensive letter specially referred to in last week's Notes, writes to say that she does not wish her name to be appended to any communication to *The Freewoman*, save to the formal letter specially referred to in last week.
more easily have forgiven every other sin of commission and omission with regard to women embodied in the Insurance Bill. The Commissioner should have been appointed and have received less than £1,000 a year, when men Commissioners are receiving this sum.

It is following considerations such as these that we cannot force our-selves into any special sympathy with the present mistress and maid agitation. We are compelled to believe that the new domestic servant tax will act in entire accord with our aims. In regard to both servants and mistresses. To begin with, we do not believe that the grievance that sick-pay shall only be paid when they leave the house of their mistress is a real one. With the vast majority of servants it is unclear, for the poorer class of servant-employers, i.e., those who keep one servant, are usually not in a position to keep a servant who is not only unable to carry on her work but is ill, in need of special attention and extra food. It is almost certainly a fact that four cases out of five, immediately it becomes obvious that the servant is really ill, she is sent away, nor is her place, as a rule, kept open. In boarding-houses, for instance, of which we can speak from years of first-hand experience, the servants who have only just time to notice that the servant is looking a little extra weary, before they learn that she is to go, or has already gone, and another appears in her place.

Even if the servant in poorer houses is permitted to lay up in the house ill, we doubt whether she gets much care, and if she she is ill at ease, being in an atmosphere where she is expected to work, and feels unable to. In rich houses, where she can easily be cared for, and sometimes is, nothing could be more grievous to George's new concessions, as her sick pay not being drawn upon, she will get it as a deferred benefit. Where she is not looked after, she can go home to friends, and with her 7s. 6d. per week insurance, and a possible 7s. 6d. per week in lieu of notice, free medical attendance, and free medicine, thousands of servant girls will be able to pull round and start afresh in renewed health. Even if she gets only 7s. 6d. and medical care, this sum to her friends will represent all the difference between possibility and impossibility. Another aspect of the servant problem which does not incline us overmuch towards favouring the present agitation is the fact that much of it is based on the assumption that neither mistress nor maid can afford 13s. a year each, and if it is to be paid, the poorer class of mistresses certainly cannot afford to pay it, therefore it must eventually come out of the small wages of the servant. Our own opinion is that mistresses who cannot afford adequately to keep a servant have no right to engage one, and that the maid who does not receive a wage sufficient to pay the necessary three- pence per week is not demanding a fair return for her labour. If a servant's wages are 7s. 6d. per week and full board, we say she is able to pay threepence; but if they are 3s. 6d. per week, she probably is not. The whole question turns upon this feature of adequate pay for domestic work. It is a fact that women housekeepers are tempted to employ more labour than they are in a position to pay for, and for some miserable sum they buy up the entire energies of an adult person. Impoverished mistresses will have to realise that their servants will not enable them to employ one servant's entire time. They will have to find some other means of meeting their domestic needs and of regulating the work of their household, possibly diminishing its needs to the extent that they can be met by the partial service of a servant, who will fill up the time of an ordinary working day with service to two or more houses. Domestic service will have to develop on the lines of the charwoman, who works and is paid by the hour. So only, indeed, will housekeepers escape the charge of sweating, and so only will the servant supply be kept up. We cannot understand those people who appear bewildered by the fact that a girl would rather work for a week in a factory and live in her own home, which may be poor, and perhaps utterly squalid, than be a well-cared-for domestic, earning with full board 7s. 6d. per week. To us the reason is as clear as daylight, and that it should be what we believe it to be is one of the healthiest signs of modern life. It quickens our belief in the people, and assuages our fears for Democracy. The reason is this: The servant with her uniform and manner of address—her "M'am" and "Sir"—is made conscious in every waking hour that she belongs to an inferior class. The girl in the mill may have to "knuckle under" from six in the morning until half-past five at night, but from half-past five till midnight she is mixing with people with whom she feels an equal, and this is not an equality in servitude which a servant may have under the present conditions there is a dearth of domestic servants. We welcome any expedient which forces housewives to reorganise their households; any expedient which makes the present domestic service unsaleable. We welcome anything which makes men and women realise that economy and forethought will have to take the place of unpaid, unskilled labour. We welcome any expedient which makes it clear that the money earnings of a man are inadequate for the proper upkeep of the house; any expedient which makes it clear that domestic service will have to take its place as a regular, serving, service. So we are compelled to believe that the present conditions will enable them to live outside of the sphere of their domestic labour. We are wholly undismayed by the fact that the present conditions there is a dearth of domestic servants. We welcome any expedient which forces housewives to reorganise their households; any expedient which makes the present domestic service unsaleable. We welcome anything which makes men and women realise that economy and forethought will have to take the place of unpaid, unskilled labour. We welcome any expedient which makes it clear that the money earnings of a man are inadequate for the proper upkeep of the house; any expedient which makes it clear that domestic service will have to take its place as a regular, serving, service. So we are compelled to believe that the present conditions will enable them to live outside of the sphere of their domestic labour. We are wholly undismayed by the fact that the present conditions there is a dearth of domestic servants.
and lower middle-class—exactly the classes which will be affected by the Bill. To those proposing to introduce medical attention, we say it would be much more valuable if the married women who work for the livelihood of their families, were to have access to free medical service in preference to the present system. We have no doubt their personal health would be greatly improved by the assumption of responsibility for providing it; and we sympathise with them in the long process of sick humanity making their way to the doctors' surgeries. Unfortunately, many are seen so without cutting into the small pitance upon which they have to live. Of course, only very small contributions could be made then, but free medical service can be provided without laying the burden of it on the poorest part of the community. We agree. We do not see how the poor can stand many more burdens. Our hope and belief is that they will not stand them very long, but by means of industrial warfare they will be able to continue to work for the livelihood of their families, and to alter their industrial position. On account of the free medical service we would accept the Bill, not only to its unfairness and cumbersome to prove to those responsible for it that they must find other means of working it. For we feel that a free medical service has been established, the country will never let it lapse, and we trust much of our present industrial health in furnishing the spirit necessary to throw off the chains of oppression. The one really deadly feature of the Bill is that which seeks to make strikes impossible, by tying up so great a portion of the funds of the Trade Unions against the reluctance of the sick benefits. By so doing, the Government is capturing the ammunition of industrial warfare from the workers, and by depriving strikers not only of their trade union funds, but also of their unemployment benefits in case of strikes. The Government seem bent upon making our industrial struggles as difficult as possible. The clause which deprives a man of his benefits has been dismissed by its enemies as an offence comprised under the elastic term of "just cause." It is an unfair menace, and it is to the belief that the discussion of other details has tended to confuse the agitation which ought to wage round the import and methods of education with the secure feeling that the principle of free education is safely established, so let us establish Free Medical Services, and then thrash out the details later.

Much has been said of the shouting down of Mr. Asquith in the City Temple, and much has been said of the alienation of support from the Women's Suffrage cause on its account. We refer to the statements made by Sir Edward Grey, who threatens consequent incapacity to help in the Suffrage campaign; Mr. Ramsey MacDonald who threatens to go into the Lobby against Woman's Suffrage; a supporter like Sir William Byles stating that such scenes are baffling their efforts; and Suffrage papers like the Daily News and Manchester Guardian warning their readers of the watering-down of enthusiasm which must follow these escapades. We say it is grossly unfair for such people to use such arguments. Time and again they have pointed out that the Women's Social and Political Union at present represents the smallest section of Suffrage opinion; they may not now turn round and say that because of the idiosyncrasies of these few they are justified, even for a moment, in threatening to dash the hopes of the great army of Women Suffragists who have not only paid their best efforts into the work, but who have watched for any sign of help to appear on the horizon, and who have done their uttermost to put such help to a good account. Do they, or do they not realise that these protests represent little more than the irritation of a small committee? If Sir Edward Grey, Mr. Ramsey MacDonald, and others are going to shape their conduct to fit in with these, we shall know what value to put upon their support. If they consider it means less to ignore the claims of perhaps a million Women Suffragists than to blot these women who are posing as being driven to political desperation, we are forced to take the view that they are merely playing at statesmanship. They are. We are sick of these poses in politics.

On the other hand, if the souls of the Women's Social and Political Union militants can only be expressed in forms of militancy, we would ask them to exert a spirit of self-repression for a few months, until the suffrage amendment is either lost or carried. Mr. Lloyd George said: "We must force through the Suffrage amendment. If it is carried in the Bill, next year," We therefore rely upon his fidelity to his own reputation as being inviolate. We may not now, with impunity, carry forward statements. Mr. Lloyd George said: "We must force through the Suffrage amendment. If it is carried in the Bill, next year," We therefore rely upon his fidelity to his own reputation as being inviolate. We may not now, with impunity, carry forward statements which imply a process fondly dreamed of by Miss Pankhurst. It would be only a reasonable thing for such a politician to say that they should realise that Mr. Lloyd George should be tied up in his own Shop. He may betray those who have relied upon him, but he may not, with impunity, carry forward statements which imply a process fondly dreamed of by Miss Pankhurst. It would be only a reasonable thing for such a politician to say that they should realise that Mr. Lloyd George should be tied up in his own Shop. He may betray those who have relied upon him, but he may not, with impunity, carry forward statements which imply a process fondly dreamed of by Miss Pankhurst. It would be only a reasonable thing for such a politician to say that they should realise that Mr. Lloyd George should be tied up in his own Shop. He may betray those who have relied upon him, but he may not, with impunity, carry forward statements which imply a process fondly dreamed of by Miss Pankhurst. It would be only a reasonable thing for such a politician to say that they should realise that Mr. Lloyd George should be tied up in his own Shop. He may betray those who have relied upon him, but he may not, with impunity, carry forward statements which imply a process fondly dreamed of by Miss Pankhurst. It would be only a reasonable thing for such a politician to say that they should realise that Mr. Lloyd George should be tied up in his own Shop. He may betray those who have relied upon him, but he may not, with impunity, carry forward statements which imply a process fondly dreamed of by Miss Pankhurst. It would be only a reasonable thing for such a politician to say that they should realise that Mr. Lloyd George should be tied up in his own Shop. He may betray those who have relied upon him, but he may not, with impunity, carry forward statements which imply a process fondly dreamed of by Miss Pankhurst.

