

Noty Gladness
words by John Macfarlane
written by Sir Isaac
illustrated by Henry
Held at Newbury
London & Sydney
Griffiths Torran
Frederick & White

SHAFTS

A MAGAZINE FOR WOMEN AND WORKERS.

Edited by MARGARET SHURMER SIBTHORP.

No. 17. VOL. II.

JULY, 1894.

PRICE 3D.

What the Editor Means.

“TO lift the woman’s fall’n divinity,” sings the poet, “upon an even pedestal with man.” What utter nonsense flows sometimes from clouded brains, through pen or tongue, under the name of that glamour called poesy, or that darkness of vision which is neither glamour nor poesy, but sex conceit. It is a puzzling problem, that men should be so blind as to imagine man set upon a pedestal, to which woman is to be raised by slow degrees until she be worthy to be seated beside him. What does the poet mean by “fall’n divinity?” what do any of us mean when we talk of *elevating* woman. I strongly protest against the use of the word in this sense specially applied. Life upon this planet is a process of continuous evolution, elevation from lower conditions. At the best here, we live a hampered existence, and one life seems all insufficient in which to gain knowledge; to prepare ourselves for that higher and higher, that Godlike grandeur and nobility, which seems to many of us to await us in the future that stretches on before our dreamings into untouched distances. Yet all the greatest of our writers have offered to woman has been, that she shall be seated eventually side by side with man, “these twain upon the skirts of time.” It is a singularly unsatisfactory goal for such hopes as surge within a woman’s soul to rest upon. It is besides a false vision, the vision of a prophet that is no seer. Our knowledge at present is very imperfect, our very senses are misleading; we live from day to day between doubt and conviction, fear and hope, touching with trembling, anxious fingers the fringes of the curtain that veils from us the future, afraid to lift it even if we might. *Knowing absolutely* nothing beyond the material, and of that but little, there yet dwells within us an idea, a suspicion that our existence is not bounded by what we call time, that it is deathless, immortal. More or less strongly this suspicion possesses us all; in grades rising from a suspicion, an idea, to a hope, to a certainty, or what we call such. When this becomes a belief, closely approaching knowledge, it transmutes all life’s experiences into the sunshine of the soul’s gladness, and is a defence against all petty anxieties, griefs, fears and disappointments.

As we rise in the scale we throw off that which will cease to be, and evolve slowly capacities latent within us, of which we were not before conscious save as the consciousness of a dream. I must confess I love not this “fall’n” idea, so early impressed upon the race; the teaching stultifies. Do we not see around us evidence enough to prove that we humans, and all of living creatures, and of life generally, are on the upward move; are now, and ever have been, since time was young? True, we are sensible at present of a dread condition of things, a very desolation of evil-doing, existing in Society; in our health, physical and moral, and in all our social conditions. But we see also that we go on rising. The evidence we gather as we go on, proves to us that from the lowest form of life we have risen, that we still rise, and will continue to

rise till we reach heights beyond our present guess or dream. Our rate of progress must, however, depend surely upon the conditions of our march. Are we hampered with unnecessary baggage? then our progress will be retarded, all such must be cast off. One of the greatest, in fact *the* greatest, stumbling block, in the way of progress is the false ideas we cherish and utter broadcast, with regard to woman. If woman is to be *elevated* she will be raised to a position, mental and spiritual, *above* man, not “equal to” him, for she is not now on a lower plane, and never has been. If one sex has fallen, both have fallen; if one is rising, both are rising. We know too little of the far past, or of the future, to justify assertion, but we have the present before our eyes, and we have powers of higher order which will come into active exercise as the years and ages pass by. Not only have we the present before our eyes, but we have also the near past within much the same range of vision with all its experiences, all the suggestive shakings of the kaleidoscope. What do these teach us of woman? Certainly *not* that she has fallen. This is specially the age of woman, her claims are in the front of our consideration; we have everywhere societies, associations of different sorts by which she is *to be raised* as is constantly asserted.

The word conveys a false idea. When we take the chains off a strong creature, which, because it was *strong*, was chained lest it should use its powers, we do not raise that creature, we simply give it its freedom. This is what we are about to do for woman, give her her freedom; let her great powers be free to be exercised as she shall find best, as they demand to be exercised. What woman demands is EMANCIPATION, not ELEVATION, to be freed from unjustly imposed shackles, not raised. She has never fallen. Whether rising by natural procession, or rising from a fall, it is rising, and a rising of both. We strive and hope that man may rise equally with woman, and be worthy to be her helpmeet and comrade. We behold the condition of our streets. We see our male prostitutes and our female prostitutes desecrate themselves and each other, and we talk of our *fallen women*, making no mention of our fallen men—why is this so?

Thinking only from the material, we have humanity; we have the animal world, the insect and the vegetable kingdoms; what do these teach us of the female and of woman? Certainly not that she has fallen. What then? In the first place, let us look at woman as the feminine; as mother. What do we see? Is sex a degradation to her, setting her apart as a creature for man’s use and pleasure, as taught more or less coarsely always, or is it a grade of evolution, a higher development? Upon this rests the solving of the question, whether woman is a creature somewhat lower than man, as has been and is yet so often asserted, or a creature of a higher grade of advance, on the ever-ascending scale of evolution.

A comparatively recent writer has said, after arguing the matter ably:—

(Continued on page 287.)

Pioneer Club Records.

ON Thursday, June 21st, Mrs. Headlam opened the debate "Are Women Competent in Money Matters?"

The President took the chair, which she filled with her usual tact. She spoke a few effective words on the subject to be discussed, and with characteristic good taste refrained from belauding the lecturer; a habit indulged in too frequently by those who take the chair at public meetings, sometimes to an extent utterly at variance both with good sense and just definition.

Mrs. Headlam's treatment of the subject was racy, practical, and to the point. She deplored the exceeding inefficiency of the average woman in money matters, her ignorance even of ordinary commercial and financial terms, but attributed this condition of things to her training, or rather *want of training*. She urged upon parents the necessity of giving to their daughters a good commercial education, and pointed out the fact that it was considered a good speculation to educate sons well, as the money expended upon them might bring in a good return in value, whereas education given to a girl had hitherto produced no results in the way of enabling her to make money. Men had managed matters so entirely in their own interests that, in spite of the triumphs of women in learning, they were unable to obtain from such training any commercial return. Much prejudice existed amongst men on the subjects of women's capabilities; they had said, with that cool insolence resulting from want of thought, "Oh, let them come into our universities, they won't do much harm, poor wretches, they will soon be very sorry they ever came here." But behold! quite another state of things. Magnificent results had accrued to women; they had scored triumphs. Now men practically said, "You may learn, you may surpass us, but we will shut the gates against any further advancement; you shall not reap any practical benefit."

Here the lecturer instanced several distinguished successes gained by women. It was of no use, she went on, to say "Oh, women don't know anything at all," and all that humbug which people set so much store by long ago, but which had ceased even to tickle the fancy of would-be smart ones. The older ones among us might not live to see woman's ultimate triumph, but it was sure nevertheless. As a teacher of commercial matters, Mrs. Headlam had seen much of the incompetency of women from want of training, she had also learnt to know how capable they were of being trained. Let them receive education fully and without stint, then abundant would be the harvest. Those women who had done, and were doing so much without any reward, might take heart of grace, for they were doing the running for all other women coming after them. Through their brave, unselfish efforts other women were going to win. She foresaw the day when the old Benchers would climb down from their seats, wouldn't it be fine to see them. Women should at once turn their attention to commerce, they might begin there, and so, making themselves independent, be prepared for the great position just ahead of them. Then Mrs. Headlam went into sort of a comic rhapsody over men's capabilities, very amusing to her hearers. The great ideal, she added, with much irony, held before women was, or had been, to marry some rich or distinguished man, and sew on his buttons. It was not always possible to carry this out, it never had been, much less so now; poor unhappy women being in such numbers, and obliged to forego this charming ideal life. She insisted upon women being well educated, and urged upon parents their absolute duty in this matter. Many barriers had already been destroyed, and the demolishing process

was going on. Soon there would be no path which women might not tread, no honour they might not claim.

Miss Gradwell, who is also a teacher on commercial lines, and holds classes at Westminster, where women and girls are thoroughly prepared for a commercial life; whose work has been advertised in these columns recently, spoke much to the same effect with grave precision and clearness.

Mrs. Sibthorp said *she* was usually marked out as being severe on men, but she thought the irresistibly comic picture of their amazing abilities, so cleverly drawn by Mrs. Headlam, was more calculated to take the conceit out of them than any severity of expression she might herself have used. She objected to the habit adopted by the ladies of the Pioneer Club, of apologising to the gentlemen for anything they might say. Since gentlemen so much desired to come to this Club of women Pioneers fighting for their liberties (and they were always heartily welcome), they must expect some hard knocks, and must learn from them how to help women to remove the barriers. Women meant to remove all the stumbling blocks from out of their path, no matter when, or by whomsoever placed. When these were removed, women would prove their capability of doing, or being anything.

Mrs. Holroyd Chaplin spoke some telling words, in which she was ably seconded by her husband; and a young lady present made a capital suggestion, namely, that children, girls and boys together, should be taught to *play at commerce* in the nursery. She suggested games, and cited instances where this had been done with effect.

The debate upon the 28th, "Is what Tennyson Upholds in 'The Princess' Freedom for Women," proved very interesting. It was generally acknowledged that to Tennyson as a poet of an older age, and depicting a state of things now passed away, women owed a debt of gratitude, inasmuch as that he had cleared a few stones out of their pathway. But considering how Tennyson is everywhere quoted on the subject of women's emancipation, it was remarkable how the prevalent opinion of the Pioneers demonstrated unmistakably that, whatever may have been the opinion of women in the earlier years of this century, the women of the present day do not think the freedom depicted by Tennyson sufficient to meet their widening and increasing demands. It proved also, to the great satisfaction of many, that opinions *grow* in spite of quotations, and are not to be kept at a standstill, even by the utterances of the poets and writers we most admire.

Mr. Bernard Shaw on the 12th, at 8 p.m., was announced to give a lecture on Art. Art with an interrogative. His lecture was interrogative and assertive from beginning to end. He asked why these women called themselves pioneers, and went out of his way to inform them that they were not pioneers in anything. He asserted man's claim to an intellectual capacity unattainable by woman, also to a logical capacity at which women might gaze in wonder, but might never reach. He told the Pioneers, and all whom it might concern, that he had been forming public opinion on the subject of Art for a long time. He said that women told lies and practised meannesses to gain their ends, which he partially justified as being their *only* means. It did not seem to occur to the lecturer that man had deprived woman of her natural rights, which might have caused such a descent into duplicity, nor did he take into his scheme of reasoning or unreasoning the lies told by men, which are at least equal in number and meanness to any uttered by women. He might have been somewhat staggered, could he have known the unqualified denial the lives of the majority of women give to his words. He assured (very needlessly, surely) the women who politely listened to him, that he had not come to say polite things to them, while at the same time he mentioned that he received the incense of flattery and words of praise from

International Women's Union.

JUNE REPORT.

FRESH VICE-PRESIDENTS AND FOREIGN COUNCELLORS.

