

THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW.

The ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW is published by the National League for Opposing Woman Suffrage, and can be obtained through any bookseller or news-agent. Annual Subscription, 1/6, post free.

The OFFICES of the LEAGUE are at 515, Caxton House, Tothill Street, Westminster, S.W.
Telegraphic Address: "Adversaria, London."
Telephone No.: 1418 Gerrard.

No. 81.

LONDON, JULY, 1915.

PRICE 1d.

THE NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR OPPOSING WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Executive Committee :

Presidents: THE EARL CURZON OF KEDLESTON; LORD WEARDALE.

Deputy-Presidents: THE COUNTESS OF JERSEY; LADY ROBSON.

Chairman of Executive Committee: E. A. MITCHELL INNES, Esq., K.C. *Hon. Treasurer:* J. MASSIE, Esq.

Honorary Vice-Presidents: The Earl of Cromer, Mrs. Moberly Bell, Mrs. Burgwin, Mrs. Greatbatch, Lady George Hamilton, Charles Lyell, Esq., M.P., Earl Percy.

Hon. Secretary: MRS. JEYES.

Assistant Secretary: MISS HELEN PAGE.

MISS G. LOWTHIAN BELL

MRS. ARCHIBALD COLQUHOUN

MRS. LAURENCE CURRIE

MRS. FREDERIC HARRISON

MRS. GAMBLE

MRS. MASSIE

MISS G. S. POTT

MRS. HUMPHRY WARD

LADY WILSON.

KENNETH CHALMERS, Esq.

LORD CHARNWOOD

HEBER HART, Esq., K.C.

W. G. W. HASTINGS, Esq.

LORD HAVERSHAM

A. MACCALLUM SCOTT, Esq. [M.P.]

A. MACONACHIE, Esq.

ARNOLD WARD, Esq., M.P.

AT HEADQUARTERS.

In consequence of the war the Council Meeting of the National League for Opposing Woman Suffrage will not be held this year.

On July 22nd a drawing-room meeting, under the auspices of the London Branches of the League, will be held at 1, Richmond Terrace, Whitehall, by kind permission of Mrs. Laurence Currie. Invitations for this meeting will be sent out in due course.

The Assistant Secretary reports:—Gifts of socks have been received during the past month for the Flying Corps. Both shirts and socks are needed for our airmen, and I shall be glad to continue to receive as many consignments as possible at 515, Caxton House, Westminster, and to forward them to Lady Henderson.

Sandbags and pugarees are also required for the front. Directions as to making these articles will be supplied on application to the Head Office.

Special thanks are due to a member of the Hampstead Branch, who kindly sent 100 respirators of an excellent pattern, for the use of our men at the front.

The work at the Central Office in connection with the Soldiers' and Sailors' Families Association continues. At the thirtieth annual meeting of that Association, recently held under the presidency of Princess Louise, it was stated that the number of cases relieved up to December 31st, omitting Glasgow, from which accounts had not been received, was 1,122,139 in five months. Grants from the General Fund amounted to £900,719. In 1913 the number of persons assisted was only 353.

THE FIRE THAT TRIETH.

The nation enters upon the twelfth month of the war in a very different frame of mind from that in which the first few weeks found it. Momentarily, during the retreat from Mons, a feeling of grave anxiety passed over some of us, but it had gone before we had time to realise what the fulfilment of our worst fears would have entailed. Since then a fuller meaning of war has been brought home to us. Slowly and bit by bit we have shed the unreflecting optimism which urged us to foresee a close connection between the season of the year next ahead of us and the beginning of the end of the struggle. The optimism we still retain is, it is to be hoped, chastened by fuller knowledge and even grimmer purpose. As a nation we have passed and are still passing through the fire that trieth. We see to-day in the western theatre of the war a condition of things that closely resembles stalemate. It is true that our French Allies have recently been able to advance their line in various sectors in a manner that may legitimately be termed brilliant, while the Belgians and our own troops have pushed back the enemy and inflicted considerable losses upon him. But the result achieved is infinitesimal when measured by the ground which has to be covered before we can hope to compel the Germans to accept the Allies' terms of peace. Yet another illusion has been dissipated in the setback experienced by the Russian forces. Our knowledge of Russia's enormous military strength, our confidence in her generalship, and, not least of all, our failure to appreciate what preparedness on the scale carried out by Germany means in war, led us to believe that Russia would be able without much difficulty to make up for all Great Britain's deficiencies. To-day we realise that as a nation we are not to be let off so lightly. Neither our genius for improvisation nor our great resources are to save us from having to attach, as the result of bitter experience, the fullest significance to our national responsi-

bilities. In the mercy of Providence we may be spared the horrors of invasion, and if that be so, raids by aircraft or by sea will but serve to make us appreciate our immunity the more. But the prolongation of the war and the menace of the tide of battle rolling yet nearer to our shores, have at last roused the nation to tardy recognition of the fact that its salvation depends on the degree of the national effort.