Present-day militants, finding it hard to restrain their spirits, may ponder over this statement. Having pondered, they may then welcome the respite in order to prepare for such an eventuality. Perhaps those people who have not protested the Bill up to the present time, will not be so quick to John Hampden will then have an opportunity of showing the "mettle of their pasture." We might remind them that John Hampden was not like John Hampden because he refused to pay a tax, and was clapped in prison thereupon. They may still be so driven to political desperation that they may not even know that in blood and by deed. We would here point out that many persons in such an eventuality must be driven to political desperation that they may not even know that in blood and by deed. We would here point out that many persons in such an eventuality must be driven to political desperation that they may not even know that in blood and by deed. We would here point out that many persons in such an eventuality must be driven to political desperation that they may not even know that in blood and by deed. We would here point out that many persons in such an eventuality must be driven to political desperation that they may not even know that in blood and by deed. We would here point out that many persons in such an eventuality must be driven to political desperation that they may not even know that in blood and by deed. We would here point out that many persons in such an eventuality must be driven to political desperation that they may not even know that in blood and by deed. We would here point out that many persons in such an eventuality must be driven to political desperation that they may not even know that in blood and by deed. We would here point out that many persons in such an eventuality must be driven to political desperation that they may not even know that in blood and by deed. We would here point out that many persons in such an eventuality must be driven to political desperation that they may not even know that in blood and by deed.
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THE FREEWOMAN
Man at Home.

We hear ad nauseam of the Woman at Home. Let us revise ideas that are too much taken for granted, and consider for a moment the domestic man. Home does not signify a place where cooking and sewing is carried on; otherwise it differs not from a restaurant or a milliner's shop. To clear our minds of cant is to perceive that home is an enclosure, not always made with hands, that contains Monsieur, Madame, et Bibi. These three persons of the domestic Trinity are interdependent for happiness. For comfort, in the landlady's sense of a "home from home," they need, not so much each other, as a civilized community. Lack of civilisation leads in our day to domestic unrest. Hitherto-accepted household conditions are becoming hopelessly out-of-date.

In certain high quarters there sounds a trumpet cry of "Back to the Kitchen, ye Women!" as though there were something sacred in cookery, and that trade alone were to remain unsystematised, while all the world moves on.

Women—and men, too, no doubt—clung to home from the stuff long after the steam-loom had made the cumbersome hand-weaving unnecessary. Now the hand-loom takes its proper place as an object de luxe. The kitchener and the private gas-stove must ere long follow suit. American women herd into hotels in order to escape the menial. Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman is, so far as I know, so far as I know, a voice crying in the wilderness of a still more excellent way, but we English are slow to enrol ourselves as her disciples. When once we have deserted the fetish of home cookery from our own hearts and minds, as it were, it will be time to call in the aid of Man. For reform on a large scale needs Capital, and Capital is for the most part under male control. Business men would respond to an effective demand from women, would organise communal cooking on an adequate scale, and release the household from that invader of the sanctity of home-life, the private cook. Those chivalrous men, too, who recognise the burden that is laid upon women will see more clearly perhaps than women themselves how avoidable is much domestic labour, and will work towards the evolution of the New Housekeeping.

The common retort to those who bid woman stay at home and never mind politics is that politics first come home to her. But the New Housekeeping would be part of politics in another sense. For it would not be of the unpaid or ill-paid kind, but a trade of large outlook, in which intelligent human beings of both sexes might have pride. Woman, as at present At Home, bears an unequal yoke. She needs in another sense what she has not yet spoken of that most necessary adjunct of home, "the baby." Might not the advice, "to go home and mind the baby," sometimes be applied to the fathers? A railway porter or 'bus-driver—nay, even a stockbroker—dandling his "little nippers," might be as touching a sight as a mother bending over the cradle. The law of England may be in doubt as to whether man or woman be the true parent. But nature has settled the question once and for all. Even as a father punishes his children and acknowledges his responsibility towards them, so will the family flourish. Co-education means education by as well as of the two sexes in common.

That woman who most denies and neglects herself is the most belauded. Also most sweated trade of all—domesticity. Household economy is economy of effort, not the planning of an impossible budget, from which even necessities are excluded. And the wits of men, as well as women, are needed for this task. To differentiate in schools between boys' and girls' occupations is beginning at the wrong end. Boys and girls alike need training above all in the faculty of co-operation.

There remains one item which is sometimes overlooked when woman is told to "go home," etc., and that is Woman herself. She is to be queen, counsellor, supreme, and so on, in her sphere, but . . . she is to be unconsidered. That woman who most devotes and neglects herself is the most belauded. If self-abnegation be a virtue, the neglect and disregard of the labourer by those who profit from her labour is a crime. Wage-earning women who go out of doors to work usually find that their men at home render them instead of the attentions that are so welcome to the work-weary, while the very fact that the housewife is not paid
a money fee is apt to make her ignored. Kindly working men, indeed, are known to rise early and make and bring up a cup of tea to the "missis" in order, recognising that she too does her day's work; but such men are exceptions, and are held pearls of their sex.

Novelists of a certain type picture the room in which the feminine touch prevails—a room full of senseless knick-knacks, such as women love! In pleasing contrast is the den of the male creature, where reigns—as is fit!—a confusion of boots, pipes, papers, and shirt-collars, everything that makes a man defer as long as possible the enforced tidiness of a married establishment. The woman who dilates upon the inconvenience of muddy boots in such novels is stigmatised as a nagger; while the orderly husband (who sometimes occurs even in such books!) tied to a slatternly wife is a martyr.

The "she" is significant in connection with giving and educational privileges, the modern reader does not take too seriously the virtue of being "secured from those difficulties and strong temptations to which men are exposed in the tumult of a bustling world." It implies a life in which sympathy may have its scope without too great cost, where, as Spencer puts it, "there have ceased to be frequent occasions for anything like serious self-sacrifice."

Whether even in the nursery it is entirely wise to allow this feminine specialising in the finer sympathies is nowadays doubted. Of course, there is the girl's maternal impulse to reckon with, but all little girls are not Wendys, with a passionate mothering lost boys and darning their stockings while they enjoy a pillow-fight. Among Mrs. Molesworth's children the boy-hero of "The Girls and I" plays the mothering part. And, as many a teacher knows, classes of girls will indignantly fail to identify in themselves this graceful tendency to take all the trouble and forgo all the excitement.

The quite modern attitude, then, being hopeful, it should be understood by women that self-sacrifice, strictly interpreted, is not a gentle yielding thing, allowing, as St. Paul prays, "Blot out of thy book"; when St. Paul mingle their own spirit among the lines of least resistance; nor is it in the highest sense possible except to a strong and energetic soul. Otherwise there may be sacrifice, even acquiescence, but not self-sacrifice. Modern psychology is at one with theology in indicating that what is sacrificed is the lower to the higher self, the narrower, more immediate interest to the wider and more remote, the "losing oneself to find oneself" of the gospels.

At certain crises of human development, in certain staggering emergences in life, a veritable passion of self-devotion is aroused in fine natures to meet the new demand. So, for instance, Browning's lover exults:

"To think I kill for her at least
Body and soul and peace and fame,
Althougb's end and mankind's aim." Or another laments:

"Would it were I had been false, not you!
I that am nothing, not you that are all."

Again, when Moses, in interceding for the people, prayed, "Blot me out of thy book"; when St. Paul could wish himself accursed for his brethren; when Danton cries, "Que mon nom soit effacé et que la France soit libre," the personal self disappears, not resignedly, but in a glory of identification with the nation's fate. Here is the "exuberance of power" admired by Nietzsche: "I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again," are Christ's words concerning His life's sacrifice.

It is not an idle truism, then, to insist that self-sacrifice demands, first of all, a self. Energy, character, vitality are shown both in the ecstasy of the lover's homage, and in the chivalry of the leader's devotion to his people. And since the lover is not permanently entranced, nor the hero's host for ever in desperate straits, the character will show itself at other times in other ways, demanding often, no doubt, in the course of its development, that it, as well as others, shall be treated "as an end and not as a means."

Whether self-cultivation or self-sacrifice is the supreme virtue, each will be a matter for insight, as the issue arises, and can not be prejudged.