Brazil	Mme. Josephina Alvares de Azevedo.
California	Mrs. Alice McComas.
Canada	Mrs. Youmans.
Holland	Mme. Poelman.
Italy	Signor Enrico Ferri, M.P.
Portugal	Senora Regina Maney.
England	Mrs. F. MacDonald.
"	W. Woodall, M.P.
France	M. Clifford Millage.
New Zealand	C. O. Montrose, Esq.
Sweden	Mme. Hildegard Heijkenskjold.
Persia	Miss Yoseph, M.D.

L'Union pour les droits de femmes (Belgium), Norsk Kvindesagsforening (Norway), International Peace Association, La Solidarité (Paris), L'Adelphie (Paris), La Ligue pour les droits des femmes (Paris), La Cerle de paix et d'arbitrage (Palermo), The Connecticut State Women's Suffrage Association, Parliamentary Committee (England), Women's Suffrage Society (Milan), have affiliated.

BELGIUM.

Mlle. La Nauze writes: The cause of woman has progressed since the movement began two years ago. Three societies socially and by their respective organs claim the rights of women. Some Members of the Chamber plead our civil rights, others for better laws upon "la recherche de la paternité."

The intellectual movement progresses slowly. There is now a special course at the Institute Gatti for young women wishing to take the university course. Recently three women took their diplomas in medicine, having passed the university examinations with the highest distinctions.

Two excellent societies are being formed, one for the mutual help of women, the other for women's conferences.

HOLLAND.

Mme. Drucker writes: In Amsterdam a Woman's Suffrage Society has been formed, the outcome of the Vrye Vrouwen-vezeingeng, the free society of women, already numbering 100 members of both sexes. In case the male element should too largely predominate, the men have no vote but are regarded as advisers.

At Hilveesum two ladies have been appointed on the School Committee by the Town Council, which manages the school and to which body the committee reports. This has not been done without much opposition, the appointment being carried by nine votes to six, and the Mayor is about to appeal to the Minister of Education, declaring the appointment to be illegal.

PORTUGAL.

Miss Alice Moderno writes: During the last twenty years Portuguese women have been living in deplorable inactivity. They scarcely knew how to read or write, knew nothing of business, and relied in everything on the protection of father, husband, brother, son, or distant male relation.

Slowly the woman of to-day begins to feel the impulse given by her sisters in America, England and France. Thus we already have our authoresses, women journalists, doctors, etc., and though these are as yet the exceptions, they show that, although a puerile education is generally given to women, an evolution, slow but sure, is taking place in Portuguese society.

SICILY.

Mdme. Marietta Campo writes: "A *fe te champetre* has just been given by the Men's Committee for Peace at Palermo, which was a great success."

The Union numbers now about 1,200 adherents and grows every week.

WARNER SNOAD.

women continually. After going through the gamut of women's faults and failings, taking now and then a far-off glance at art, he tripped himself up, retraced his steps, took the ground from under his own feet, and ended by leaving all his hearers in doubt as to what he had meant or if he had meant anything. His lecture might be described thus —? Is it absolutely necessary that a club of thoughtful earnest women, Pioneers in women's advance not after man, nor yet with any thought of reaching to his height, which at the best is only side by side with theirs, should be addressed by *men*, unless these men have something to say worth hearing. Pioneers do not exclude men, but if they invite men to address them and these men accept, surely they are in their right in expecting to be addressed as reasonable creatures. Perhaps Mr. Bernard Shaw intended to be funny; if so, he had his reward; for the Pioneers on this occasion even rivalled the House of Commons in their laughter.

Miss Edith Simeox in the discussion spoke exceedingly well, and left deep thought behind her in many minds. Miss Sharman Crawford deplored the lecturer having failed to discuss the subject given out as the debate of the evening, and pointed out many deductions which might have been drawn from the consideration of art in the past and present.

On the 19th the Rev. John Page Hopps opened debate by a very interesting view of spiritualism, and of the question "Is spiritualism worth investigation?" He gave as his definition of spiritualism, in brief, that it meant the persistence of the being after the phenomenon we call death, and narrated an experience of his own at a private séance in his own house. Many Pioneers and visitors spoke, and spoke very much to the purpose, among whom may be mentioned Miss Green, Miss Whitehead, Miss Sharman Crawford, Mr. Lane Fox, and other ladies and gentlemen whose names we did not catch.

This closed the debates for this session. They will be reopened on the first Thursday in October. The Club now goes into recess for one month, from August 4th till September 3rd. During recess, the Writers' Club has generously offered its hospitality to members of the Pioneer, which proves how women sympathise with each other, and how cordially the hand of fellowship is held out. The Writers' Club is situated at Hastings House, Norfolk Street, Strand. A meeting to appoint trustees for the Club of the Future will take place shortly. Only those members who have contributed to the "Fund" will be invited to attend.

The Pioneer Club is at present a proprietary Club. It is so, owing to the fact that we owe its existence to the generous, noble woman who is its founder and President. Her funds have been lavishly spent upon it, to render it all that can be desired, and to unite perfect freedom with home comfort and a sense of rest and comradeship, so necessary to the hard-working women who really compose the Club. In spite of the fact that it is proprietary, it is really the most democratic club in London, as it receives and welcomes as its members women of *all* classes, rich as well as poor—poor equally with rich. The President and founder bestows not only her wealth in funds, upon the Club, but her wealth in time and personal superintendence, which is of far greater import, essential as the former certainly is. When the change comes which will make it self-supporting, no one will rejoice more than the President, and towards the establishment of the Club of the Future her most earnest efforts are put forth, her best hopes and wishes turn. In the meantime, many of us are more than content with things as they are; and Pioneers feel that their utmost loyalty is due to the woman who has given them so great a boon, who has with her means enabled them to make so splendid a beginning. We hope that should the Club become

(Continued on page 287.)

How the New Factory and Workshops Bill would Affect Women.

SECTION 4 forbids women to clean machinery in motion. This is of course a useful precaution, women's clothes being likely to be more in the way than men's in this occupation; at the same time, as it is so dangerous I fail to see why men should not be equally restricted from doing it, except in cases where it is absolutely necessary.

Section 7, which deals with restrictions as to overtime. Women don't want to work overtime, but they do want to be free to work overtime when it is inconvenient and impossible to get through the work otherwise.

Mrs. Holt, Secretary of the Shirt and Collar Makers' Union, stated to Mr. Asquith, on the occasion of his receiving a deputation of forty *bonâ fide* working women in the Committee Room, No. 13, on Tuesday, June 26th, that if she did not work overtime in the full season she could not make more than 8s. a week, if she makes as little as this, she could not possibly live on it and put by enough for the slack season.

Miss March Phillipps complains in this month's *Fortnightly Review*, that in the laundry trade, "to find a respectable married woman taking to the trade is almost always a proof that the husband, from drink or other causes, does not do his duty by the home." Are we to make irksome rules for all women employed in the washing industry, because some have the misfortune to have bad husbands? I absolutely refuse to believe the statement that most of the women who are laundresses have drunken husbands; many of their husbands are decent, respectable men who often help their wives, or carry on a trade quite apart from the wife's earnings. The wife is, as a rule, very glad that the hours are irregular; as Mrs. Moloy stated in her evidence, she had the time to see that her children were clean and started to school before she began her work, and this was much more convenient to her than being obliged to be there early and to leave off early.

Section 22, which extends the number of trades where overtime is allowed, about eighteen in all, by the insertion of the words "non-textile"—any non-textile factory. Of this we cordially approve.

Section 8 forbids any young person or woman to take work to finish at home from the factory, where she has worked in the day. This, if passed, will of course lead to evasion and subterfuge, as it will require a whole army of inspectors to see whether work is carried home and whether work is finished by the worker or by other members of her family. Often a daughter or mother can gladly do a little work at home, who is perhaps not strong enough to go out and do a whole day's work.

Section 18, enables the Secretary of State to forbid any person working at any trade which he is satisfied is injurious. This places freedom of contract for all persons at the fiat of an individual. Women have no votes, "therefore they can be safely neglected," as Mr. Gladstone once said in another connection, but worse than to be neglected is to be interfered with and treated like children, and this the Women's Industrial Defence League feels will be the case if such obnoxious clauses pass into law. It is giving absolutely unlimited power into the hands of one man. One woman, a Mrs. Briggs, a boot machinist, has done work, by some considered to be dangerous for women, for twenty-five years, and gave her opinion that this trade had never hurt her, and she had good health, and had brought up a family of healthy children. For three years, this heroine in humble life took in all the work that her husband was supposed to be doing, and did it herself, till he died, attending to his wants and keeping her family all through her trouble in respectability and comfort.

MADLEINE GREENWOOD.

Why should not Women have the Vote?

THE Parliamentary Committee for Women's Suffrage held a drawing-room meeting, by the kind permission of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Cooke, at their residence, 40, Brunswick Square, W.C., on Tuesday evening. The meeting was a most enthusiastic one, and was well attended in spite of the inclemency of the weather. Among those present were:—Mrs. Goldworthy, Miss Knollys, Mr. Alfred Rees, Mr. Montrose, and many others. Letters have been received regretting unavoidable absence from Lady Aberdeen, Lady Hardman, etc. An important engagement in the country unfortunately prevented Mr. G. Whiteley, M.P., from being present, and his place was taken by Mr. Atherley Jones.

The Comtesse LUCILE DE HAMEL DE MANIN presided, and made a short opening speech, after which Mr. JAMES RENTOUL spoke. He said:—

Ladies and Gentlemen, the following resolution has been put into my hands:—

"That in the opinion of this Meeting of women and men, the time has arrived when no measure of Parliamentary or Electoral reform should be considered apart from the claims of women."

The distinguished lady who occupies the chair said that she had a great deal to say on the subject of Women's Suffrage, but that she had secured the services of other speakers. I am sorry she did not exercise her privilege and address you, as it would have been to your advantage and certainly to mine, for I have nothing at all to say about it. To-day, lunching at the House of Commons, I was opposite a distinguished and thoughtful Member of Parliament, who belongs to the Liberal Unionist Party, and I told him that I was going to address this meeting. He asked what the question was, and I replied, "Should Women have Votes?" He asked how I proposed to answer this question, and my reply is, "Why should women not have votes?" What I have to say now is merely an amplification of that text. I have thought the matter over from every possible point of view, and I can conceive of no reason why women should not have votes under the same conditions as men. Apart from party interests I fail to see where the difference comes in, or what reason anyone can adduce why women should not have votes. It may be said that there are ignorant women and unintelligent women; but there are also ignorant and unintelligent men. In reading a pamphlet published by the Society, I found some interesting statistics, which proved that in crime, want of intelligence, and in a great many other matters, men compare extremely unfavourably with women. Now, I should say, that the first thing necessary for exercising Parliamentary Franchise is honesty. It would be absurd for anyone to enter into a discussion as to whether men or women, taken as a whole, were the more honest. We may dismiss that part of the matter by saying that there is probably as much honesty on one side as on the other, as much desire to do what is best for the whole kingdom and for the good of the human race on one side as on the other; consequently from that point of view there is no argument to be adduced why women should not exercise the vote. The next essential is intelligence. With regard to the intelligence of women and men, a marvellous change has come over public opinion within my memory. The first time I ever addressed a public audience was on the question of Women's Intellect. I was a junior student in College, and being asked by the Debating Society to deliver an address, I selected as my subject Female Education,—and that was just at the time the question, "Should Women be admitted to University Degrees?" was beginning to be discussed. I was unknown to anyone in the University town,—my name could not have attracted a single individual; but although the audience often numbered only 8 or 10, and 20 or 30 at the outside, the