Bitter as the experience may be, we shall have to admit, if we are honest, that it brings with it lessons which in no other circumstances would have had any chance of being learnt. We may differ among ourselves as to the value of those lessons, or even as to what the lessons may be, but the more thoughtful will take note that here and there opinions have been changed, the outlook on life has been modified, lines of conduct altered, and they will be content to leave it to future generations to decide to what extent the war has been responsible. It matters not what opinions, what lines of conduct have been affected, the point which it is sought to make here is that it is only in the protracted ordeal of passing through the fire that appreciation of the lessons to be learned has been gained. If the war had ended by Christmas, 1914, the nation would have had no precise knowledge either of the latent strength it possessed or of its limitations. We are on the eve of great developments in regard to the co-ordination of national effort. A short war would have left us to face the future in the state of unpreparedness in which we embarked upon this war, but the danger would have been increased tenfold, for every other nation would have learnt the lesson which we still refused to take to heart. A year ago it was held in some circles that women's services were lost to the State, because they had not been given political enfranchisement. The war came, and women turned to the work that lay before them. It has been shown that the last thing the nation gives heed to in a supreme crisis is the Parliamentary vote, for by common consent a political truce is proclaimed, and elections are postponed indefinitely. Thus we have the long list of war work which women, Suffragists and Anti-Suffragists, have to their credit, without reference to the vote. It is but one of the many errors that the war has helped to jettison. Others will follow suit as the trial of our beliefs endures. There are pacifists in our midst whom even months of war have failed to divest of their unpractical views. For some their theories found utterance recently at The Hague; but the weeks pass, a fuller appreciation of the significance of the war is obtained, and who shall say that the nation does not benefit when unworthy convictions which encourage treasonable designs are sent by the board?

Everyone out of his or her experience can extend the list of lessons to be learned nationally or individually. The sum total we may hope, when duly applied, will make of the British Empire a more worthy exponent of the part it has been set to play in the world's history. It is true that we are fighting for our own liberties, but we are fighting also, as we have fought before, for the liberties of Europe. If ever a nation has been given a mission, this is the mission of Great Britain. Our geographical position saves us from being suddenly overwhelmed by the military might of any nation aspiring to the hegemony of Europe. Our resources and our naval supremacy make us an invaluable champion of the principle of nationality on the Continent, an invaluable ally of any country seeking to develop its resources in peace, without

menace to the liberties of any other State. Force of circumstances rather than deliberate intent has made us add to our power in the past, and ordinarily it may be difficult for us to combat the belief held by other nations that we have in each case deliberately embarked on war for our own aggrandisement. In the present instance only the blind hatred of Germany could formulate such a charge. Our Allies and the rest of the world will know not only that the war was none of our seeking, but that for a brief space, so great was our desire for peace, we hesitated to take up the responsibilities of our mission. This war has shown how great would have been the disaster to ourselves as well as to Europe, if we had failed to champion the cause of its liberties. The shortcomings of our championship are being written large enough across the Continent, as the weeks and months pass, but of the spirit behind that championship no one can now complain. It is for the nation to take to heart the lessons of the war, and to see to it that in the future we give more heed to the responsibilities of our mission. Herein lies no danger of militarism, which can only exist where it can batten on a spirit of aggression. Those who are obsessed by this fear malign their own countrymen, and know nothing of the Empire's mission. But the error into which they have fallen will be one of the last to be exercised by the war. Until it has gone completely, or has been reduced to negligible proportions, the lessons of the war have not been learnt. As the war drags on, therefore, we must derive what consolation we can from the reflection that if we but remain true to ourselves we shall in the end be saved "yet so as by fire."

NOTES AND NEWS.

Women and War Work.