Now, just because so many women in the loose, popular sense have a gift for self-sacrifice, they may be reminded that it is possible to spend one's all, prodigal-wise, at home as well as in the far country. What lot remains but that of the hired servant?
There are homes with helpless female members, invalided or inefficient because undeveloped, a burden and a drag to the male supporter in spite of the pitiful tale of past self-suppression on his behalf. Would it be possible for me to express a sentiment of which Nietzsche might be supposed to assert that “women always intrigue in secret against the higher souls of their husbands”? Alas, the woman with the muck-rake not only does not see the crown, but sweeps the mud diligently from the path of the man who might reach it. Her salvation as well as his lies in the fact that she sometimes gets in his way!

WINIFRED HINDSHAW.

Mr. Asquith will Die.

I HAVE never written before for any specifically feminist publication, and shall never in all probability do so again. I am one of those people who agree with the ends and detest the means of the current suffrage agitation. I am an adult suffragist. I want to see women have votes because I believe the vote may be a useful educational symbol (even if it prove temporarily a political nuisance) in the necessary work of establishing the citizenship of women. I follow Plato and Miss Celia Hamilton in this. Present women are not regarded as citizens; they do not regard themselves as citizens; they behave accordingly, and most of the trouble of life ensues. . . . Apart from the material oppositions of sex, I believe there is very little difference between men and women that is not imposed upon them through the extravagant sex-nunnery of our social system. Humanity is obsessed by sex. I have always been disposed to take sex rather lightly, and to think we make a quite unnecessary amount of fuss about it; I write for an imaginary Reader whom I never think of as specifically male or female, and consequently I have never cared to write for such deliberately and self-consciously female publications as this.

I do my best to avoid the present suffrage agitation, because it over-accentuates all those sexual differences I want to minimise, and shakes my faith in the common humanity of women. It is, unhappily, impossible to escape it altogether. I am waylaid by ladies who sell me The Vote in an aggressive manner, shops full of green, white and purple articles of no particular merit are always good, I am annoyed, while walking up and down Heath now without hearing some devoted woman doing her best to persuade a crowd of ribald hearers that women are entirely different from men, and should therefore be given the vote upon identical terms. And that reminds me of the thing I had in mind when I began this article: almost always as I pass those speakers one name drifts to my ears. It is the name of Mr. Asquith. Sometimes it is “Mr. Asquith says.” Sometimes it is “Mr. Asquith said.” Sometimes it is “This will make Mr. Asquith say . . .” A perpetual nagging of Mr. Asquith.

In some extraordinary way I perceive Mr. Asquith has become the central fact in the suffrage agitation. The whole campaign is presented as the creation of mental states in Mr. Asquith. He has become the Antagonist of Women. He has become the State Husband, the Official Wretch. He plays the rôle of Devil just as the two Misses Pankhurst are the radiant angels in the struggle for this emancipation. At times I am forced to doubt whether the green, white and purple shops, the straining speakers and the rest of it have very much to do with the cause of women at all, so relatively immense are these personal issues. At times I suspect it is all a trick of Mr. Asquith’s friends to magnify his importance. I am capable of enthusiasm for my own dream of a woman, level-eyed with a man, brave, absolutely loyal, free and his fellow, but I have never had very much of an opinion of Mr. Asquith, and I do not care a rap what he said, what he says, or what he will say about this or any question; he scarcely exists for me, and I am never going to feel a spark of enthusiasm for any woman who engages in battle for or against him. I do not want to annoy him, any more than I want to gratify Miss Pankhurst. They bore me. I do not want to see the cause of woman hanging up upon Mr. Asquith. And I am impressed more and more by the fact that Mr. Asquith will die. It may not be for years, he may go on to ninety or a hundred or a hundred and twenty or so, but in the end he will die. I take it the feminist agitation, if it is indeed as parasitic upon him as it seems to be, will then die too. . . .

I welcome this opportunity, now that I am writing for the first and perhaps the last time in my life for women as such, of suggesting that they should try to do without Mr. Asquith before it is too late. I propose that the W.S.P.U. shall try to cure itself of its morbid infatuation for this man. I suggest that its members should try to make speeches without naming him, try to write pamphlets without mentioning him, contrive cartoons omitting him, receive his name when he is mentioned in meetings with a studied indifference, pass him in the street calmly and quietly—almost carelessly. All this, I know, involves tremendous self-restraint and a stern struggle against ingrained habits, but I am convinced it can be done. And it will help them very much to remember that the cause of women is immortal, if in moments of temptation and difficulty they will repeat—in audibly, of course—this melancholy but necessary, and perhaps even in the end consoling, assertion: “Mr. Asquith will die.”

H. G. WELLS.

Woman, Education and Islam.

THROUGHOUT the Mohammedan East the march of intellectuality on modern lines is evident in every grade of society, and especially does this apply to Egypt. For, whereas in the old days the Moslem was Hamletian and could spend the evening of his days wrapped in the religious contemplation of sacred books, to-day the cry is for new men, new manners. And, despite the “semi-barbarous” charge levelled at the Egyptians by Lord Cromer, Sir Auckland Colvin, and other occupation apologists, the new thought movement, the new thought movement had set in long before the advent of the “modern reformer” or that of the Anglo-Indian Financial Controller.

Napoleon, when he descended upon Egypt with his rearguard of savants, unquestionably implanted the desire in the breasts of thinking Moslems for a fuller knowledge of the outer world, and Mehemet Ali was quick to realise the educational requirements of the people if they were to progress on those lines. Our modern contact with Eastern and Western customs had made imperative. Although realising this necessity for erudition in Egypt, beyond educating his younger sons he did little for the people, and this mainly owing to his strenuous military life, which left time for little else, except, of course, the empirical works which were intended to aid the supply of money for his martial exploits.
The Pasha and the Effendi class, however, having also become imbued with the same ideas as Mehemet Ali, and for like reasons, began to supply this intellectual need by sending their sons to European colleges. When Said Pasha succeeded to the Pashalik, having himself received a European training, he not only sent his son Tous­soun to be educated in Europe, but also many of the fellah class, whom he recognised by reason of their overwhelming preponderance, the most important element in the social scheme, to be trained in the schools of the West.

But, notwithstanding his good intentions in regard to the mental amelioration of the masses, his later years being burdened with bodily infirmity and disease, he proceeded to steep himself in pleasure, to the entire exclusion and extinction of all higher considerations.

It was, therefore, left to the ambitious and rapacious Ismail Pasha to remedy the defective and almost non-existent educational system of his predecessors. When he came to the Viceregal throne in 1863, there were only 185 elementary schools throughout the land of Egypt. In 1875 their number had risen to the respectable total of 4,685, with an attendance of no fewer than 111,803 children. A large number of higher Government and municipal educational institutions were also established, with special schools for soldiers—one to each regiment—and last, but by no means least, he founded a school for Egyptian girls—the first of its kind, not alone in the Land of the Pharaohs, but in the whole of the Turkish Empire.

It is therefore to Ismail, that the gratitude of the women of the Ottoman Empire and of the Islamic world is due for making the first effort in the direction of their intellectual advancement. Of course, the daughters of Princes and Pashas of Egypt and of the other prominent sections of the Turkish Empire were educated in Europe—principally France—before that date, but their education, beyond enabling them to enjoy the somewhat risqué French romances, was of very little practical value. Ismail, however, by getting at the mass of the female population, established a precedent which was quickly followed in the capital of the Ottoman Empire, and which has continued to spread throughout the Mohammedan world.

Notwithstanding the greater educational advantages accorded women, the Moslem system, by reason of its social seclusiveness, still continues to trammel the advance of its female intellect, because, whether the Moslem woman is educated East or West, in the Islamic household she still remains, to a very large extent, a mere cipher, with the veil as her heritage and a husband of her father's choosing—however inferior intellectually—and the beget­ting of children, preferably boys, as the Alpha and Omega of all her mental endeavour.

There were many causes that contributed to this condition of affairs. In every age and clime woman has not only been considered by man to be the weaker and inferior class, but she has been jealously guarded by the Ottoman Empire and East, and, for the most part, as a sort of chattel or a lust-inspiring toy. And this applies with greater force in the case of Mohammedan women.

In the first place, we have the veil, which dates anterior to the introduction of Islam, and is not a religious rite.

In ancient times the oriental considered woman the richest spoil of war, inasmuch as her productivity made for the increase of a population depleted by constant strife. And, as warrior races were compelled to protect their property with the sword, woman being his most valued asset, she was either entirely segregated or her beauty veiled. Therefore, the Moslem law which says "if thy beauty cause strife among men, inspiring them to love, or jealousy in others, then it were better for thee it should be hid," is merely a moral safeguard recognising an existing institution.