largest hall in the town—which held about 1,200 people—was packed on this occasion, and about 500 were turned away from the doors. I remember very well the extreme length to which I went in my address. I was considered very revolutionary, for I tried to prove that girls of high intelligence—picked girls—could pass the Matriculation for the University. That was all. Most of my audience did not believe it. One student got up and said that probably Mr. Rentoul would argue that women ought to be admitted to the Degree of M.A.; but I repudiated this idea, saying, "Far be it from me to imagine anything of that sort." I was in advance of my age. I went the length of their matriculating. That is not a great number of years ago, and what have we arrived at now? Ladies have again and again taken the highest place in the highest degree in the most severe Universities. Last year the two first places in classics were taken by women in the London University. We have had a Senior Wranglership taken by a lady in Cambridge, a lady has also held the position of Senior Classic at that University, and only a year or two ago the first place in the Second and higher Division of Mathematics was taken by Miss Johnson. Thus we see that the Degrees of M.A., B.A., M.D., and many others have been taken by women, and we have reached a length that no one dreamed of years ago. Men who held the most advanced views with regard to the intellectual powers of women at the time said, "Clever women can learn languages, history or any memory subjects, but they cannot study mathematics or logic, matters of that sort are entirely beyond the grasp of any woman, except perhaps some phenomenal one in a century." That idea is brought out by George Eliot in her novel *The Mill on the Floss*, when the teacher is appealed to by Tom and his sister as to the difference in the mental capacities of boys and girls; that reverend gentleman gave as his opinion that girls had a little superficial cleverness, but when you came to the depths they were not in it at all. We have passed away from that age altogether, and now women as a whole are studying the very highest and deepest subjects possible. We have many illustrations of the ability of women in political matters. I myself had a very erroneous idea—an idea possibly shared by a large number of people in this country—with regard to Her Gracious Majesty the Queen. Until a short time ago I believed that the Queen was a very amiable old lady who did very little good and very little harm, and who signed Bills when they were sent up to the Houses of Parliament, but as to her having any intellectual grasp of political matters she knew very little about it. I became acquainted with two members of the Royal Household who have an intimate knowledge of Her Majesty, and they told me about her inner and intellectual powers—that she speaks fluently eleven languages, that she commenced the study of Hindustani for the first time in the Jubilee year, and that for the last three years she has carried on all the correspondence in that language herself. That a lady nearly seventy years of age should take up the study of this most difficult language is wonderful! Her Majesty is in the habit of writing a letter to each of the sovereigns of Europe once a fortnight, and has been the means of stopping several budding Continental Wars. It is admitted that there is no sovereign in Europe who can compare in intellect, intellectual powers and grasp with Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen. (Cheers.) My informants have been present at various interviews between Her Majesty and her Foreign Ministers—notably Lord Salisbury, so great an authority on Foreign Affairs—and it is stated that he can only find one person in this Kingdom able to match and beat him on his own ground and to take a wider and clearer grasp of foreign policy than he can do—and that person is our Queen. (Cheers.) And yet this Queen of ours with all her intelligence, if she were an ordinary subject, could not vote in a Parliamentary election! Anything more absurd can

hardly be conceived. Women agitated for their right to go in for University education and to compete with men for University degrees, and this agitation quickly brought about the opening of the doors of the Universities to women. Then it was for women to show whether they would disgrace or distinguish themselves. They have distinguished themselves. Girls have obtained a larger proportion of honours than men have done. I think that is the nearest parallel to the question before us now. Women are saying, Open the doors and give us the chance of showing whether we can intelligently and usefully exercise the franchise or not, and we will take the responsibility and the risk. Now in this country the principle at the present time admitted by all parties is "No Taxation without Representation." This cry was first uttered by the Liberal Party, but it is a cry that no Conservative can wisely oppose. Of course, those who are opposed to "One Man, One Vote," can use that principle in another way, and say, that because a man pays taxes in several places, he is entitled to vote in several divisions. And yet all the women are taxed exactly like men, no difference whatever is made, and they are deprived of that which is the platform cry of both parties, "No Taxation without Representation." If women are to be treated as unfit for the rough-and-tumble cares of voting and going to the poll, if they are too delicate plants for that sort of thing, if they are to be set upon a higher platform than men, keep them there, but remove all taxation from them. All the women I know would dynamite me if I agitated for the vote on those conditions. It would be an enthusiastic advocate of the franchise indeed who would want a vote if she were exempted from taxation. I do not know any man who would not give up his vote on the same terms, but if that is so, if men are taxed and get votes, and if women are taxed the same and do not get votes, the thing is too foolish to bear discussion. And the hesitation that I had in speaking on this subject was due to the fact that the other side has no case at all: there is nothing for me to argue against; there is nothing more difficult in a law case than when your opponent has nothing to say, and you have consequently nobody to fight. You are compensated by getting your costs without difficulty—but there is no fun. As I began, so I end by saying, and my sole answer to the question is—Why should women not have the vote? It is absurd to say that they should not have the vote because in early times and in some countries still, votes were more closely connected with fighting than with taxes. Voting involved defending the country. Considerably more than half the male electors are declared by the War Office incapable of fighting. Every man over the age of 47 to 49 is considered to be valueless on the battle-field, though of course some men are as strong at 50 as at 30. Thus more than half the men who exercise the franchise are declared by the authorities unfit for battle. Therefore you are asked to apply to women the same principle that is applied to men. There are thousands of men between the usual limits of age for military service (21 to 49) who are declared incapable by the doctors of standing a single march. Every one of these men votes, and there is one man at the present time who has 63 votes who could not appear on a battle-field at all. Now under these circumstances one might well ask, considering that voting does not depend on fighting, considering that women are called upon to pay the same amount of taxes as men, considering that statistics prove that their honesty, absence from crime, absence from drunkenness and their general character is nearly three times as good as the general character of men in this Kingdom at the present time, considering that their intelligence has been proved in schools and colleges since the establishment of university and local examinations for the last twenty-five years, why should not women have the vote? With all these facts before us, it is truly absurd to talk of this question any more, to argue it any further. I was talking this matter

over with a Member of Parliament of considerable experience, and he said that almost all the women he knew were against women having the vote. Well, that goes further than any experience I have had, and I asked whether amongst the women he referred to there were any ratepayers. He thought not. It may be that there are some women who do not pay rates who are selfish enough to say, "We do not want women to vote at all; we cannot vote ourselves, why should other women be allowed to vote?" My experience goes as far as this—I cannot call to mind any woman who pays taxes who does not want the vote. I think that they ask only what is fair and right and just when they ask for a vote. A large section of the people of this country ask for a thing which it is absolutely unfair, wrong and iniquitous to refuse them, and for the refusal of which no one can produce one single solid argument. One may say the vote will be of no use to them when they get it. That is their own business; they ask for a thing against which nothing can be said; they are fit for it, why not give it to them? Why is it that the House of Commons on both sides does not care a farthing about this question? Simply because Members of Parliament look at things from the political standpoint only, and that being so, every Member of Parliament has before him, as a thing of the first importance, the machinery of election, because nothing is of any use unless you win in the election. No Government can be of any use unless it is returned, and furthermore there cannot be a Member of Parliament until he is returned. The reason we are not interested in this matter is that we do not believe the women's vote will affect the elections. It will be so much divided that it will probably not make one Member different in the House of Commons. If you could prove to the Liberal party that women would vote all Liberal or to the Conservative party that women would all vote Tory you would have the utmost enthusiasm, the one advocating the women's party, the other opposing it. I would say to those who are enthusiastic in this matter do not be discouraged because you find Members of Parliament very careless: it is because they think it will not affect the elections, and not because it is a woman's question. They are equally careless about any question of electoral change which will not affect the return of any party to power; it is for those who want the change to agitate for themselves; it is for the women to speak for themselves in this matter, I do not think addresses from Members of Parliament are of any use. Success may come suddenly, like a thief in the night, and within a few years at the furthest women will have the vote. In the meantime it is necessary for them to keep on working as hard as they can in order that their just rights may be given to them. At the County Council Election of which I spoke, there was not one woman present who went to the poll who did not exercise the vote with remarkable intelligence; I never saw more intelligence displayed—as far as I know they all voted for me. I have been drawn into taking some little interest in this matter by Miss Cozens, who has worked so energetically in the cause, and it was at her request that I came here to-night, though I thought that I had nothing to say, because there is nothing to say, no case on the other side to answer. I thank you for listening to me as patiently as you have done.

Mr. ATHERLEY-JONES, in seconding the resolution, said that this movement had no doubt make considerable progress during the last few years, and had passed through the most difficult stage of any movement, that of ridicule. A very high measure of honour was due to Miss Lydia Becker and the other pioneers of Women's Suffrage. This was an era of reforms tending to raise the social life of the people to a higher standard. In New Zealand the extension of the franchise to women had contributed towards a greater interest in social reforms, and to the increase of Members of

Parliament pledged to the temperance cause, and he thought that in this country there were changes in the social condition of the people which required attention, and in which the co-operation of women would have a beneficial effect. The intelligent way in which women had taken a share in Local Government had lodged a claim which entitled them to representation in matters of Imperial politics. He should be sorry to see this movement become a purely party question, and he thought that if women were given an equal share with men in the Government of the country, they would exercise those functions with credit to themselves and to the glory of the country.

Mr. MONTROSE (New Zealand) made a few remarks on the way in which the women's franchise had worked in his country, and said he thought that the great need of the movement in this country was more organisation.

The Comtesse LUCILE DE HAMEL DE MANIN then put the resolution to the meeting, which was carried with only one dissentient; and the Secretary read the memorials which it was proposed to lay before Sir William Harcourt, M.P., Mr. J. Morley, M.P., and Mr. Arthur Balfour, M.P., which were afterwards put to the meeting and carried.

Mr. HERBERT E. ORMEROD made an able speech in opposition to the resolution, and after some discussion, in which Mr. Arthur Rees and others took part, the proceedings terminated with a vote of thanks to the Chairwoman and to the Host and Hostess.

The Blue Line on March.

MADAME JEANNE SCHMAHL, and the Society called "L'Avant-Courrière," have been working energetically to ameliorate the condition of French married women.

The earnings of all married women in France, married under the *régime* of a *communauté légale* (community of property), that is to say, of all *poor* women, the bulk of the nation's wives, who have no property to settle, the earnings of all these belong to their husbands.

On July 7th, 1894, the following "*proposition de loi*" was laid before the French Chamber by M. Léopold Goirand, deputy, on behalf of L'Avant-Courrière:—

"Whatever *régime* is adopted by husband and wife, the wife has the right to receive the payment due to her for her own work, and to dispose of it as she likes. The powers thus given to the wife will not affect the rights of third parties with regard to the property of the married pair."

This matter of women being entitled to their own earnings was put straight by England in 1870; by Sweden in 1874; by Denmark in 1880, and by Norway in 1888.

AN inaugural meeting for a proposed Imperial Exhibition of women's work to be held in London in 1897 or 1898, was held at the Society of Arts, Adelphi, on July 10th.