Much that is written about women's war service appears to be based on the conviction that women have hitherto been useless members of society, and are only now beginning to find themselves. It is impossible to protest too strongly against an idea which can only emanate from those who are anxious to show that women are labouring under some disadvantage or other. No doubt a certain number of women have led purposeless existences for varying terms of years in their lives, but it seems ridiculous that there should be any need to point out that no such indictment holds good against the sex. For the few who have turned from idleness to useful energy a revolution may have occurred in their lives—the spirit in any case was there before, though the incentive was lacking—but the remainder have merely changed the form of their work. They have answered before to the country's need; they are continuing to answer to it now. The need is more urgent, and their response has been to a corresponding degree more conspicuous. But just as a man who enlists does not ask to be regarded as a superhero, so it will be well to guard against the theory that a woman who is able to leave the task that came to her hand before and turn to "war work," has acquired a virtue which she did not possess previously.

A Lesson from Past Experience.

It must be admitted that there is some excuse for the mistaken theories which have arisen in regard to women

and their work. At the outbreak of the war the country realised as little the need of mobilising its resources in men as the need of utilising the women. The only advance made upon previous experiences in regard to the men was that the Government insisted upon keeping in its own hands the raising of an army, and we were spared the humiliation of relying for victory over our enemies upon A's Scouts, B's Horse, and C's Guides. Outside the Army, however, no steps were taken to make use of the man-power of the country, and we have had to wait eleven months for a National Register. The failure of the Government to give any thought to the woman-power of the country inevitably led to efforts of voluntary organisation, which in the absence of State control were as valuable and as splendid as the efforts which produced the irregular forces in the Boer War. But like the latter they fall short of the maximum efficiency attainable by State control. On the other hand, side by side with the Army we realise the need of Local Defence Forces or Volunteer Training Corps. May we not therefore draw a lesson from the experiences of this war and argue that the maximum efficiency of the woman-power of the country will be attained by State control of any central organisation, and by local organisations for all other patriotic efforts? Hitherto the Government has tacitly encouraged the raising of "irregular forces" among women, and has found in them sufficient reason for taking no steps in the matter of mobilising women. Now, however, there are signs that the "irregular forces" are not coming up to expectations, and a demand is made for State control.

National Organisation.

Unless, therefore, the Government sees its way to mobilise women on the same lines as it proposes to mobilise men, it is to be hoped that voluntary effort will be directed more and more to local organisation. A proposal has been made for a "Women's Legion," but if it is to rely upon a central administration run by volunteers, there is every ground for supposing that a great deal of patriotic effort will be wasted. It must be clearly understood that these remarks refer to women's labour, and in no way reflects upon the administration of relief funds by voluntary effort. The transfer of women's labour presents too many difficulties to be undertaken effectively by an unofficial organisation; indeed, it may be doubted whether it can be carried out on any large scale officially without more serious dislocation than the results would justify. On the other hand there is abundant scope for the organisation of women locally—the "Local Defence Forces" of the woman-power of the nation. We hope that valuable time will not be lost by sacrificing what can be achieved locally, to an agitation for a central organisation. In all probability if the War Service Register had been carried out locally for purely local purposes, more use would have been made of it.

Infant Mortality.

In one direction we are likely to pay dearly for our failure to mobilise our national resources on a business-like footing. There can be little doubt that the serious increase in infant mortality is in part due to the scarcity of doctors and nurses. It may be directly attributable to epidemics of measles and whooping-cough, but these in turn will reflect the absence of help and advice. The Government could create a Panel for insurance pur-

poses, but it entirely overlooked the necessity for organising the Medical Service for war purposes. The lack of method which has caused skilled workers to be taken from munition factories to the firing line or behind it, has also robbed whole districts of doctors, and benefited, in some cases, the crew of a torpedo gunboat at the expense of the next generation. There would still be time to correlate the medical needs of the Army, the Navy, and the country as a whole for an equitable distribution of doctors and nurses. But so long as everything is left to individual initiative patriotic effort is in danger of becoming wasteful and of failing in its purpose.

Woman Suffrage in Denmark.

Denmark has now to be added to the list of Suffrage States. Its population in 1911 was 2,757,076, with females in a majority of 81,276. Suffragists are elated over a further conquest, and a resolution has been passed by one Society urging the British Government to follow Denmark's example during the present world-crisis. The average person, however, possessing any acquaintance with the trend of public affairs in Denmark, would rather be tempted to find in the Danes' acceptance of Woman Suffrage a very strong reason for every other country to hold back until the result of the experiment has been seen. Denmark has embarked on a career of ultra-democracy, and it is significant that for years the main subject of political controversy has been the question of national defence. The parties which have won Woman Suffrage in the new Constitution stand for the policy of reducing expenditure for military purposes to a minimum. They hold, or have hitherto held, that Denmark has only to proclaim neutrality if any war arises, and all will be well with her, without any expenditure on national defence. This policy will find endorsement among our own Suffragists, but it suggests that there may be something at fault with the theory that whatever Denmark considers good for herself must necessarily be good for Great Britain.