In the second place, the older Moslem, even at the present day, regards woman in the light of a chattel, whom Allah has conferred, among other blessings, as a slave to her lord, especially dispensing for the adequate satisfaction of man's carnal appetite. Accordingly, although the individual of this class—who is fortunately becomingrarer—is made, and does grant his womenfolk educational advantages, because of his inability to withstand the new moral force which surrounds him, directly the woman returns to the home she is incontinently veiled and shut up a prisoner in the harem, even as her sisters have been for centuries, until she is duly trotted out to be loosely bound to her chosen lord and master. Now, inasmuch as hareem life, with scandal-mongers, story-tellers, and female musicians and dancers, does not promote intellectual effort, the Mohammedan woman of the middle class, having invariably completed her education at the age of, say, sixteen, on becoming a wife, finds herself far below the intellectual standard of her husband, who is forced into the companionship of male friends at the cafés, in order to indulge in much needed relaxation, as his position as has become necessary to his existence, and which is made imperative by his constant official or commercial relations with Europeans.

The young and educated Moslem of the middle class has strenuously set his face against the old marriage system, and the clamp that thralldom for intellectual wives is continually increasing. Nor will he tamely consent to be bound, however loosely, to a woman of whom he knows nothing beyond the representations of her parent. He much prefers the Western woman, with her greater liberty and higher standard of culture. At the same time, realising that a nation's progress depends upon the elevated mental condition of its women—especially does this apply to Moslem countries where boys are mainly relegated to the women's apartments—the young Mohammed of the Ottoman Empire is having his sisters and daughters trained on approved European lines.

The wives and sisters of Princes, Pashas, and Beys, although possessing greater freedom than their humber sisters of the middle class, are still, for the most part, enmeshed in Islamic tradition and seclusion. The Western culture and their absolute liberty whilst visiting the West makes the yoke of segre­gation more galling on returning to the ancestral home. It was for this reason that the cultured women of Constantinople, in addition to sending their jewels to the melting-pot to aid the war-chest, intrigued, in the interests of the Young Turk movement, with the hope of obtaining greater social freedom and intercourse than that which existed under the old régime. A Moslem woman of education and culture, who had not only received her training in the highest seminaries of Europe, but who, on her annual visits to the West, attended the various fashionable resorts in perfect freedom, even as other women, could not well be expected to content herself with the seclusion of hareem life and the inevitable veil. It is, indeed, true that in Turkey the Yashmak has almost become a disappearing quantity, owing in part to its extreme transparency when not entirely discarded, but it is the veil, whatever its texture, and becomes odious by reason of its enforced use.

The question of marriage has also irritated the educated Moslem woman. According to Moham­medan law, while a man may possess four legal
wives, there is no limit to his concubines. The law compels a husband to supply each wife with a separate establishment and an adequate income. "He shall give unto his riches, according to his riches," says the law, "and the man who has only what he requires, according to that which God hath given him."

It must, however, be observed that during the last quarter of a century polygamy has been on the decrease, and intellectual advancement has contributed in no small measure to this desirable state of morals; and no doubt the example of the late Tewifik Pasha and that of his son and successor, Abbas Hilmi, being both monogomists, has had a tendency to discourage plural marriages. The enormous increase in the cost of living, the abolition of the domestic slave, female, has also added their quota of discouragement in that direction, and in this respect the Mohammedan woman has little cause for complaint.

The divorce laws, however, are most galling to the educated women of Islam. The law says, "If a husband repudiates his wife thrice he is not permitted to take her back until after she shall have married another man, who, in his turn, has repudiated her." It is, therefore, sufficient for a husband to say "Thou art divorced" to repudiate his wife, and the repudiation becomes absolutely final on the formula being repeated thrice. The husband is forced by law to return the dowry the wife brought him, and she must be paid a pension, according to her position, for three months. Should she be incapacitated, he must support her until the child is weaned.

Men of bad principle, in order to avoid repayment of the dowry, have been known to pursue their wives with systematic cruelty, because, should the wife desert her husband, he is not compelled to refund the dowry; and a wife, possessing no other remedy except that of applying to the Kadi, or Moslem judge, for what may be termed "restitution of conjugal rights," would rather relinquish all remedy to the extreme final on the formula being repeated thrice.

Fortunately, the young Moslem, by comparing the Mohammedan marriage customs with those obtaining in the West, observes the necessity for change in this direction; but he is well aware that, notwithstanding educational advantages, the emancipation of his women must be gradual. He feels—and those in Egypt who will read these pages will concur in this statement—that, were the Moslem woman to be immediately let loose, unveiled, upon society, the very seclusion which at present tries her patience, making, as it does, for a limited knowledge of the world, would make her the ready prey of the first plausible adventurer to cross her path.
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say, and their worn faces say more eloquently, that they work too hard now. They are sure they would not be able to earn more than 8s. 6d. at the new rates, and, as one of them said at the meeting: "Girls round here can't live proper on less than 3/- shillings."

The statement may be accepted without question. In these bleak, inconsequent streets rents are very high. "Proper life," even with the whole of a weekly eight shillings, must be somewhat difficult of attainment.

It was a weakness that, of the four hundred girls affected, some three hundred were frightened by dread of starvation into submission, and that the unaffected departments held aloof. That this was so much the fault of the strikers, who tried by un­worned picketing and fierce argument to broaden the battle.

"Wat do you gitt?" said a picket to a wretchedly thin girl from an unaffected room. Not more'n nine shillings, I know."

"I don't gitt nine shillings," retorted the girl, indignantly.

"Then wy don't you come out?" said the picket. She adding a leading question for the enlightenment of listeners—"You've got to work 'ard, haven't you?"

"'Ard?"—the girl interrogated turned in quick wrath—"'Ard?"—she made an expressive gesture—"I'm tired now; I'm tired of me bloomin' life."

Then she vanished, and the gates closed.

The tin-box trade is a rough trade, and its workers win their wages through toil as dangerous as it is severe. These girls are rollers, flangers, and, and the rest, and they handle heavy machines, which very often roll out more than the maternal. Many of their poor hands, which should be beautiful, are squashed and marred. One of these strikers has had two fingers ripped. She got them dressed at the local hospital, but after several dressings the foreman decided that sentient labour was satisfied.

When the girl was going off once more he thoughtfully pointed out to her that if her impression was that she was employed in a damned nursery she was mistaken.

The girl did not think that she was employed in a nursery, damned or otherwise, and her visits to the hospital were discontinued. This was a pity, for it entailed permanent disfigurement; the ripped fingers did not heal as with further dressing they would have done. They are spread out now, so that each looks as though it was meant to be two fingers.

Over such injuries as these the girls were light. They live in a world of realities, where mere daintiness does not matter. Whether their hands are beautiful is, of course, of little account. What matters is the rapidity with which they can fashion tin boxes.

Their despairing strike is not a protest against risks, which they expect as part of the day's work. It is against a still further reduction of their meagre wages until not even life itself can be maintained on the fruits of their toil.

J. J. MALLON.

The Reward of Virtue.

T HIS novel forms very appropriate reading for supporters of the FREEMAN. Miss Reeves has depicted with an unerring skill and lucidity, almost worthy of 'Père Goriot," the anemic, soul­less training of the average young girl, and the coercion of her heroine into a loveless marriage by a sheer combination of maternal finans, shocking boredom, and a feeling that the marriage market is all against a woman holding out for the man she wants. The characters are nearly all disagree­able, with the exception of the heroine's father, and the reader has a horrible suspicion that he is only likable because we hear so little about him. The heroine liked him because "he loved her uncritically," and "it never had mattered not telling daddy the whole truth."

In a few simple words Miss Reeves gives the picture of the "tactful" schoolmistress—"She carried to perfection the art of educating one hundred girls without influencing their minds. Mental development she left to the parents, as they left it to the school. In this way the school flourished, and nothing happened to disturb anybody."

Again, "Her father's bookcases were always locked, the key of the biggest was certainly lost, and the only kind of novel that fell into her hands was the class of penny novelette she saw in the hands of Susan."

Perhaps Miss Reeves is at her best when satirizing mental indolence, such as one of her characters complains of when she says: "Call a thing a principle, and you need never think of it again"; or in describing the psychology of Mrs. Baker, the heroine's mother: "Her thinking was much like wandering through a forest in the dark: a dodging among and a bumping into obstacles that were at once invisible and unyielding."

Yet if Miss Reeves does not spare her own sex, she is even more vitriolic in describing men. Any more odious type of person than Mr. Leonard Day, who marries Miss Baker, would be difficult to find, and he is all the more odious because so convincing.

We all know the type of son-in-law who wants to conceal everything from his wife and her female relations, when his father-in-law is dying, and treats all the women like infants in arms. His attitude in regard to his wife's control of her own money is even more disagreeably typical. But Miss Reeves is, perhaps, like one of her own characters, too apt to look for the "secondary and less presentable motives" of any given action.

Any person gifted with acute observation has moods—especially in illness—of seeing everyone and everything as very drab and unsatisfying, and this may be (metaphysically speaking) as true a view of life as any other. There are many such passages in Jane Austen's novels, and Miss Reeves writes so well, and her characterization is so little affected by a certain paucity of incident, that her work sometimes recalls that of her great prede­cessor, though the young ladies of 1811 certainly appear more attractive than their successors of 1911.

But it is to be hoped that in her next work she will give us something a little more genial and a little less detached. The reader feels that she could achieve better results if she would only let herself go a little more. The suppression of her likes and dislikes creates an impression of concen­trated acidity, which loses its effectiveness when not relieved by any other vein. In "Pride and Prejudice" the imbecility of Mrs. Bennett is at least relieved by the qualities of Mr. Bennett and Elizabeth.