Sir Richard Temple, M.P., took the chair at first; afterwards Lady Aberdeen.

There were present about fifty persons, including General Webber, Miss Maitland, of Somerville Hall, Oxford, Miss Margaret Windeyer, of New South Wales, Mrs. Bedford Fenwick, Mrs. Russell Cooke, Miss Blackburn, Madame Canziani, Sir Donald Currie and Mr. Liberty.

The meeting was convened by Mrs. Roberts-Austen, who managed the Art section at the Chicago Exhibition. She read out the names of various ladies favourable to the scheme, who were unable to be present. Among them were those of Miss Conybeare and Lady Henry Somerset.

Lady Aberdeen brought forward a resolution that Her Majesty be approached with a view of granting her patronage to the proposed Exhibition.

This was unanimously passed.

Continued from page 283.

PIONEER CLUB RECORDS (continued.)

through the years self-supporting, she will still continue to be at its head.

The Debates for the coming session will be published in our August issue; with many other particulars. Now, for some weeks, the Pioneers and their friends seek the sylvan shades, or the sea-girt coasts, of these, or some foreign shores, there to gain health and strength for the debates of the autumn and winter months, and the busy lives of work they each and all live; yet looking forward with keen pleasure, to meeting each other again.

May we say here that the President of the Pioneer Club never sees this page until it is published in the paper. No one, in fact, except the Editor, regulates anything that appears in SHAFTS.

—+X+—

NOTICE.

Next month will be reviewed two capital books. *British Freewomen* by Charlotte Carmichael Stopes, and *Woman and Her Era* by Mrs. Farnham. These have been delayed owing to the prolonged illness of the Editor, which is now passing away.

MARRIAGE is too often mirage: far off in books, in dreams, lovely and divine; approached, it resolves itself into washing and ironing and cooking and nursing and house-cleaning and mending and long-suffering from New Year to Christmas, and from Christmas to New Year.—GAIL HAMILTON.

MATTHEW ARNOLD:—"A man's children are not really *sent* any more than the pictures upon his wall or the horses in his stable are *sent*; and to bring people into the world when one cannot afford to keep them and one's self decently and not too precariously, or to bring more of them into the world than one can afford to keep there, is by no means an accomplishment of the Divine will or a fulfilment of Nature's simplest laws." True beyond dispute, but what are the means proposed? All will depend upon that. A new factor, the most powerful of all factors, is about to assert itself and will fix this question.

—X—

Nichols and Co., 23, Oxford Street, publish a useful little book, entitled, *A Woman's Work in Water Cure and Sanitary Education*. By Mary S. G. Nichols. Price, 1s. It contains much valuable information, besides the *Water Cure* itself, which is simply marvellous in its results, as herein stated. It is, in any case, well worth a trial, and the book will repay study. Here is an extract from its pages, of vital interest to women:—"Boys and girls are born and reared in the same family, they should also be educated together. It has been thought that girls have not the faculties, or the physical powers, necessary to acquire the same education as boys, that the functions which fit them to become mothers, unfit them for the severe studies of men. As girls are now born, and have been educated, there has been some truth in this; they have been cramped, weakened, by the dress, manners, habits, and exercises, supposed to be suitable to their condition." All the weaknesses from which women suffer are stated to be the results of these absurd ideas, carried out in their education and the habits forced upon them.

"All this is abnormal and unnecessary. A girl reared as healthily as her brother will successfully compete with him in learning. The feminine intellect is quicker than the masculine, and girls often grasp, by a sudden intuition, what boys acquire slowly by study."

WHAT THE EDITOR MEANS (continued.)

"It is clear, then, that sex is a grade of development, and that the feminine exceeds the masculine by the differentiation of two organs more than the latter employs—organs of vastly complicated relations and exquisite sensibilities—organs which are entrusted with the momentous offices of the ante-natal creation and post-natal nurture of the race. These may be termed the Superior-Maternal System, in contradistinction to those organs and functions of the reproductive system which in the feminine are balanced by their equivalents in the masculine. They are two steps taken by the feminine under the law of differentiation, of which the masculine stops short. And whether maternity (which function as to its organ partakes of the voluntary character) is performed or not, in any individual case, the organs testify the presence of capacities and qualities in the feminine which the masculine know not. Thus the plus of powers, sensibilities, emotions experiences, and possibilities, either in happiness or suffering, is hers, not his. And, without fulness of action in this system of organs, there is an action which establishes Womanhood—a function anticipative of Maternity, first movement of the Superior-Maternal System which the masculine balances by no phenomena of its vital circuit. This unique function separates the ante-maternal from the ante-paternal period by a world of fine susceptibilities, emotions, affections, yearnings, which transcend—as intellectual *power* does mere knowledge, or as moral purpose does mere intellect—the limits of self-enjoyment which bound the horizon of the masculine. It is the open window of the feminine soul, affording its longest and divinest outlook beyond self and the present, into the wide, vague world of life and happiness, to which through love it aspires to contribute; indifferent in its highest moments whether it be through martyrdom or ineffable joy that it gives itself, so but the gift be made."

As I intend to continue this subject here for some time, to enter into it as deeply as possible and on the highest lines, I ask my readers to consider it earnestly with me, that we may study it together from the highest and purest meanings, and arrive at beneficial results. Letters will be received with joy which will help. Believing as I do that upon the right apprehension of woman depends all our moral progress into the heights before us, I urge all women, also all men, to approach this subject with holy earnestness, to think of it in their moments of inspiration and pure influx of spirit-power; for if, as many assert, our life here is a coming, a going, and a returning, if one sex evolves into the other as it develops, it becomes men surely to prepare themselves for the higher stage, not by sneers or sex-conceit, resting upon a false basis, but by throwing off the garment of gross uttruths, and so entering into this temple of holy study and thought as into sacred precincts.

Let us learn the true and the relative value of things, and how far spiritual knowledge and power transcends the mere intellectual and material.

—X—

THE RIGHT OF WOMEN TO THE SUFFRAGE.—If women are entitled to life, liberty, and property, they are equally entitled to be consulted as to the manner in which their lives, liberties and properties shall be controlled and disposed of; and any control or disposition of them in which they do not participate is simply an usurpation, and a wrong. If they are amenable to the laws, and called upon to pay taxes, they are merely slaves as long as they are prevented from authoritatively expressing their views as to what those laws and taxes ought to be. The title of men and women to the suffrage is based on exactly the same considerations, and its denial to the latter is iniquitous for exactly the same reasons that its denial to the former would be so.—*Westminster Review*.

VACCINATION.—"Everyone who knows anything of public health questions and the practical unity of epidemics and their determining causes, will agree that exemption from all alike must be sought, not by one thing, such as vaccination, but by removing the cause of epidemic susceptibility generally."—MISS FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE.

Will the Legal Status of Women in the East Compare Favourably with that of European Women?

By PIONEER 363.

BOOK I.

THERE is a very general opinion among those who know and understand the religious and social needs of Oriental countries that the women of the East must be dealt with by women. The Bishop of Rochester has expressed the belief that in the future Christian womanhood is likely to be a more powerful force than Christian manhood, more particularly in Oriental lands. Orientals themselves are awaking to the recognition of this coming power, if the following extract from *The Christian* of December 21st, 1893, is to be trusted. Dr. Martyn Clark, of the C.M.S., in a conversation with a friendly Hindu, inquired which of all missionary methods was most of all feared by the Hindus? The reply was:—

"We do not greatly fear your schools, we need not send our children. We do not fear your books, for we do not read them. We do not much fear your preaching, we need not listen. But we dread your women and we dread your doctors, for your doctors are winning our hearts, and your women are winning our homes, and when our hearts and our homes are won, what is there left us?"

As all the world knows, Oriental prejudices are extremely stubborn and difficult to overcome, but all-powerful as are the immemorial customs of the East, they will in nowise deter the coming host of British women, who are expected to be the publishers of a purer ideal of human happiness, from taking up their appointed mission to their Oriental sisters. Yet as we regard this future great work of women reformers, we cannot but see that very much ignorance prevails as to the legal status of Oriental women as laid down in the different religious systems of the East. It is for the purpose of removing the wide-spread misunderstanding of Oriental religions that Prof. Max Müller so enthusiastically defends them and their peculiar conceptions of religious thought. That we may no longer err in absolute darkness on this subject, he has been instrumental in putting before the British public a large number of translated canonical books, known to students as the *Sacred Books of the East*. These he would have us carefully examine, if the origin and growth of Eastern religions are to be properly understood.

Now as some of us may agree with the assertion of a certain writer (T. H. S. Escott) that the British are marked out as all creation's heirs, it does seem but reasonable that we should, in mingling with all nations, tongues, and peoples, do our very best to gain some tangible knowledge of the religions we are hoping to destroy.

Under such circumstances, then, it cannot perhaps be too strongly urged upon British women, preparing for a field of labour in the East, to make a careful study of Oriental laws affecting their own sex before initiating Oriental women into what they consider their own honoured and exalted privileges.

Unhappily the legal rights enjoyed by women in the West are not by any means distinguished for strict justice and equity, and therefore do not compare so very favourably with the legal rights of women in the East. Let us take, for instance, the Brahman code, the code of the Indian sage known as the Laws of Manu, and therein glance at the law of inheritance, and then compare it with the law of inheritance in this country. Of course all codes of laws in the process of time go through the operation of revision and rearrange-

ment.* The laws of Manu, like our own English laws, bear visible signs of this readjusting policy. And so we find the earlier statutes of Manu considerably altered by later ideas and edicts.

The ancient law of inheritance rules that the inheritance goes without a distinction to the children of both sexes. The right of daughters who have no brothers to succeed to the paternal estate is insisted upon, and reminds one of the law carried into effect by Moses in the case of the daughters of Zelophehad. "A son," it is declared, "is even as one's self, a daughter is equal to a son; how can another heir take the estate while a daughter, who is even as one's self, lives."

A similar point is made in the Brehon or ancient Irish laws as to the succession of daughters, where there are no sons, to the paternal inheritance. In the later traditions of Manu it has been noted that daughters under all circumstances do not appear to share equally with sons.

"To daughters who have brothers," says the later canon, "one-fourth of a share is the allotted portion.† After the death of the father and of the mother, the brothers being assembled may divide among themselves in equal shares the paternal and maternal estate; for they have no power over it while the parents live. The eldest shall deduct an additional share and certain heirlooms. To the maiden sisters the brothers shall severally give portions out of their shares, each a fourth part; those who refuse to obey this law will become outcasts."

The duty of providing for sisters devolves in the first instance on brothers of the full blood, and in default of such on half-brothers.

If in the conscience of the Brahman there be wanting a proper reverence for women, it must be because he has no veneration for or is ignorant of the most ancient and sacred laws of his country. The oldest texts of Manu speak with no uncertain voice as to how women are to be treated. Men who do not honour them have no desire for their own welfare. Where women are honoured religion is honoured; but where they are not respected no religious rites can bring reward. Nor can any family prosper where female relations live in grief and are despised.

We may presume that this enforced reverence for women became distasteful to the male sex, as it is repudiated in a changed interpretation of the law. Hereby a female is called upon to be subject to her father, in youth to her husband, and after his death to her sons. If she thoroughly behave herself, never disputing her lord's authority and dominion over her, she has a fair chance of residing with him in heaven.