HELP FOR THE ITALIAN WOUNDED.

So soon as Italy had definitely joined the Allies against Germany, every effort was made in the Italian hospitals to prepare for the wounded. Some idea of the scale on which these preparations are being made may be formed from the fact that in Bologna alone 25,000 beds are to be in readiness. This means that the need for trained nurses and necessary equipment will everywhere be very great.

As in England, many private houses have been offered to the authorities as convalescent homes, in order to relieve the military base hospitals. In a mountain district very near to Turin, which has had the honour of supplying the first soldiers who have won distinction in the field, an English lady is turning her hall, which measures some eighty feet, into a hospital ward. Her daughter has just completed a six months' training in a Bologna hospital, and an English nurse is shortly going out from England to assist them to organise and run the ward. As many necessary articles will be wanted, a case of these is being collected to be sent by sea. Contributions in kind or money will be gratefully received by the Honorary Secretary of the N.L.O.W.S., at 515, Caxton House, S.W. Bandages will be specially useful if made after the many-tailed pattern, and in thin flannel.

A SPLIT AND THE MORAL.

The differences that had arisen in the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies, owing to the refusal of the Executive to nominate delegates to the Women's Peace Congress at The Hague, were threshed out at a special Council meeting held at Birmingham on June 17th and 18th. Matters were to be brought to a head by the moving of a resolution by the Manchester Society. If the resolution were passed, the members of the National Union Executive who had resigned were prepared to offer themselves for re-election. The resolution read as follows:—

"This Council, being convinced that the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies should give effect to its belief, expressed at the annual Council in February, 1915, that all human relations should be governed, not by physical force, but by the recognition of mutual rights, resolves to work for the realization of this ideal—(1) By propaganda demanding the enfranchisement of women as essential to the constitution of a democratic State; (2) by co-operation with other organisations working for these objects having accepted the principle of the enfranchisement of women, and in discussion with women of other nations to promote the establishment of a stable system of international law and mutual understanding, upheld by the common will of men and women; it being understood that societies shall be at liberty to concentrate their efforts on that part of the propaganda with which they feel themselves ready to deal."

When, however, this resolution was submitted to the Manchester Society by its Executive, as a preliminary to its being moved at the Council meeting as the "Manchester Resolution," the members refused to accept it. As a result of this *contretemps* fifteen members of the Manchester Executive out of twenty-five, including Miss Margaret Ashton (Chairman) and the Hon. Treasurer and Hon. Secretary resigned, and the "Manchester Resolution" had to be moved at the National Union Council meeting by the Macclesfield Society. It is, therefore, no matter for surprise that it was defeated. Mrs. Fawcett and her loyal guard carried the day, the resolution upholding their attitude being passed "by a very large majority." A subsequent resolution dealing with the Peace Propaganda question ran:—

"Seeing that the difficulty of interpreting the resolutions of the last Council has proved conclusively that there is no unanimity in the National Union as to the best means of promoting at this time the cause of international goodwill and future peace, this Council agrees that propaganda directed to those objects cannot be undertaken by the National Union, and that Resolution B 3, passed at the last Council, must not be interpreted as involving propaganda, individual members being free to work through other organisations in any way they think fit."

Twelve new members were elected to the Executive. They were:—Miss Eleanor Rathbone, Miss B. A. Clough, Mrs. Coombe-Tennant, Miss Helen Fraser, Miss Frances Sterling, Mrs. Alys Russell, Mrs. Corbett Ashby, Mrs. Oliver Strachey, Miss O'Malley, Mrs. Florence Willey, M.D., Mrs. Stocks, and Miss F. de G. Merrifield.

The candidates for election who withdrew their names as a result of the Council upholding Mrs. Fawcett's action were:—Miss Margaret Ashton, Mr. G. G. Armstrong, Miss E. Barton, Miss Alice Clark, Miss K. D. Courtney, Miss I. O. Ford, Miss Margaret Hills, Miss Emily M. Leaf, Miss C. C. Lyon, Miss C. E. Marshall, Mrs. Streatfield, Miss S. J. Tanner, Miss E. M. Williams.