E. S. P. HECLOUSE.

THE REWARD OF VIRTUE. By AMBER REEVES. (Heine­mann.)
Correspondence.

To the Editors of THE FREEWOMAN.

How unfortunate we women are! Conservatives may "die hard" and shout that their leader "must go"; the Liberal Press may lecture Sir Edward Grey or gently admonish the Prime Minister himself. We women only are left bound always to servility and blind, unquestioning obedience. Have we leaders? Then from our lips may no question, no breath of criticism issue? Though active in a fight which demands the recognition of women as persons and individuals, yet when the Voice speaks from Clement's Inn we must voluntarily surrender our individual opinions, humbly to fall in and follow.

And the services we may have rendered to the woman's cause are not allowed to us as extenuating circumstances. We think of long days and nights of sleepless work, of the insults and mishandling of brutal mobs, the strain on brain and nerves and health, of all the enthusiasm and devotion we have so freely spent. And you, mesdames, must think of the bare cells of Holloway closing in on heart and brain, and the horrors of the hunger strike.

But you are traitors who "stab in the back those who have shown us all a thousand kindnesses". You confess to a profound admiration for the courage and leadership of Miss Pankhurst, though I reject her infallibility as I reject the infallibility of the Pope, the Premier, or anybody else. I agree with THE FREEWOMAN in condemning her latest move as a mistake, but Miss Pankhurst, I imagine, will suffer less from us, her critics, than from the childish bad temper of her friends. They prove at least that she has partly failed in the task she has set herself; that the women who, we thought, had learned at last devotion to a principle of justice are, after all, only driven, they know not whither, by blind hero-worship. To such a spur the bondwoman has always responded. May the freewoman react to no other!

Miss Pankhurst having been placed above discussion, we next learn that the great living principle of the world—sex—is beneath discussion. Is this to be our attitude when the vote is won? Surely we do not propose merely to force on men the standard they have forced on us. To do so would be to proclaim ourselves not merely slaves, but willing slaves. For heaven's sake, let us temper our enthusiasm with sanity. Let us at least consider where we are going. Let us grasp our individuality firmly and flood with sunlight the arena so jealously guarded by the other sex.

Feminism necessarily includes a belief in woman's suffrage. The Suffrage movement is a coalition of women fighting for very different ends. The Suffrage battles will be won as Germany's were won—by marching apart to strike together.

MURIEL NELSON.

To the Editors of THE FREEWOMAN.

I have read almost every word of the two first numbers of THE FREEWOMAN with the most intense interest, and will you allow me to say that I think it is the first paper published in the name of women which has not been an insult to their intelligence? I was prepared for adverse criticism from many quarters, but not for the attitude of many of those who are prominent in the women's movement. Their letters prove them to be blind leaders of the blind.

Do they begin to see at all what the emancipation of women really means, or have they the faintest glimpse of the infinite possibilities which it opens up?

It is good to read your "Commentary on Bondage marriage as it exists to-day, for there can..." with its steadfast, courageous acceptance of what it means to be free. With almost all of it I am in entire agreement, but I think there are one or two points which call for further discussion.

MARY N. MURRAY.

[It is one of the aims of THE FREEWOMAN to encourage sincere discussion, and we invite our correspondent to raise the points which she considers debatable in the columns of THE FREEWOMAN.]

A PLEA FOR COURTESY.

To the Editors of THE FREEWOMAN.

Having read with some surprise and much regret the extracts from a letter sent in reply to your criticisms of Miss Pankhurst, and also your comments on same, may I say that while totally disagreeing with the attitude which you have assumed, I do depurate very strongly the terms in which this (at present) anonymous correspondent has seen fit to state her views?

While, personally, I consider that your criticism is not justified in the slightest degree, I write to put in a plea for courteous discussion to be carried on in your columns; for surely few things can do more harm to the Suffrage cause than the spirit of personal abuse and intolerance which has already shown itself. In the name of all that is fair, do not let it be said of any member of the W.S.P.U. that they descended to the use of methods of discussion which were neither just nor courteous. I have the most implicit faith in Miss Pankhurst's wisdom and political acumen, but I cannot think that the best way of showing it is to indulge in objectionable personalities. Such methods are certainly very far from those adopted by herself, and can only discredit a cause which is, to most of us, the highest ideal in life.

MURIEL DARTON.

December 1st, 1911.

To the Editors of THE FREEWOMAN.

As a subscriber of a small sum to the Establishment Fund of THE FREEWOMAN, I write to express my utter detestation of the attack made upon Miss Christabel Pankhurst in its pages, and to say that my promise of a subscription was made under the impression that the Editors were still loyal friends to the cause of Woman's Suffrage and to the Women's Social and Political Union.

HERTHA AYTSON.

To the Editors of THE FREEWOMAN.

Will you allow me to express my admiration for your courage in bringing out a review like THE FREEWOMAN. It has struck a new and clear note in a movement which was in grave danger of being permanently pitched in the rather low key of the demands of the undeveloped and parasitic type of woman whose horizon is bounded by the rim of the gynaeceum. It is evident that your concern is with fundamental things; and your paper will encourage many women to speak out what social bondage would bid them hide.

An extremely interesting article in your last issue is the one on Feminism and the Birth-rate. I find myself in complete agreement with the writer of the article as to the need for bettering the quality rather than increasing the quantity of the population. The theory of Malthus (the first feminist, albeit an unconscious one) is the strongest possible argument for any reforms, through the complete emancipation of woman, to abolish the fundamental tyranny from which all others spring. The question of the economics of population cannot, however, be considered apart from some criticism of the institution of monogamic marriage as it exists to-day, for there can...
be no doubt that under a system in which indi-
vidually we each other the in-
crease of population is more rapid than under
any other circumstances. It is rightly pointed out
in the article under consideration that science has,
on the other hand, given to women the power of
controlling their fertility; but this does not dis-
pose of the whole question as easily as your con-
tributor appears to think. It is just here that the
social problem becomes also a subtle and infinitely
important psychological problem, for the common
Malthusian practices are, in my opinion, a gross
over-simplification of the misery of women, and
the final mark of their sexual degradation. There
is another objection to the limitation of the family
that I have heard put forward by a woman who
was concerned with the ethical aspect of the pro-
lem. Her point was, that constantly to evade the
outrage on the aesthetic sensibilities of women, and
on the other hand, given to women the power of
controlling their fertility; but this does not dis-
consider these circumstances. It is rightly pointed out
with man. ISABEL LEATHAM.

In conclusion, I should like to thank you for the
editorial article in your first number on Bond-
women, where you make it so clear that woman's
bondage in the resort is psychological, and that
only in the freedom of her will lies her true equality
with man. ISABEL LEATHAM.

To the Editors of THE FREEWOMAN.

Had I clearly understood what "feminism" was
supposed to stand for, I might have hesitated to
contribute to the new magazine that I then started as to its trend; I expected it to stand
for a free and full discussion of the problems of
womanhood, especially social problems. Now that
we are on the eve of obtaining a measure of en-
franchisement, this would be opportune, for many
laws will need readjustment, and it is impossible
without free discussion for women to decide
what they want. I do not even object to the
voicing of extreme views of "freedom," because
such views had better be frankly expressed and
freely indulged in than concealed, to keep our
rising generation, and appeal in the sacred name of
"freedom" to those as yet without experience of
life.

But it is a pity that THE FREEWOMAN should
from the start show itself "bound" to what it
considers "advanced" views, instead of holding an
even balance for the expression of all shades of opinion.
Free and frank discussion of sex pro-
blems is needed, but they should be discussed from
the point of view of facts, not opinions, of
psychology especially, and a wide and varied ex-
perience. For instance, criticism of marriage is so
often undertaken by those who have never ex-
perienced it. The assumption that happiness is
an end in itself, and that even in marriage "happy-
ness," or the reverse, is a test, beggs the question.
The art of living together is a difficult one, and
there are many dual friendships between women
in which the suppression of personality in one or
the other, and the condition of "bondwoman" is
at least as obvious as in marriage. In my young
days, the early days of Girton College, the free and
frank discussion of many questions relating to
womanhood went on amongst us, but the great
conservative forces of Nature moulded most of our
lives to something very different from what we
discussed—yet, after all the discipline of life, I
should say, infinitely better for most of us. I take
liberty, therefore, to stand for a belief in the
sacredness of wedlock. I believe the child is the
centre of both manhood and womanhood, but that
for full twenty years the child needs both father
and mother for development, and that this is the
sanction of marriage. Whatever wild dreams of
freedom in sex relations may be dreamed by those
who call themselves "advanced," the great solid-
mass of the women of our country will continue to
live in wedlock. Much needs altering, much needs
patient study: free discussion, and evolution of
both ideals and laws must go on. But, personally,
i am old fashioned enough to believe in the reli-
gious sanction for "the holy estate of matrimony,"
founded not on custom, but on facts of human
nature.

MARY HIGGS.

[An editorial answer to this letter will be found
under "The Editors' Reply," on page 55.—Ed
The Freewoman.]

MARRIAGE AND MOTHERHOOD.

To the Editors of THE FREEWOMAN.

I suppose I must take notice of the curious letter,
signed "I. D. Pearce," contained in your last issue,
though the answer to it is contained in the article
she criticizes but does not appear to have under-
stood.