For men to arrogate to themselves the power to close or open the gates of paradise to women, there must have grown up an absolute forgetfulness of such precepts as taught that a brother must behave towards an elder sister as towards one's mother, though the mother is more venerable than the sister. That a maternal aunt and a paternal aunt, and even a mother-in-law, must be honoured with the greatest respect and reverence; that way must be made for a woman, and that the pain and trouble suffered by a mother could not be repaid even in a hundred years. The degradation that superseded these excellent rules of conduct towards women had without doubt a religious origin. Of this we may judge by a decree that sets forth priestly notions as to the proper disposal of property: "Since the wealth of a regenerate man

* Cicero, in his *Roman Commonwealth*, remarks that institutions and customs have had a thousand revolutions. In his day married women had been disabled from inheriting property, and it had been thought wise to set some limit to the wealth of women. He says:—"Relative to the legacies and inheritances of women the present law is quite different to what it was before the Voconian enactment came into force, an edict which was passed in favour of the men, but full of injustice to women. There is, therefore, no natural justice; and hence it follows that men cannot be just by nature."

† See *Laws of Manu* in *Sacred Books of the East*.

is designed for religious uses, the succession of women to such property is unfit; because they are not competent for the performance of religious rites. Riches were produced for the sake of solemn sacrifice. . . . Therefore they should be allotted to persons who are concerned with religious duties; and not be assigned to women, to fools, and to people neglectful of holy obligations."

Notwithstanding that the Hindu has been content to accept as a divine law the edict that a woman has no right to independence, the Hindu law of inheritance does not treat her as if she were wholly merged in the individuality of the male sex. For instance, in the case of parents becoming heirs, the mother is the nearest of the two parents, she therefore is considered the most fit to take the estate. Anything more opposed to the spirit of modern English law than this preference for the mother could hardly be cited, for however unsettled or disputed a question of descent and inheritance may be, the law of England rules that the male paternal line is the true and proper line of succession. English lawyers have done more than their best to exclude the possibility of a maternal title to property, hence in the case of an Englishman dying intestate and leaving neither wife nor children, his property passes to his father, his mother having no share in it. But whatever the law elsewhere, a woman by Hindu law inherits and holds property in her own right, and her kinsfolk succeed to it if she die without issue. Her dower she uses as she pleases. It is an inherent right, says the law, for a woman to employ her dower for her own use without being subject to control of relations, so long as she spends it in a reasonable manner.

In all forms of marriage, if the woman have offspring, her property after her debts are paid devolves on daughters. Daughters inheriting from their father hold property for life only. They cannot, however, claim the father's inheritance during the mother's lifetime, as the Hindu widow is the sole heir of the husband if there be no sons; the law being that the wealth of him who leaves no male issue goes to his wife; on failure of her it devolves on daughters. The law allows no uncertainty as to the heirship of the wife: "Let the wife of a deceased man, who leaves no male issue, take his property, notwithstanding kinsmen, a father or a mother."

There has been an attempt made to assign to the widow a maintenance only, but this innovation has been resisted, and the law remains that the heirs of the husband who dies childless, and is succeeded by his widow, have no rights of inheritance until after the death of the widow. Where there is a plurality of wives, two or more, they have according to the law in Southern India, a joint interest in the husband's property, with rights, it is said, of survivorship and equal beneficial enjoyments.* One of the peculiarities of the Hindu law is to recognise relationship of an illegitimate child to its father. Unlike the English law, the Hindu enacts that illegitimate children are members of their father's family, and have a right to maintenance. The father who fails to protect his children's rights, or connives at their being deprived of the same, can be disqualified and the mother made their guardian. A father cannot alienate his property, improperly from his children.

It is generally supposed that the Hindu widow must remain with her husband's relations. It is stated, however, that if she, for no improper purpose, leave her husband's family, she does not forfeit her right to be maintained by them. That widows are to remain widows under all circumstances does not appear to have been a rule without an exception; for in accordance with the sacred law a childless widow can bear a child by a surviving brother. But, as before observed, laws are subject to modification and woeful alteration, and thus may either become friendly or hostile to liberty.

* For further information see *The Law of Inheritance according to the Mitacshara* Trans. by H. T. Colebrooke.

It was against the iron heel of despotic and arbitrary innovations and changes in Hindu law, designed to degrade the functions of the woman to the most servile dependence upon men, that Buddhism asserted its influence and strength. Before, however, proceeding to refer to the reform effected by Gautama Buddha in the re-establishment of woman's independent legal status, as it seems to have stood in the earliest Hindu traditions, it will be as well to notice the analogy of our own ancient English law of inheritance to that which exists in the codes of so-called heathenism.

The law of the division of inheritance in England in the reign of Henry II. is thus given in Stephen's *Commentaries on the Laws of England* (vol. II., p. 193). By the law as it stood in the reign of Henry II., a man's goods* were to be divided into three equal parts, of which one went to his heirs, or lineal descendants, another to his wife, and the third was at his own disposal; or if he died without a wife, he might then dispose of one moiety or half, and the other went to his children; or if he had no children, the wife was entitled to one moiety or half, and he might bequeath the other; but if he died without wife or issue, the whole was at his own disposal. The shares of the wife and children were called their reasonable parts, and they had the power to claim them.

This continued to be the law of the land at the time of Magna Charta (1215). In the reign of Edward III. (1327) this right of the wife and children was still held to be the common law, and in the reign of Charles I. (1625-1649) it was still laid down expressly to be the general law of the land. But this law has been slowly altered by imperceptible degrees; and a man may now, by will, bequeath the whole of his goods or personality to whomsoever he will, and thereby, if he so please, leave his wife and children destitute.

Scotland has been more fortunate than England in retaining the right of wife and children to the reasonable parts of the husband's estate (*i.e.*, one-third for the wife and one-third for the children), for this is still the general law in that part of Britain.

This ancient custom continued in use, it is said, in the Province of York, the Principality of Wales, and in the City of London until modern times: when, in order to favour the power of bequeathing, and to reduce the whole kingdom to the same standard, certain statutes were provided, whereby, as already stated, it was enacted that husbands and fathers might dispose, by will, of *all* their personal estate according to their own whim or conscience. Thus the claims of the widow and children and other relations could be totally barred.

Though it cannot now be traced when first this alteration of the law began, it seems pretty certain it had its origin in the desire to get rid of certain ecclesiastical claims. By law the Church had on the husband's moiety, or upon his third part, a claim to two of his best chattels, which prerogative gave the right to seize the most valuable property, provided it was not freehold. It was to abolish this much abused privilege of the Church that arose the necessity for a change of custom. Thus the need to rescue private property from the clutches of the lords spiritual, is answerable for the widow and her orphans being, so far as the law is concerned, dispossessed of any legal right to a deceased husband's estate, except in the case of entailed property, whereby the eldest son, and he alone, is benefited.

The recent attempt to move the second reading in the House of Lords of the Law of Inheritance Amendment Bill† is a tardy recognition of the undue power men hold according to the present English Law of Inheritance. The substance of

* Goods or chattels comprised, with other things, immovable property, as lands and houses not freehold.

† This Bill was rejected by a majority of five.

the Bill goes to show that if a man dies intestate, that is without making a will, and leaves nothing but real property,* viz., land, the whole of that property falls to the eldest son, or failing a son, to the eldest brother and his male issue, neither the widow nor other offspring having one atom of legal interest in it. The Bill also rightly points out that in former days the law was not as unreasonable as it is at present, because, as observed by the Lord Chancellor, the eldest son was not, years ago, regarded as the absolute owner of the estate to which he succeeded, without any obligations or duties towards the other members of his family. He was in those times bound to take care of the rest of the family, and it was only in later days that this inheritance by the eldest son came to be regarded as an absolute right, and that all duty and responsibility in relation to the family disappeared.†

The ruthless manner in which the widow has been defrauded of her ancient right to at least a life interest in a third of her husband's real estate as her dower, and for the maintenance of her younger children, is a legal proceeding that could only, it would seem, be put into execution in Christian England. The right to dower, according to legal authority, after falling from its original consequence, is at length in regard to women married after Jan., 1834, reduced to one of the most precarious description which the husband may bar or defeat at his pleasure.

Buddhist and Mohammedan codes of inheritance, like the Hindu code, afford a very different protection of the widow's rights. A valuable and interesting legal exposition of Buddhist law has been written by Mr. Justice Jardine, Judicial Commissioner of British Burmah, and from this a very comprehensive idea may be gathered of the rights of property and the position of women thereto.

To properly understand Buddhist jurisprudence we must, he says, refer to the Hindu Manu, whose laws form the basis on which are founded Buddhist laws, though Hindu laws have been differently interpreted and transcribed through their Indian origin having been forgotten. The society for which these laws were made was, he affirms, archaic and peculiar, and many of its circumstances seem to resemble those of the nation for whom the Mosaic law was framed. We need feel no surprise at this statement. If time allowed, it would be quite possible to produce evidence from the researches of different writers into the foundations of Hinduism and Buddhism that these had no other origin than a Hebrew one. That the Brahma of the Hindus is identical with the patriarch Abraham is a conjecture only to be mentioned here as affording further reason for a more than superficial study of Eastern religions before we endeavour to put them aside or to bring them into contempt in the eyes of those peoples who now revere them. The fact that they possess some affinity with our own religion cannot be too widely acknowledged, and when acknowledged it must remove those long-fixed barriers of religious prejudice which have kept asunder East and West as if the two extremes had not one sympathetic thought in common.

(To be continued.)

Messiah's Kingdom gives in its June number some interesting facts, culled from historical records, regarding the efforts that have been made in the past to bring about the abolition of war. In 1260 St. Louis, king of France, was the first to promulgate an ordinance "forbidding to all persons throughout our dominions the trial by battle, and instead of battles

* If personality it goes to the children equally, the widow taking a third; if there be but one child the personality is divided equally between the widow and child.

† We read in the law commentaries (Stephens), that by the law of gravel-kind the lands descend not to the eldest, youngest, or any one son only, but to all the sons together, which was the usual course of descent all over England.

we establish proofs by witnesses these battles we abolish in our dominions for ever." At a later period the Emperor Maximilian proclaimed at the Diet of Worms a "permanent peace" throughout Germany, while in England trial by battle was abolished by law in 1818. The tendency of justice and all moral advancement is towards a universal peace; as Emerson has said, "War is on its last legs, and a universal peace is as sure as is the prevalence of civilisation over barbarism, of liberal government over feudal forces. The question for us is only, *How soon?*"

Changing Ideals of Marriage.

IT is difficult in these days to take up a periodical, or even a newspaper, without finding some article to demonstrate that the question of the relations of the sexes is being probed to the bottom and that there is a wide-spread feeling amongst both men and women that a new and higher basis must, for the future, guide our ideals of marriage.

In questions of this sort it is necessary, above all things, to maintain a philosophic calm and consider all sides of the question, and enthusiasts, who glow with ardour to defend the lovely virtue of purity, must beware, lest in their haste they throw to the wind that which St. Paul declared to be "the greatest of these"—Charity.

Let us consider the theory which forms the philosophical basis of the present system, and also that which lies at bottom of the reforms most widely advocated by women especially.