The members of the former Executive who resigned and did not apparently offer themselves for re-election were:—Miss Maude Royden, Mrs. H. M. Swanwick, Mrs. Harley, Mrs. Arthur Schuster, Mrs. Stanbury.

Meanwhile the *fons et origo mali*, Miss Chrystal Macmillan, was on her way to Petrograd to commend the peace doctrines of the Women's Congress to the Russian Government. With splendid detachment she writes to the *Common Cause*: "As I see that there is no question of all members of Executive offering to resign in order to stand for re-election, I do not resign." Whether Miss Macmillan will change her mind when she finds herself pilloried in the *Englishwoman*, in an article by Mrs. Fawcett, remains to be seen.

With this last split it is worthy of note that not a single Suffrage Society of any proportions has been proof against the tendency of its members to quarrel amongst themselves. The Women's Social and Political Union, the Women's Freedom League, and the N.U.W.S.S., all in turn have been houses divided against themselves, and all have solved their difficulties in the same way, by the expulsion of the recalcitrants. Differences of opinions are not unknown in men's political societies. In the case of Tariff Reform it is probable that the Unionist Party was at one time more acutely divided than the National Union over the question of supporting peace propaganda. The Unionist Party holds together, but not so the Suffragists. We do not pay the National Union the compliment of regarding it as representative of all women; but if ever Woman Suffrage were introduced into this country, Suffragists would become the most articulate section of voting womanhood. It is of interest, therefore, to note what characteristics they would be likely to introduce into our political life. From the history of the Suffrage Societies it is safe to say that the first and foremost trait would be intolerance. Compromise is not necessarily a virtue at all times and in all places. It can play, however, a useful purpose in politics. Suffragists have proved conclusively that they will have none of it, and the electorate is left to decide whether its elimination is calculated to uplift politics or to introduce into our political life personal rancour and bitterness, which have been for the most part conspicuously absent.

The following letter to the *Morning Post* from Dr. Ethel Smyth on some of her fellow-Suffragists is as interesting as it is vigorous:—

Sir,—The Executive of the British Committee of the Woman's International Congress sent me a report of the recent proceedings at The Hague with a demand for financial support. As it is common knowledge that Germany is spending millions on peace propaganda both in neutral and belligerent countries—which need not astonish us, since anything that tends to weaken the resolution of the Allies is of more value to our enemy than many army corps—I replied as follows:

"I am surprised that you forward this appeal to me. Whether you realise it or not, you are playing the game of Germany, and for that reason are traitors. As one of a family of soldiers I am ashamed that such literature should have passed my doors."

To those who protest that these ladies and the men with whom they work, such as Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, the Independent Labour Party, the Union of Democratic Control, etc., are sincere and inspired by the highest motives one can only reply: So was Brutus, yet Dante places him with Judas Iscariot in the lion's mouth, simply because both were traitors. And so are all, if people will only think it out, who are deliberately playing the German game to-day.

We English have our own peculiar "Kultur" danger—the mixture of sentimentality and evasion of logical conclusions which we are apt to mistake for enlightened tolerance. When contact with grim reality has sufficiently purged us of this particular form of cant these cranks will perhaps be seen and dealt with for what they are—a disgrace and a very real danger to a country at war.

SUFFRAGISTS IN CONTROVERSY.

By Miss G. S. POTT.

On June 14th last an article under the headline of "Women After the War," was published in the "Standard," and gave rise to some correspondence upon the matter of Woman Suffrage. Though the anonymous writer of the article professed to have been an Anti-Suffragist up to the time of the outbreak of the war, his (or her) use of more than one expression induces the careful reader to regard such avowal of faith with suspicion. To quote the following sentence as an example: "I write as an Anti-Suffragist on the old lines . . . with its opinions, presumptions, and its total disregard of simple human truths." It is improbable that an Anti-Suffragist penned these words. One seems to recognise the familiar stalking horse, thinly disguised. Suffragists were not slow to follow up the opportunity thus afforded, truce or no truce, and in the next issue of the "Standard" appeared a letter from Lady Selborne informing us that her advocacy of Woman Suffrage rests upon the foundation of "the excellent results it has produced in the countries where it has been tried." We are as familiar with this statement from the lips of Conservative and Unionist Suffragists, as with their inability to prove the soundness of their own arguments. As usual, Lady Selborne resorts to the dictum of "the countries where women vote have shown themselves most successful in dealing with the problem of infant mortality."