Your correspondent imagines my article, "A
Definition of Marriage," to have been inspired by
what she terms an "insane concern for the con-
tinuance of the race," and then proceeds to lecture
upon me proposals for "State-enforced hatcheries"
and compulsory child-bearing, which must have
their origin in her own exuberant sense of humour.
Had she read the article she would have noticed
that I declined to say that it was the duty of every
individual to have children, but that the question
was an economic one. The desire, how-
ever, to perpetuate the human race is not insane.
Sanity consists in a certain conformity to natural
instincts and social needs. The desire to eat and
to sleep, for instance, is not generally taken to be
a symptom of insanity; the refusal to do either might
be so taken. (I have to put things very simply to
your correspondent.) And though, I repeat, it may
not be the duty of every individual to take heed for
the continuance of the race, it undoubtedly is that
of every organ of community. Thought for pos-
terity underlies all human corporate endeavour.
What would be the condition of art and literature
in a society self-sentenced to death? If existence
is an evil, then murderers and suicides are the sanest
of men, and the State, instead of offering premiums
for babies, as I. D. Pearce fears it may, should
offer them for corpses. The "insane" concern for
the propagation of the race! I wonder if your cor-
respondent is an adult.

The contention in my article may be summed up
in a very few lines. The State has no interest in
the cohabitation of a man and a woman, except in
view of possible offspring. Marriage was origi-
nally designed, and is still intended by the Church,
for the reproduction of the race. If people do not
want children, let them live together as long as they
like, uncensured, unlicensed, unmolested. It has
nothing to do with the State. But if it pleases
them to advertise their relations, it may be asked,
why not humour them? Because, as I have shown
in my article, and cannot be bothered to show
again, this is to give people who are rendering no
service to the State the privileges which the State
is interested in reserving to mothers. As I. D.
Pearce is not at all interested in my proposals as
to the unmarried mother and her child, I need not
deal with that aspect of the question.

As your correspondent claims to have a sense of
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humour, I ask if it is not tickled by the sight of two persons applying to the State to be bound together for life when they know that they alone will be constituted the contract? For whom and against whom do they seek protection? If they trust each other, why these solemn bonds? If they don't trust each other, surely it must be all the worse to be tied together for life. In most cases these people do not want to bind themselves, but are at present forced by law to do so by which the present race calls "the subtle compulsion of a disturbed public opinion." If marriage does not exist for parenthood, I fail to understand for what it does exist. I. D. Pearce protests against the legalised marriage being reduced to a State-licensed human incubation. Perhaps she prefers it to be a licensed hothouse for the selfish indulgence of the sex instinct. I presume she will not say that marriage exists for the harmonious cultivation of fraternal relations.

I. D. Pearce's letter is extravagantly clear. "Enforced child-bearing is a sin against the human race, whether it be the thrusting of an unwanted child upon an individual unwilling mother, or the more subtle compulsion of a distorted public opinion upon all mothers (women) at once." Of course the opposition to marriage in my article of any compulsion on those who are already mothers. The only compulsion I propose is that women who don't want to be mothers should not be entitled to the slender privileges originally intended for mothers. Their complaint reminds me of that of the good people who, never having been Churchmen, expect the Church to marry and to bury them. Is it, then, such a hardship to be deprived of a wedding ring and the glorious title of Mrs.? "I don't want a nasty baby," I hear the unwilling mother whisper; "I want a pretty wedding ring."

Then your correspondent tells me that there is no such thing as being "well born." I never said there was. Neither did I propose that human souls should be incarnated to order. Nor did I suggest premiums, nor tell women that their place was the home, nor say any of the things which your correspondent tells us are the cause of all recent disorders. "We shew no faith," she complains, "in Nature's ordination; we act as if she cannot be trusted to come anyhow? Well, they don't in France."

A considerable part of I. D. Pearce's letter is devoted to eugenics, a subject which interests me very little. The remarks about spirits seeking incarnation in human form, and true motherhood consisting in the production of ideas, etc., convict her of belonging to a class of "thinkers" about whom I know something, and whose ideas are as extravagant as their life is atrophied and common-place.

EDMUND B. D'AUVERGNE.

To the Editors of THE FREEWOMAN.

Mr. Edmund B. d'Auvergne, in his article entitled "A Definition of Marriage," in your issue of November 23rd, misses one very important point. Arguing, as he does very rightly, that marriage, as sanctioned—consecrated—by Church and State, is essentially bound up with the production of children (as is plainly stated in the English Prayer-Book), he, throughout his article, is concerned to pour ridicule on the idea that childless marriages, whether willfully so or not, merit any form of consecration, as his argument is summed up in the sentence in which he says that the willfully childless (married) couple remind him of a man who takes out a gun licence without intending to keep a gun. He's wrong. Such couples do intend to keep "a gun," and, further, they intend to use it too, but, and here is the point, against whom?—they don't intend to shoot anything! Now, quite apart from the fact that they are very likely to hit something by mistake (accidents will occur in the best regulated families—we know that), the point that Mr. d'Auvergne so lamentably fails to appreciate is that it is not that marriage that is essentially bound up with the production of children, but that sex itself is inevitably so bound, and that marriage is not only the consecration of the family, but is also the consecration of sex.

Mr. d'Auvergne claims to be reactionary rather than revolutionary. He is wrong again, for he fails to react against the very revolutionary, though very common, notion that sexual intercourse (participation in which is, of course, assumed by him, as by everyone else, when speaking of the living together of men and women) is to be regarded as the preliminary to the production of children.

Let Mr. d'Auvergne realise, Agnostic though he be, that, from the point of view of the Church, not only does marriage mean (children) but that sexual intercourse means children also, and then let him rewrite his article. I think he will find that it will come out rather different.

ERIC GILL.

P.S.—May I offer you my sincere thanks for supplying, at last, a really clear definition of the meaning of "feminism"? You say: The Free-women are those who consider "their sex just as much an incidental concern as men consider theirs." Now it is out, and the Virgin is dethroned! Now, she will be able to find time for intellectual attainments, for the mothering of the Son of God has been reduced to an incidental matter.

E. G.
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of life behind them. They do not need to have violently suppressed it. Can they not think of such things as, at the age of forty-five, one would think of wearing a white muslin gown and pink ribbons? A SPINNER.

[We have heard that there are women who can.—ED. THE FREEWOMAN.]

To the Editors of THE FREEWOMAN.

I have read with regret and surprise the article in the first number of THE FREEWOMAN, entitled "A University Degree for Housewives." As a keen Feminist and Suffragist, and one of those responsible for helping on the movement for the development of Home Science, it is indeed a disappointment to me to find the aims and objects of that movement misunderstood. It would not be possible within the limits of a letter to reply categorically to the accusations of your contributor. May I say, however, that one of the special aims of the Home Science course of London University is the removal of unnecessary drudgery from the daily life of women of all classes, and the application of scientific principles to what is called "Woman's Sphere." Your contributor says that much of this "lower grade work will soon be done by mechanical contrivances, and would in all probability have already been so done had it been men's work and not women's." Here we are in perfect agreement. If, however, the writer of the article would take the trouble to read the syllabus of lectures on the Development of the Home, by one of our King's College lecturers, Miss Mabel Atkinson, a woman of the most progressive ideas, she would realise that, far from being a "retrograde scheme perpetuating women's inferiority" (I quote from the article), such teaching will stimulate students to rebel against the intolerable, unscientific, and unpractical conditions, with their concomitant waste of energy and brain forces, of the majority of households. There is no idea of a "deliberate pandering to the most sentimental sections of the community." Women have shown and are showing that they are capable of the highest intellectual effort, but in the homes of many of these very women, we too often find the nurture of the children left to the uneducated and the elementary principles of hygiene and economics neglected. Until the education that makes women capable of being too old to rear our courses are open to both sexes)—fit to rear children receives the same status as other branches of scientific work, those who undertake the physical and mental training of childhood or the conduct of large households or institutions will not be given either the position or the salary which will induce the highest type of intellect to devote themselves to this work, and the community is by so much the loser. Your contributor goes on to say, "the centralising subject-matter of the proposed new faculty is housework," and pours scorn on the idea that housework implies the study of physics and hygiene, economics, ethics, and psychology. Here she is entirely wide of the mark. The centralising idea, actuating the eminent educators who are leading this movement, is not housework but the care of the household—and I fail to see why, if Universities have instituted a Chair of Agriculture for those students who are to devote themselves to the care of our food supplies, or to the scientific breeding and rearing of animals, and an engineering school for the training of students in the manipulation of factory or Dreadnought machinery, there should be anything derogatory to a University in the systematic and scientific training of those who are to have the physical and mental care of human beings, whether in households, schools, or institutions. Is it intellectual and progressive to know what fuel and manipulation is required to get the full power out of the machinery of a Dreadnought, but retrograde and stifling to discover in what way the physical and mental capacities of householders can be made to yield their fullest meed to the world's work? I believe your contributor has misinterpreted the meaning of the King's College for Women Home Science circular. Any programme which is issued to the public at large lays itself open to misconstruction. I still hope, if instead of basing her judgment upon the circular alone, she were to devote a little time to following the lectures there, interviewing the lecturers and students, she would be convinced that our movement is on the most progressive lines, and tends to the uplifting of our daily life out of the morass of materialism and preventable misery. We have called in science to solve the problems of curing sickness and poverty, why not then of preserving health and improving home life?