The present system has been defined by Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, as "The Monogamic Family with legalized prostitution." Its basis may be stated thus:—The man undertakes to maintain one wife and the children that are born of his union with her; to protect her, fight for her,—if needful, giving his life for her,—to provide her with necessaries, and, if he can, with luxuries, and to shelter her from the struggle of life as far as one human being may shelter another. This he will only undertake to do, if, by her conduct before and after marriage, she shows herself chaste and trustworthy, so that he can be quite sure that his labour and love are not bestowed on another man's children. The woman, to secure this protection in her hours of weakness, and to assure to her children a father's love and guidance, accepts certain restrictions on her liberty, absolutely refuses love or gifts from all men but the one chosen, conducts herself with a modest demeanour that she may provoke no desire in other men to offer her unpalatable attentions, and undertakes certain housewifery and motherly tasks.

The women who refuse to accept these conditions are accounted dishonourable, because they choose selfishly, prizing their own liberty or self-indulgence before the welfare of their children, refusing the conditions needful to the maintenance of a home. On the other hand, it has been accounted a venial fault in a man to accept from the independent woman all that she will give him; generally, although she does not demand life-long protection, she asks some equivalent in gifts or pleasure.

The women who demand life-long protection unite with the men in degrading the woman who accepts less, for she undersells them. Thus, all has tended to the division of women into two classes, the respected and the pariah. The former have been fostered in a hothouse atmosphere which has produced in them an unnatural delicacy and development of the emotional faculties at the expense of their reasoning power; while the restrictions of liberty to which they have submitted have weakened their brains and their bodies alike; while the latter class have been more hardly treated than any class of men, here in England, for instance, the pro-

visions of the Habeas Corpus have been violated against them, ostensibly in the interests of the respected class as well as in those of men.*

The times which gave birth to this system were very different to our own, being distinctly military, when the physical weakness of women put them at a serious disadvantage in the struggle for existence, and their honour and life itself were in constant danger from violence. In these days, what danger does exist could be totally abolished if the police were properly effective and acted in the interests of women. The records of the Courts of Justice show, moreover, that under existing legal powers granted to the husband, women are more likely to receive injury, and even death, from the hands of their professed protectors than from any other source, and the leniency with which men punish the brutalities of husbands to their wives, does much to make women feel that "liberty and a fair field to labour for themselves" is the substance, and "protection from the ills of life" the shadow.

In the peaceful industrial present the number of self-maintaining women is very great—greater in England than the number of self-maintaining men—and the tendency is that all will become so, many lucrative and easy trades and professions being as yet closed against them, through prejudices surviving from the reign of violence, which gave all advantage to the more muscular male. The privileges offered by the man are no longer an equivalent to the sacrifices demanded of the woman in a life-long union. To offer protection where there is no danger, and food and shelter to one who can easily provide herself with both, is obviously absurd, and to demand that for these things she does not want she shall accept a subordinate position and curtail her liberty, naturally rouses in her a keen sense of injustice.

This sense of injustice is greatly enhanced by the fact that men have not contrived to afford maintenance and shelter to all women who keep strictly to the lines of conduct held to entitle them to be taken care of, economical conditions being such that thousands of maids and wives have to maintain themselves by their own labour, or failing to do so, mainly because of artificial restrictions and male privileges, are forced into the pariah class as their only escape from starvation.

Women are demanding that the man who profits by the degradation of one of their sex shall be socially ostracised as well as the woman who allows herself to be degraded, and that his legal punishment shall be on a level with hers. They ask greater freedom for their sex, and demand that it shall be guarded by the social and legal punishment of the man who tempts them to misuse it; they ask their share in the government of the country in order that the laws may be just to both sexes.

Men, having hitherto had legislation in their hands, and, owing to their power to monopolise education, to a great extent public opinion also, have naturally been biassed to what they imagined to be their own interests, and have punished breaches of chastity in women and excused it in their own sex, except where the offender seduced another man's wife to be the partner of his guilt; they have recognised that as a crime, although they have refused to punish the man who is faithless to his own wife. A higher morality, recognising the interest of the woman as well as that of the man, points out that—independently of the duties of parentage, which would make the misuse of procreative gifts an equal crime in man and woman—the man who shares a woman's crime, even if his breach of chastity is to be looked upon as blameless in itself, is in the position of a receiver of stolen goods. He profits by the wrong-doing of another, and consequently shares the sin. It is in some measure recognised already that to corrupt the innocent

* So far, is a picture of marriage with all the glamour which hides the reality removed. It is an ugly picture, is it not, and in much need of re-painting from a reformed condition of things.—Ed.

maiden or wife is a crime, it will come to be admitted that to share the guilt of the abandoned is so likewise.

A new and higher basis is required on which to rest the mutual obligations of marriage, and that basis is afforded by the duties of parentage. Although chastity may be considered peculiarly binding on women because men must rely on their good faith to know in truth that they are fathers, yet men are as responsible as women for the welfare of the new human being who can only be born into the world through that mysterious union of one sex with another which Carlyle has defined as a perpetual miracle. The woman or man who lightly uses the wonderful gift of procreation, the man who for his own selfish gratification helps to make an abandoned woman the mother of children, of whose fate he is utterly careless, whether they may be murdered by the baby-farmer, or drag out a miserable and degraded existence in the gutter, is assuredly not blameless; nor are they less guilty who prudently prevent the birth of such, by methods which are as truly murder as those of the baby-farmer.

The tendency in the future, it may be hoped, will be for the educated, self-maintaining, independent woman to ask of the man she accepts as her partner for life, not so much protection and maintenance as purity, fidelity, and intellectual companionship, and to develop a true monogamy with the absolute abolition of prostitution; men and women who refuse to conform to the pure family ideal, sharing an equal penalty.

M. M. BLAKE.

READERS of SHAFTS ought specially to have noticed the correspondence on "Human Vivisection in Hospitals" to which our attention has been called but recently in the *Daily Chronicle*. It is remarkable that Dr. Berdoe's serious and awful statements received corroboration in the pages of the *Medical Press*, for May 16th, in a paper by Dr. Roath. *The Sentinel* very justly observes: "Penal servitude for life is the least possible punishment that is adequate for those who, out of mere operative curiosity, would perform an operation which is only justified by the life of the patient being in extreme danger. The punishment of such a crime should be as lifelong as the effects of it."

The Woman's Signal says:—When but twenty years of age Miss Cady, now known as Mrs. Cady Stanton, went to the New York legislature, sitting at Albany, somewhere in the thirties; there were many Dutch farmers who had grown rich, and who were grieving that the dowries given to their daughters were dissipated by their husbands; for thus to see their hard-earned money spent in free living was an insupportable grievance to these thrifty men. Miss Cady easily obtained their assistance, and after some effort she secured the passage of a law giving married women separate rights of property.

Mrs. C. Leigh Hunt Wallace in her admirable little paper, *The Herald of Health*, has printed an excellent article on "The Salt Delusion," of the utmost importance to those who study health and desire to live out the sum of their years. Joseph Collinson, in the same pages, writes an article on the Pasteur Institute at Chelsea—"Pleasant Prospects for Chelsea,"—which ought to change the most determined vivisectionist into an active and ardent worker against that scheme of darkness, of torture and death. Mrs. Wallace has been lecturing on "Clothing for Health" at the Northern Heights Vegetarian Society, Jubilee Hall, Hornsey Rise. She dealt with the clothing of women and of men. She has printed her lecture in her *Herald*, and it contains capital lessons in *How to Dress*. "Feathered women! why not tarred?" is just what we want to see. It is by that active and noble worker, EDITH CARRINGTON.

He was Entertaining.

WHEN Chicago was a younger city than it is now, a few friends met one evening for a friendly game of whist and a quiet supper as a finish.

The only stranger in the company was a gentleman from an adjacent town, a brother of the hostess. He was suffering from a slight attack of neuralgia, owing to which he was decidedly uninteresting, and his playing caused his partner—a pretty young lady who prided herself upon her skill at whist—to look at him several times with considerable annoyance as she found herself on the losing side.

When supper time came, he took the same young lady to the table. Once seated he rallied slightly and endeavoured to be entertaining.

"Very cold weather."

"Very."

A pause, then after a visible effort, "Do you like cold weather?"

"Very much—in August."

A longer pause. "Do you—do you like Chicago?"

"Yes, *Chicago* people are very pleasant."

Being entertaining means something to-night, she thought. Just then, in taking a look up and down the table, he caught sight of something which had an enlivening effect evidently, for he smiled broadly, saying—"Ah, there's Torrence, that man is the champion swearer of Illinois."

"Indeed, you know him then?"

"Know Torrence, who does not know Torrence? he is the best commercial traveller on the road. But he *can* swear," he added, with evident enjoyment.

"*Can* he? of course ladies are not supposed to know anything about those little failings so purely masculine."

"I shall never forget an incident which happened last winter. Torrence was driving over a lonely country road at a breakneck pace, as he always does. The snow was deep, and drifted badly; the air bitterly cold. Wrapped in furs to the eyes, he neither saw nor heard anything but the sound of his own bells, when, turning a slight bend in the road he saw a heavy sleigh; the next thing his light cutter was upside down and himself plunged into a snow-drift, while the driver, a Swede, who could understand but little English, and speak less, looked on in amazement. I was following closely in the track of the heavier team, and that scene I can never recall without laughing."

"Even when suffering from neuralgia?" And his partner's eyes looked into his with an answering smile.

"Any time, under any circumstances. The string of oaths issuing from that man's mouth with inconceivable rapidity, the Swede's astonishment, Torrence sitting in the snow-drift, making no effort to extricate himself—wholly absorbed in the occupation of swearing—really you cannot imagine how ludicrous it all was."

Evidently she could, for she was laughing as heartily as he was.

"It's awfully nice of you to be so easily amused, you must not think I am always so dull as I am to-night; I am intensely grateful to poor old Torrence for his presence here, else I dare not think what impression you might have taken away with you about me—"

"Pray do not say that, I have enjoyed it immensely."

"So good of you," he murmured. "If you have enjoyed hearing it, so lamely described"—apologetically—"I do not know what you would say if you could *hear* him, you see it's the *way* he does it, just opens his mouth and the words come, in a steady flow,"—getting very earnest and emphatic—"you can't imagine."

"Oh yes I can," she interrupted. "I can imagine it easily, for, you see—he is my husband."

LAMIA.

"WHO loves God?"

"That one who loves himself least."

"Certainly then I love God, for I hate and despise myself." "Ah, lady, in those very words is revealed the secret of your sorrow, the sorrow of which your face bears silent witness."

"My sorrow? my face? But what does my face reveal?"

"Your eyes are restless, longing, as though seeking to find something lost and very dear; your mouth, beautifully formed, has hard lines around it as though continually pressed to keep back the loving words your kind heart tells you to say; your whole expression one of intense weariness and unrest, sadness and disappointment."

"What, then, is the cure for all this?"

"To love."

"God?"

"To love."

"My husband? My children? My neighbours?"

"That is not all."

"Father, you bewilder me. I hate and despise myself."

Is not that state necessary before we are acceptable to God?"

"He loves God best who loves himself *least*."

"What is the difference?"

"It seems a trifle, yet in it is contained the whole of happiness or misery, past, present or future."

"Must I then love myself?"

"Yes, but the least. Love all things which God has made, for God dwells within them. All living things."

"But what is *not* alive?"

"Aye, lady, what?"

"If we could but *see* God."

"Look within. Within your own heart."

"I do not see God there."

"With reason, God is Love and you hate."

"Not God."

"That matters not, 'tis hate."

"What must I love?—"

"All living things wherever seen."

"And man-made things—their customs, unjust laws, the thousand things which prove a power unkind?"

"Do you love your God?"

"With all my mind and heart."

"Have you two minds, two hearts?"

"Two—two? No."

"Then while you hate you cannot love."

"Then I must cease to think."

"You cannot while you live. Until your thoughts have been surrendered to that Love which is your life, you cannot find the God you claim to love and serve. Oh, lady, drive cold hate away, and let Love free to fill your days with sweetest peace and perfect joy."

"Father, you ask too much."

"'Tis often thus when love first speaks."

"First speaks? and will it speak again?"

"If you bid it come."

"But will it stay?"

"If you keep a heart free from hate; the two cannot abide together—one drives the other out."

"It is hard, very hard."

"One there is Who will gladly give us help to cut those ties."

"The Christ?"

"Aye, lady, the Christ within."

LAMIA.

Women's Work in England and Wales,

UNDER THE

Local Government Act, 1894,

THE coming elections under the Local Government (England and Wales) Act, 1894, are the beginning of a new life in the nation. It has been well said by Dr. Spence Watson that "into villages where for centuries men and women have lived, toiled, and died, without real control of their local affairs, there will be introduced the new and stirring sense of citizenship with all its hopes and possibilities."

But the new Act goes far beyond the Municipal Corporations Act in the area which it affects, and moreover has wider possibilities, for on the new local governing bodies it is expressly provided that women may serve, and in the electorate married women have their rightful place.

It is now for women to look to it that they are alive to the greatness of the occasion, and that they take part in the Parish Meetings, and, in respect to the Councils and Boards of Guardians, take steps to secure the election of candidates of high character who will carry on the Local Administration on sound and honest principles.

But although it is the duty of women to see that the men elected are fit and proper persons, their duty does not end there. Not only must women offer themselves as Guardians, as heretofore, but for the Council in every parish and in every district one or more suitable women should be induced to let themselves be nominated as candidates—women of some firmness of character, determined to learn the new work patiently, to co-operate with their colleagues with goodwill and tact, and to make a stand when needful.

The new work that has to be learnt and that demands the co-operation of women is:—1st, The Work of Parish Councils. 2nd, The Work of Rural District Councils. 3rd, The Work of Urban District Councils in Urban Districts which are not Boroughs. Now that the eligibility of women is clear, and the qualification no difficulty, women should be found ready to act as Councillors. 4th, The Work of Urban District Councils in Boroughs. In Boroughs there is a separate election of Guardians, so that women can serve as Guardians.

In the first elections under the new Act, it is greatly to be hoped that women will

(1) Poll in large numbers and for the best candidates.

(2) Offer themselves for election.

(3) Read carefully the leaflets published by the Women's Local Government Society. Hon. Sec., Miss Browne, 58, Porchester Terrace, W., from whom copies may be purchased at 1s. 9d. a hundred, or 2d. a dozen, postage extra.

PLEASE NOTE.

FRENCH ON THE GOUIN SYSTEM.

Madame Delvade, formerly resident in the family of *Prof. Gouin, in Paris*, is prepared to initiate teachers and students into the above method of acquiring and teaching the *French Language*, and has received an excellent testimonial from *Prof. Gouin* himself. The time required for these lessons is three or four weeks, and as Madame Delvade's residence is in *Somerset*, a pleasant summer holiday in lovely surroundings could be combined with the pursuit of this study. Pupils can be accommodated with cheap lodgings in the village.

Terms and all particulars on application to Madame Delvade, Office of SHAFTS, Granville House, Arundell Street, Strand, W.C.

"The Woman's Movement."

CUSTOMS AND LAWS.

Extracts translated from an article in *L'Indépendance Belge*.

SEEING in the political rights of women the remedy for all society's evils, some agitators have formed a party in favour of the equal rights of men and women to citizenship. In order to carry out their project, a woman was necessary as an example, to show the wish of others of her sex. They hunted here, there, and everywhere for the *right* woman willing to give herself to their party, and approached many who, some for one reason, some for another, are eminent. Their answers—all of them against the movement—are interesting from the diversity of reasons given for their determination:—

Madame Séverine says:—"Speaking from the ground of economics, that is, in defence of the interests and rights of women in all that is most sacred and important to them, I am your man. Politically, I cannot appreciate the good of universal suffrage for either sex; and as far as *we* are concerned, when the apple is rotten it is not the time to take the first bite."

Madame Duc-Quercy, speaking as a Socialist, replies:—"I tell you honestly, I see no use in your Suffrage party; it seems to me that it is not in the interests of the woman's movement to give the impression, as you do by the agitation you have started for women, that one sex must necessarily fight against the other. Is it not enough that there must always be the struggle of class against class—of those who work that others may reap the profits of their labour?"

Side by side with these two opinions, Madame Clémence Royer gives hers, saying:—"An experience of forty years proves to me that the result of Universal Suffrage will be entirely different to what is generally expected."

All the various letters are written in the same tone—the women refuse to support the Suffrage party, *not* because they are timid, *not* because they are opposed to women's interests, but for the reason that not one of them believes in the political Government of to-day. We have to understand from this that women have always been a little inclined to be Anarchists, even before Anarchism received its name! and their reasoning after all is logical. The existing state, that which is established by the laws of the country, does not exist as far as women are concerned; they want something else, but so far, I believe not one of them has put her aspirations into any form.

As for myself, I am of opinion that as customs form the laws, and not laws the customs, that what we should demand is the right to make the customs and not the right of making laws.

When a legislator decides to act upon a particular question of importance, it is invariably a long time before he can get his ideas understood and taken up by the people.

In France, when the party for the establishment of the Law of Divorce was at work, M. Naquet had no less than fourteen thousand letters from miserable, unhappy women, thanking and encouraging him in his work. No doubt those who did not express their thanks outnumbered those who did, yet at the same time M. Jules Simon told the Senate that women did not desire divorce laws, simply because they had not demanded them; divorce was a custom in France before it became a law.

If, as I believe, customs make laws, why do not women, who have, if they care to use it, such a wonderful influence in the world, exert it to effect those reforms for which they plead, by first of all changing the customs and habits of their

country, for laws inevitably follow great changes in public opinion.

It is singular that many women believe that the law takes the initiative in reform!

How is it that they do not see that if men make the laws and women create the customs—the need for the laws—that they are in reality the law makers! Women who agitate do not realize their real influence and power, their ability to create the opinions which lead the people.

The best women—those who have exercised the greatest influence in their time—have neither been senators nor public personages! When the women of to-day realize this, social re-organisation and the purification of life will come quickly, but so long as they do not understand their true position as the leaders of opinion—the woman's movement will never be looked upon seriously.

People may, and will, say in answer to my views, that for anyone to be able to *really* influence the customs of their time, means of action are necessary which are denied to women.

They must be able to speak, write, discuss, in a word, make themselves heard and understood. Further, the objection may be raised, that the life of the Parisians, from whence come great movements and opinions, is so organised that it is an impossibility for anyone not rich, to lead a party for the purpose of propagating any particular idea. To publish a book means a matter of one or two thousand francs, even then it may not reach or be read by those for whom it was intended.

To organise and carry through a conference would mean at least two hundred francs, and outside one's own particular friends, and those over whom one had personal influence, no support would probably be received. Woman is systematically isolated, in fact, as Professor M. Charles Richet has said, "*She is the real pariah of modern society.*"

Another professor, Dr. Rechs, told me himself, speaking of women's work:—"All that you do is broken on the rocks ahead of you." Here we have the prevalent idea of the powerlessness of women to form the customs of their time; we have no help, not even from the rich women, who, like others, would be benefited by a change. Fortune and riches do not soften human nature, but the rich, like everyone, live under the law of compensation; and in social life, those who have reached the top of the ladder often lead the saddest lives. But the *real* woman's question is not yet understood.

Political agitators have alarmed the peaceful and uninterested to such an extent, that any woman who desires anything, no matter what it is, is at once labelled as extravagant and fanatical.

It is not understood at present that there are *true* women among them, and that we—the more moderate—demand simply the reorganization of family life, a more *moral* education for our sons, a more *serious* better education for our daughters, and above all else, to teach the truth in place of all the errors and wrongs of the past!

Must we go to the "Chambre" to obtain these?

Is it not sufficient to form a band of earnest, clever, convinced, womanly women, to seek the means we must employ to arrive at the reforms we desire? If only the activity of women now used in needless fighting could be thrown on the side of usefulness to obtain means which we could immediately realize, for questions which everybody approves and all parties would encourage, we should without doubt be strong enough to defeat the party which must ruin us, and quietly prepare for the new *régime* which everybody is anxiously awaiting!

Why is it that the women who are ever fighting and struggling have not realized that before they can be successful, if ever they are, it must be so long, so far in the future that they will never profit by the result of their fight? They will

spend endless time struggling for the right to vote for some man who will very likely represent them badly, and will fight for ever to be able to themselves plead their own cause, without in the least knowing whether they will be successful or not, does not all this seem like nursing a pet scheme only to lose sight of the real question?

If we look carefully into these matters, if we discuss the reforms which women are asking for, the result shows that most, if not all of them, can be obtained by private, individual work, because they are the outcome of *customs* and not *laws*.

The following appeared in the *Egalité d'algiers*, from the pen of a very able woman:—"Is it by helping to return Members of Parliament? is it by foundering on the same rocks on which they are stranded that we shall save the wreckage of a sunken ship? Is it by copying the mistakes of past governments that women hope to help their country in the future? No! a thousand times No! Those who seek universal social progress must work on different lines to these. The politics of women must be in the first place humanitarian or they will be useless; if they enjoy equal rights with men to act as members, senators, they will in time copy their tactics and become mere seekers after place, position, distributors of favours, commercial buyers and sellers, financiers. Directly they have any connection with the Government they will become corrupt, it is fatal, it is human nature! Why, therefore, are women so anxious to take up a work which others have tried and failed to do? The Government is weak, worn out, and yet women hope to revive old customs with its dying aid. Useless effort! You can do nothing. Cannot you see the building crumbling? If we wish to build it up, surely it must be upon new, strong, lasting foundations, without the defects which have led to its decay."

The new *régime* which we women believe in and are working for, is simply the substitution of capacity for incapacity. Those who in the past have made our laws, have made them badly, and have not carried out the wishes of the people. We are anxious not to fall into their errors, and we desire to substitute for the old Government a new and better, a congress of capable persons, able to discuss fairly all questions which interest and affect humanity. This congress shall stand in the place of the Government and will make laws when it is assured of the necessity to do so, laws equal for all, men and women, for everyone according to his or her capability will take a share in their framing.

This congress will not be dependent upon the votes of the people, it will not exclude women because by virtue of their ability they have earned a place there, it will make use of the brain power of every nation and do away with the wars of different peoples. International assemblies such as this, built on the foundations of a new life, will remodel society on the truest and most equal basis. When women really understand this they will cease to agitate for civil and political rights, and will quietly and peaceably take their rightful places in the great assembly from which no one will desire to exclude them, and there with men will work to bring about the changes they desire and believe to be best for all, men and women.