ADELE MEYER.

December 2nd, 1911.

[We hope to secure a reply to Lady Meyer's letter in our next week's issue.—ED. THE FREEWOMAN.]
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and it regrets the strenuous work done by Manchester members in advertising the paper. It would be prepared to modify or even withdraw so strong a resolution if a satisfactory explanation were forthcoming from Miss Gawthorpe.

Passed unanimously by the Manchester Women's Social and Political Union, November 24th, 1911.

The Editors' Reply

To MRS. MARY HIGGS.

THE FREEWOMAN is not “bound” to any opinions, “advanced” or otherwise. It is testing opinion. It is quite true that we, as editors, express opinions, but then so do our contributors. We may surely be expected to have some view regarding the various problems with which we deal, and have as great a right as our contributors to maintain these views. Unlike other journals which have an editorial point of view, we do not endeavour merely to secure opinions which support our own. We give direct encouragement to those who disagree with our views to state their case as openly as possible. For instance, if Mrs. Higgs herself would send an extremely hostile criticism of any of our views (not of us, by the way; she will understand that that is another matter), we should be very glad to put the medium for publicity supplied by THE FREEWOMAN at her service. It would then be the simple matter of letting the best side win. It is true that in a certain measure we, as editors, are at once competitors and adjudicators; but considering that the adjudicator's decision has to be given openly on grounds which the paper makes clear to all, we consider that fairness is guaranteed. It is our business to keep our reading public, and if we appear unfair in our editorial awards, we lose the confidence, and therefore the support, of our public. We do hold even balance for the expression of all shades of opinion, but we cannot force the balance to remain even when the weight of one opinion outbalances the weight of an opposing one. Mrs. Higgs will, we are sure, understand that while she has a perfect right to state her belief in the “religious sanctions of the holy estate of marriage,” others who have no such belief, but have a belief in other sanctions, or in no sanctions at all, have as perfect a right to be allowed to state theirs. We point out to Mrs. Higgs that as yet no editorial views on the subject of marriage have been expressed, and those contributors who have approached the subject, as it happens, have been married. The burden of Mrs. Higgs' arguments, therefore, should be directed, not against the "open" editorial attitude, but against the opinions of contributors who, with the same sincerity as herself, hold these opinions seriously, and who secure the publicity afforded by the pages of THE FREEWOMAN to give them public expression.—ED.

To DR. HELEN GORDON CLARK.

May I ask a few questions?

Is THE FREEWOMAN a Suffragist or an Anti-Suffragist publication? —H. G. CLARK.

We have a vague impression that this question is meant to be regarded as wit, but in case we are mistaken and it should turn out to be a groping for light, we may say that THE FREEWOMAN is a Pro-Suffrage review, but is intended only for those who by native endowment and elementary training have the understanding and education to discriminate between sentimental affirmation and prejudiced denial. It is a Pro-Suffragist journal for “Some,” not “All.”—ED.

The paragraph, "It appears of more importance to the cause of Votes for Women," etc. (see page 23), suggests that the editors fancy they are forwarding that cause; but a previous statement concerning thepull of the Suffragist, as compared with that of the FREEWOMAN, is reminiscent of the Anti-Suffrage Review in its better moments—a platitudinous exposition of beautiful beliefs unaccompanied by any practical suggestion as to their realisation.

The editor of the Notes of the Week regrets not having a closer acquaintance with the Anti-Suffrage Review, and must say if the Anti-Suffrage journal is arguing the same points as THE FREEWOMAN, in no matter how different a manner, it is full proof that we have at last arrived at the root argument in the Suffrage Question. We would point out, apropos of the temper of the above comment, that it is almost always unwise to assume that one holds a "corner" to the exclusion of one’s opponent, in intelligent discussion. Where is THE FREEWOMAN’S definition of “Feminism” taken from? Nuttall gives it as "the quality of the female sex."—H. G. CLARK.

Those who are in the habit of turning to Mr. Nuttall for their philosophical definitions will doubtless find much at which to marvel, when we say that we evolved our definition of Feminism out of our own understanding of that subject. Now that we understand that we have readers who read THE FREEWOMAN with Nuttall at elbow to play commentator, much of the misunderstanding which to us has been dark now becomes clear. We know there are minds who borrow their philosophies from Plato, Rousseau, or Mill, but from Mr. Nuttall! We are driven to repeat—from Mr. Nuttall!—ED.

Was not one of the editors a member of the Committee of the W.S.P.U. when most of the militant outbreaks chronicled were "commanded"? Did she enter a protest then, or did she "coerce" her conscience as we are to applaud Mr. Asquith for not doing? When did she resign? Was she still a member when letters were sent round inviting support for THE FREEWOMAN?—H. G. CLARK.

The editor alluded to as a Committee member of the Women's Social and Political Union has not been able to see the questions, owing to the lateness of their arrival, but she will doubtless reply to the questions specially concerning her next week. It might here be stated that the editor responsible for the "Notes" did enter a protest in March, 1910, and entered a further and reasonable protest against other matters in January, 1911. Upon learning the blatantly intolerant and insulting manner in which such a wholly private protest from a fellow-worker was received by this Committee, it became clear that the only course consistent with any self-respect was resignation, and to make criticism, when necessary, from outside. We are glad to give an isolated instance, because of its ease in following up if need arises, but we know that such treatment is not a single case to be specifically explained away, but is indicative of a general practice.—ED.

It is stated that "the W.S.P.U., as an organisation, has received no public criticism whatsoever."
Why was the Women's Freedom League founded?—H. G. CLARK.

Why indeed? To the world in general this is still an untold story.—ED.

Did not the original members of the Women's Freedom League consist of ladies who differed from their colleagues in the W.S.P.U. solely on the question of organisation—not tactics?—H. G. CLARK.

Would our correspondent care to press the point, and ask us to request one of the ladies who seceded from the W.S.P.U. in order to form the Freedom League to give publicity to her version of the grounds of secession in these pages?—ED.

What about Mrs. Billington Greig in her lonely furrow?—H. G. CLARK.

Mrs. Billington Greig's criticism was inadequate of necessity because she cut it short. The tale of criticism of one woman against a powerful organisation of thousands has to be told with the persistence of an Ancient Mariner to get it home. Mrs. Billington Greig told it perhaps half a dozen times. Also, her criticism was largely personal, and in the hubbub of personalities what she was saying of the organisation was lost sight of.—ED.

If the principle of non-coercion is so admirable when applied to the conscience of the Premier, why should no attention be paid to that of the Chancellor of the Exchequer? Surely the Free Woman does not look on Mr Lloyd George's conscience as "a negligible quantity"? Yet it must be suffering severely from repression if it really believes all he said at Bath. H. G. CLARK.

Again our correspondent is far from clear. We presume she means that the Chancellor's Suffragist conscience is being coerced by the Premier's Anti-Suffrage attitude. Well, this would be for the Chancellor to answer. We think if the coercion were very painful, he would at least make a protest, and might even threaten to resign. Instead, we find him with the Premier informing a deputation of Suffragists that he is in entire agreement with his leader as to the method of proceeding with the Votes for Women question. We believe that they have arrived at an honourable compromise in a matter on which they differ temperamentally rather than politically. Neither is coerced, nor will submit to be coerced, by the other.—ED.

Feeling that one "can produce new evidence of creative force," is not of much use if one is deprived of the instrument whereby the liberty of producing is protected. H. G. CLARK.

We have endeavoured to extract a meaning from the above phraseology, but we find it difficult, and can only guess that the drift of its meaning may be that we cannot "produce new evidence of creative power" until we get the vote! It is remarks such as these which make it clear to us how impossible it is to explain what the feeling that one may possibly "produce new evidence of creative force" means to any save those who feel it. Arguments can do nothing against statements which emanate from minds clogged with exaggerated values, bombastic metaphors, and distorted symbols. Time alone, with its dislusionment in hard fact, can show that the vote is at most a means of protection, and has little if anything to do in the realm of creative force.—ED.

The impression given to one who looked forward to the appearance of The Free Woman, and who is bitterly disappointed, is that the editors and most of the contributors picture the average woman as an individual wallowing in sex-consciousness. This may be their unfortunatet experience. As a medical woman I am thankful to say it has not been mine. H. G. CLARK.

Why be so exaggerated? Why "wallowing" in sex-consciousness? One would not say of a person who objected to having his eyes constantly bandaged that he "wallowed in seeing," nor of a person who protested against his ears being stopped up that he "wallowed in sound." Why then say to healthy people who object to a total repression of sex that they "wallow in sex-consciousness"? In those who do, does it not argue that they are not yet free from the dark theory which holds that sex in itself is something degrading? That it would be better to have no sex? We think it does so argue. We are not surprised that our correspondent's experience as a doctor is not the same as ours. Of necessity her experience must have been among the sick and not among the strongly alive.—ED.

As to "the species of bird The Free Woman is," a second glance into the pie is unnecessary. The first enables us to realise that she is the one alluded to in the proverb, "It is an ill bird that fouls its own nest." H. G. CLARK.

This is not argument. This is bad temper. We do not know whether it accords with Dr. Clark's general notion of courtesy to ask a list of questions requiring time, patience, and space to answer, and to round off her long list by a gratuitous insult, merely to show that she is not seeking information in order to make up her mind as to the relative merits of the case, but that she asks the questions in a spirit of mischiefness and from love of gossip. We answer her questions, however, in order to make it clear to her and others that it is not a light matter to ask the editors of The Free Woman to answer personal questions concerning the Women's Social and Political Union.—ED.

---
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Feminism Under the Republic and the Early Empire.

In our two previous articles we have been content to paint the difficulties and restrictions imposed upon women by the Roman law, allowing it to be supposed that the women themselves were wholly passive under such restrictions, and that, even when civilisation had made the immense strides which it did during the later Republic, they submitted to the lot in which they were the property of husbands who were also their judges, the despotic masters of their children, and, until it clashed with the interests of their fathers or guardians, of their fortunes. We have allowed it to be supposed that they bowed to the unequal moral law, whereby, in his famous dictum to which we alluded in our second article, Cato, the Censor, the most "virtuous" man of his age, laid it down that the husband might put his wife to death for unfaithfulness, on his own initiative and with impunity, whereas, under like conditions, she, as the complainant, must not be allowed so much as to presume to touch him with her finger, while we have seen how, in a later age, his great grandson, who possessed a similar reputation, followed other well-known examples in divorcing his wife, under the most painful conditions, for political and mercenary ends. We have now to show, however, that the Roman woman did not submit to all that those laws and customs implied without making some struggle against what she felt to be the bitter hardships of her lot, and we must again refer to our foregoing articles to the extent of impressing upon our readers that it would be well to bear in mind throughout, that her lack of mental training, her complete severance from the intellectual life of Rome, placed her at a disadvantage in seeking means of redress, or even in selecting, from the many under which she laboured, particular grievances for attack.

That there was a consciousness of hardship, and that this consciousness had penetrated even to the obdurate masculine mind, peeps out in Plautus, when Syra, the venerable maid-servant of four score years and four, meditates on the troubles of her mistress, and exclaims with passion, "I faith the women do live upon hard terms, and, wretched creatures, on much more unjust ones than men. I wish the law was the same for the husband as the wife." She goes on to say that if men were punished for flagrant offences against their wives, in the same way as women were punished for trivial faults, there would, under those conditions, be many more divorced men than women in Rome. The later centuries of the Republic are filled with the domestic strife and the political strife. The story is that such a crime, at any rate in the earlier days of simpler manners and purer morals, could not be without some instigation to be found in outward circumstances. In no civilisation is it thinkable that 170 women should unite to put to death their husbands. Juvenal alludes to this particular crime under the Empire in the words:

"But murder now is to perfection grown;
And subtle poisons are employ'd alone,
Rather than fail the dagger does the deed."

What escapes Juvenal and all these writers on the subject is that such a crime, at any rate in the earlier days of simpler manners and purer morals, could not be without some instigation to be found in outward circumstances. In no civilisation is it thinkable that 170 women should unite to put to death their lawful partners without an underlying motive. That motive, however, may, without doubt, be found in the bitter exasperation of the women, who were
at the untender mercy of the Roman law, written and unwritten. We turn to a less gloomy aspect of the women's revolt.

During the early part of the second century before Christ the Roman Forum was the scene of so strange and violent a commotion that there is scarcely a more interesting page in the whole annals of Rome. Then, as now, the matrons, regardless of laws and restrictions of public opinion, of the scandal of the Senate, of the commands of their husbands, in short, of the whole sum-total of masculine disapprobation, turned out in a body to agitate for the removal of the Oppian law. This law, passed a few years previously, during the second Punic war, forbade a Roman woman "to possess more than half an ounce of gold, or to wear a garment of various colours, to ride in a carriage drawn by horses in a city, or any town, or any place nearer thereto than one mile, except on occasion of some public religious ceremony." The law had been cheerfully submitted to by the matrons as long as the war continued, its object being to prevent excessive expenditure and consequent waste of money which might go to the war-chest.

Now the war was a thing of the past, there was no excuse for continuing the restriction, but no effort was made by the Senate to remove it, and this injustice caused the greatest organised rebellion of Roman women in their history. The cause of the ferment was not by any means the most pressing of their disabilities as we now see them, but the Roman women, harassed by restrictions, bound down by legal formulæ, in every circumstance of their lives the complement merely of men, with imperfect training and acquirements, suffered from an injustice, obviously and clearly a wrong, appealing, even to make a clear mental image of the root of the mischief of their seething and sullen discontent.

Here, however, was a flagrant act of particular injustice, obviously and clearly a wrong, appealing, by deprivings them of the finery which formed a staple part of their lives, to the most mentally inarticulate of their ranks. Accordingly, we are provided with this curious scene, depicted by Livy with vivid clearness and in such a manner as to bring their disabilities as we now see them, but the Roman women, harassed by restrictions, bound down by legal formulæ, in every circumstance of their lives the complement merely of men, with imperfect training and acquirements, suffered from an injustice, obviously and clearly a wrong, appealing, even to make a clear mental image of the root of the mischief of their seething and sullen discontent.

The Capitol was filled with crowds who favoured or opposed the law, by the Senate to remove it, and this injustice caused the greatest organised rebellion of Roman women in their history. The cause of the ferment was not by any means the most pressing of their disabilities as we now see them, but the Roman women, harassed by restrictions, bound down by legal formulæ, in every circumstance of their lives the complement merely of men, with imperfect training and acquirements, suffered from an injustice, obviously and clearly a wrong, appealing, even to make a clear mental image of the root of the mischief of their seething and sullen discontent.

"Men of the Senate!" thundered the plebeian tribune. "The Roman law is a hateful thing, a snare to the modesty of matrons confined them within the limits of their own rights, it did not become you even at home to concern yourselves about what laws might be passed or repealed here. Our ancestors thought it not proper that women should perform any, even private, business without a director; but that they should ever be under the control of parents, brothers, or husbands. We, it seems, suffer them now to interfere in the management of State affairs and to introduce themselves into the Forum, into general assemblies, and into assemblies of election. For what are they doing at this moment in your streets and lanes? What but arguing, some in support of the motion of the plebeian tribunes, others for the repeal of the law?

"Will you give the reins to their intractable nature and their uncontrolled passions? This is the smallest of the injunctions laid on them by usage or the laws, all of which women bear with impatience. They long for liberty, or, rather, for the truth, for unbounded freedom in every particular. For what will they not attempt if now they come off victorious? "Recollect all the institutions respecting the sex by which our forefathers restrained their undue freedom, and by which they subjected them to their husbands, and yet, even with the help of all these restrictions, you can hardly keep them within bounds. If, then, you suffer them to throw off these one by one, to tear them all asunder, and, at last, to set themselves on an equal footing with yourselves, can you imagine that they will be any longer tolerable by you? "The moment (the italics are the writer's) "they have arrived at an equality with you they will have become your superiors. "My opinion is," he concludes, "that the Oppian law ought not to be repealed."

"Red-haired, grey-eyed, and savage-tusked as well, Porcius will find no welcome even in Hell."

Now came the turn of the Minister proposing the motion to reply to the words of the Censor, and, as has since been the case when women have sought
a champion among the opposite sex, his language must have been such as the more introspective among the women can have cared little to hear, showing, as his words do, a complete lack of comprehension of the problem at the root of all this passion and determination.

His opening sentences, however, were praiseworthy. He began by citing other instances of the women coming out from their homes to the Forum, as when, for instance, a body of matrons intervened to stop a pitched battle being waged in the Forum between Sabines and Romans in the reign of Romulus, and, again, when they turned away by their arguments the army which Coriolanus was bringing against the city, or, again, when they brought their gold ornaments to the public treasury in order to buy off the attack of the Gauls. Later, he reminds the Senate, the women gladly consented to the curtailment, by the Oppian law, of their splendidours, in order that the war-chest might be replenished.

"Shall the men," he continues," alone feel the removal of the war pressure and the return to luxury and ease? . . . . It will be a source of grief and indignation to all (women) when they see those ornaments allowed to the wives of the Latin confederates of which they themselves have been deprived, when they see those riding through the city in their carriages and decorated with purple and gold while they are obliged to follow on foot. This would hurt the feelings even of men, and what do you think must be its effect on weak women, whom even trifles can disturb? Neither offices of State, nor the priesthood, nor triumphs, nor badges of distinction, nor military presents, nor spoils may vanish and the excitement die away, but the remembrance of the firmness, resolution, and cool determination.

"The bondage of women is never shaken off without the loss of their friends, and they themselves look with horror on that freedom which is purchased with the condition of the widow and the orphan. Their feeble nature" (this of the women whose deeds he has just been recounting, and who were the mothers of Romans) "must submit to whatever you think proper to enjoin, and the greater power you possess the more moderate ought you to be in the exercise of your authority."

The women in this instance carried the day, for we read that "although these considerations had been urged against the motion and in favour, they were not satisfied with an academic discussion, but "poured out, next day, into public places in much excitement and violence of the consul, remains im
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