CELINE RENOZ.

NOTE.—No doubt in the Assembly of the future, wherever it may be, women will take their share of the work, and no difference, political, civil, or social, will mark them from men; it is the present and not the future we have to look at *now*, and if we do not agitate and combine to make our wishes known, felt and gratified, such Assemblies as Madame Céline Renoz writes of, may come—and perhaps go—before we have won our day, the right to equal rights and opportunities with man—civil, political, and social; the right to work for our own and the other sex, to bring about happier and better times for all.

MARY FORDHAM.

Correspondence.

[Writers are themselves responsible for what their letters may contain.]

LORD COLERIDGE AND VIVISECTION.

DEAR MADAM,—By the death of Lord Coleridge humanitarianism has suffered a distinct loss. Comparatively few are aware that the late Lord Chief Justice was an active opponent of all forms of cruelty to animals; but he especially attacked vivisection as being the most unjust, the most cowardly, and the most cold-blooded of all cruelties conceivable.

Vivisection, it is frequently asserted, is a "question of evidence." There is no one in England whose opinion on this subject will be received with so much respect as Lord Coleridge's. The ensuing excerpt is taken from *The Lord Chief Justice of England on Vivisection*. It is a pamphlet published by the Victoria Street Society for the Protection of Animals from Vivisection. In it, Lord Coleridge advocates "The strongest law . . . absolutely forbidding the practice." I quote:—"I must . . . be permitted to say how loose and vague are the notions of evidence which, so far as I know them, pervade the writings of men of science on this question. . . . No fair man, I think, can fail to be struck with the uncertainty—a different point from inutility—of the conclusions to which vivisection has conducted those who practise it. The conclusions are doubted, are disputed, are contradicted by the vivisectioners themselves, so that it really is not experiment to verify or disprove theory, which one well-conducted and crucial experiment might do, but experiment *in vacuo*, experiment on the chance, experiment in pursuit of nothing in particular, but of anything that may turn up in the course of a hundred thousand vivisections, and during the course of a life devoted to them. This is the experiment for which liberty is claimed, and the unfettered pursuit of which we are called very hard names for objecting to. . . ."

Denying that the pursuit of knowledge is in itself always lawful; still more denying that the gaining of knowledge justifies all means of gaining it, Lord Coleridge continues:—"Suppose it capable of proof that by putting to death with horrible torture 3,000 horses, you could find out the real nature of some feverish symptom, I should say without the least hesitation that it would be unlawful to torture the 3,000 horses. There is no proportion between the end and the means. Next, the moment you touch *man*, it is admitted that the formula breaks down. No one doubts that to cut up a hundred men and women would enlarge the bounds of knowledge as to the human frame more speedily and far more widely than to torture a thousand dogs or ten thousand cats. . . . The moment you come to distinguish between animals and man, you consent to limit the pursuit of knowledge by considerations not scientific, but moral; and it is bad logic, and a mere *petitio principii*, to assume (which is the very point at issue) that these considerations avail for man, but not for the animals."

As I have failed to discover any reference to this important item of Lord Coleridge's distinguished career in the newspaper obituaries, perhaps you will do me the honour of publishing this brief minute. It will, I think, prove both interesting and useful to your readers; and I hope, too, that it will help on the cause for which Lord Coleridge did so much when living.

JOSEPH COLLINSON.

RE THE SUBMISSION OF THE DAUGHTERS.

DEAR MADAM,—Having from my eighteenth year been entirely mistress of my own life and actions, a word from my experience may prove useful to some of those mothers who believe a girl incapable of taking care of herself and managing her own affairs.

Brought up in the most conventional manner; kept perfectly ignorant of the facts of human life, I suddenly found myself obliged to earn my own living in a world of which I knew nothing except through the medium of story books, and those of the "goody, goody" description. From that day to this present time my life has been one of honourable, cheerful, hard work; my enjoyments, doubly enjoyable, because earned by my own labour; my mind, strengthened by the necessity of thinking and deciding for myself; my body, kept in health through lack of leisure to indulge in ailments.

During these years, I have, no doubt, often acted unconventionally; through pure ignorance of the world and its ways, or because it suited my convenience. For example, my work on one or two occasions caused me to remain till a rather late hour in one of our great towns, which necessitated my returning home by a train that left at midnight; I spent the intervening time in the pit of a good theatre and enjoyed myself immensely. It is true that curious glances were cast at me by the men who stood about at the back of the pit when I entered, but not the slightest rudeness was offered to me, and indeed I can truly say that during the many journeys I have made by rail, road or steamer, at all hours of the day and night, I have never experienced the slightest annoyance, but have always found people ready to help me if help was required.

The natural consequence of all this is, that I have never felt a desire to marry. What has marriage, as at present understood, to offer me in exchange for my life of perfect independence? A provision for old age, perhaps. Yes, but at what a price! the loss of all liberty of action, and free expression of thought; utter surrender to a man, from whom, no matter what the future might make of him, there could be no possibility of escape unless he brought himself under the power of the law; a law made by men for men.

Therefore, I say, mothers should teach their girls to stand on their own feet; they need not fear that they will become what it is the fashion to call "unwomanly women;" they will make blunders no doubt at first, but a pure-minded sensible girl will not do worse than blunder, and as for the silly and prurient-minded ones, who require perpetual watching lest they might go astray, they are scarcely worth taking into consideration.

Yours very truly,
E. CURTIS.

HOW TO HELP "SHAFTS."

DEAR MRS. SIBTHORP,—I write to say how much I admire your paper and sympathise with its aims and your efforts. Being as poor as the proverbial church mouse I can only suggest a plan which has occurred to me, and would say to each reader of *SHAFTS*:—

1st. Take one extra copy (or more) and circulate among your friends.

2nd. Take a copy with you when you travel about in train, tram, or omnibus, and leave it on the seats; also on the seats in parks.

3rd. When away on a holiday ask for *SHAFTS* at all the newsagents you can, at the railway stalls, and see that you get it.

With every wish for success,
J. C.

IN FAVOUR OF LADY HELPS.

DEAR MADAM,—A young fellow, strongly moved, by reading some accounts of the sufferings of women under the Contagious Diseases Acts, said: "Tell those who are working for this cause, that men will never be virtuous while domestic service exists, corruption begins in the nursery." Further comment is needless, but what a lurid light this throws upon the carelessness of many mothers. How important to consider well into whose hands they confide their children in their most impressionable years; too often it is to those whose homes have been such that the common decencies of life were impossible to them. They will give £60 a year to the cook to please their husbands' or their own appetites, and £10 to the nurse-girl, who is entrusted with the souls of their children. If they employ a lady-help she is too frequently expected not to ask a salary at all, yet what can be more important than the character, and the possibilities of communicating refinement to their charges, in the minds and lives of those to whom mothers entrust their children?

ONE WHO OWES MUCH TO HER NURSE.

AN UNNOTICED SUGGESTION.

DEAR MADAM,—I regret to note in the June number of SHAFTS the absence of any response to the suggestion of your correspondent J. R. R., that your readers should help you over your financial difficulties in the publication of your interesting and valuable paper by practising a self-denial week, etc.

As a good example, if I may say so without egotism, I enclose the small sum of five shillings as the result of that suggestion.

A CONSTANT READER.

[SHAFTS may be materially assisted by the purchase of the back numbers for binding. The volume will provide excellent reading for many a leisure hour. Numbers of those who take this paper, or any paper, do not read every page, and occasionally a month's issue is missed; owing, they say, to lack of time. To such it would be a benefit and a pleasure to be able to turn again during a holiday, or some quiet time of rest, to the articles thus missed. I am assured by those of my readers who have adopted this plan, that they find something fresh and strengthening every time they open the volume. Young women would be helped to think, by the perusal of some of the reading matter in SHAFTS. Many would be refreshed, and the *funds*, both of the memory of my readers, and the coffers of the journal, would be benefited thereby.

All MS. sent in for insertion must be condensed, made as brief as is consistent with sense and effect. A good thing is the better because of brevity, and the more easily remembered. Lengthy articles I am often obliged to refuse, even when excellent. I always do so with regret, as one of the main objects of SHAFTS is to bring what women have to say before the public. No contributor must expect her or his work to appear in the very next issue of the paper, nor can I *always* reply personally to letters. Next month a column of general replies will be commenced so as to answer some of the daily pile. Every possible attention will be paid to letters sent. It is always a great pleasure to me to hear from my readers, and I make every effort to reply. I offer here a sincere apology to any whose letters, on any subject, may have been overlooked during my illness, they will now be attended to, as I am happy to say I am gradually recovering my strength and vim.—ED.]

HOSPITAL TREATMENT.

MADAM,—Some little while ago a letter of mine appeared in the *Echo* requesting all Anti-Vivisectionists, Vegetarians, in fact, Humanitarians in general, not to contribute to Hospital Sunday until the barbarous practice of vivisection had been abolished. Since that time the subject has taken far graver proportions. The warning of Anti-Vivisectionists is, as is proved by recent letters in one of the daily papers, coming to the front—human vivisection.

In the scientist's idea it seems but an easy step from the lower to the higher animal. Only those who go among and converse with the poor, can be aware of their increasing horror of hospitals which ought to be the noblest institutions in the world. Are they to cease to become so, owing to this fearful and increasing mania that has bitten some of the profession?

Is there no Pasteur who can cure this rabies? Yes. The voice of the people. It is the people's, not the doctors', I should say scientists', question. Let the people answer it.

These institutions are supported for our benefit—not for experiments. Our bodies, though poor and ill-fed, are valuable to us. We object to their being treated as "material" or "cases." Let the people speak. *Vox populi vox dei*, and indeed, in this instance, will the voice of the people be the voice of God.

E. WATTS PHILLIPS.

THE "TORRENT" WASHER.

DEAR MADAM,—You will, I am sure, be pleased to know, that since the very kind notice in your January number, from the pen of Miss Gwynne, the "Torrent" Washer has progressed most satisfactorily, and I am now anxious to obtain some capital to further develop the business by opening premises from which the "Torrent" Washer can be seen in constant and practical operation. I feel confident that there is a future of success, which will remunerate investment. My object in writing is to ask if you will kindly insert this letter, so as to make fully known to your readers that I will dispose of an interest in the invention for a sufficient amount of capital to enable me to enlarge the business, which is now fairly established and yielding excellent results. Details of my project, which has carefully been thought out and includes more than one source of income, will be afforded; also full investigation is invited, and personal supervision of expenditure will be arranged, if desired, by anyone who may reply to this proposal.

A. MACKIE.

NOTICES.

Will readers, subscribers and agents kindly take notice that SHAFTS is about to change its offices. The new address will be announced as soon as possible. Please notice, so as to save trouble to the Post Office, and other officials, also to myself and staff.

The Discussion Meetings at these offices, held over during my illness, are to be resumed on the first Friday in September, at 6 p.m., every second Friday during the autumn and winter and spring months. The first subject for debate, which will form a series lasting for a few weeks, will be:—"Does the Ideal Feminine and Masculine present to us a real, or possible creature? In what does it differ from the actual? and the why? of the difference. Debate opener for this subject, Mrs. Sibthorp. All women are invited to attend.