That those countries have not the problem in similar conditions to those of our own land, and that those countries showed as low a proportional rate of infantile mortality to that of Great Britain before Woman Suffrage was granted as they did subsequently, has been shown time after time both in the columns of this REVIEW and upon public platforms. Imperviousness to argument as distinct from unsupported statement is one of the best known characteristics of Suffragist debaters. But Lady Selborne hastens to guard herself from retaliation. Having written as definitely controversial a letter upon the vexed matter as it is possible to write, she conveniently recalls the Political Truce, and reminds her readers that this is not the time to advocate social or domestic reform, but to give one's whole and undivided attention to the war. Apparently it is only the Anti-Suffragists who are to respect the truce consistently. Suffragists may break it when and how they please, but should their statements call forth replies the opponent is reminded that controversy is unpatriotic. So be it. Anti-Suffragists should not follow crooked paths, even if others tread the same. The pledge given should be adhered to. But it may be permissible to point out how the plea regarding the success of women's votes in other countries has been shattered by a notorious Suffragist since the war began. "You cannot force Europe to be governed in the same way as America is," quoth Miss Christabel Pankhurst on January 13th last, "because the circumstances are so different. . . . It is a false analogy. . . . There is nothing so dangerous as a false analogy." Quite true. We might hope that these sage remarks would bring conviction to Miss Pankhurst's sadly illogical co-adjutors.

It is amusing and instructive to notice how completely Suffragist champions are undermining their own arguments. The stress of war is upon them, not only as regards the European and world-wide conflict, but within

their own camp at home, where they have been busily engaged in slaying the phantoms reared by themselves in piping times of peace. It seems almost unnecessary to point the many lessons to be learnt from the recent split amongst the members of the N.U.W.S.S. A minority disagrees with a majority, therefore the minority secedes. Some members of an Executive construe the meaning of a resolution in one sense, the remaining members in another. Neither party will yield, but the Executive is broken in twain. The resigning members immediately prepare a plan for their own reinstatement. Have we here before us a forecast of the political actions of women if admitted to Parliamentary office? Are these the principles which will guide women Suffragists in the re-shaping of constitutional or democratic government? Let those who run read and mark.

It can hardly have been possible for any one to listen to Suffragist orators, representing either the N.U.W.S.S. or the C. and U.W.F. Association, without hearing the statement, made either directly or by implication, that the enfranchisement of a limited number of women would bring about the representation of *Women*. Miss Helen Fraser has expressed this view more than once in public, for instance upon platforms at Abingdon and Clevedon in 1913. It is the basis of all arguments in favour of the Conciliation Bill. But observe Miss Helen Fraser's present views, as put forth in a recent number of the "Common Cause": "It is as intolerable that the N.U.W.S.S. should speak for women (even its own women) on peace and war as that men should speak for us in the State on this and every other question." Where is the much talked of women's point of view? It reminds one of an effort at argument on the part of her colleague, Miss Helen Ward, in former days, when she attempted to refute criticism of Miss Maude Royden's inaccuracies. It was unfair, wrote Miss Helen Ward, to imply that any argument used by Miss Royden in her pamphlet upon wages depended upon the statement that the average wage of women in industry was 7s. 6d. per week. Miss Royden's "main contentions are set out in leaded type" in the pamphlet. The first page of Miss Royden's pamphlet contained in leaded type the words "the average weekly wage earned by industrial women is about 7s. or 7s. 6d. a week (*sic*). According to Miss Helen Ward, therefore, it is unfair to regard a Suffragist's *main contention* as the basis of the argument deduced from it by the author. One other sign of improvement of Suffragist minds may be noted with regard to their recent disagreements. Mrs. Fawcett and her hon. officials write to the "Standard" protesting against the public use of documents marked "Private." Whether the "Standard" did in fact make use of any such documents is not within my knowledge. The point I would emphasise is that in 1911 a prominent member of the Executive Committee of the N.U.W.S.S. having obtained possession of a letter written by one private individual to another and marked "Private and Confidential," published the same in the columns of London newspapers. This action has constantly been referred to by members of the N.U.W.S.S., notably by Mrs. Fawcett herself, but without a word of disapproval. On the contrary, to quote the words of one of the Union's own members, Lady Chance, "The Suffragists *naturally did not feel themselves bound to secrecy*." Let us hope that for the future the Union will apply to their own conduct the code of honour they profess to expect from other persons.

THE WOMEN'S CONGRESS AT THE HAGUE.

The importance of the Peace movement in the Suffrage world at the present moment justifies further reference in these columns to the Congress held at The Hague during the last week in April. In our June issue we discussed the gathering in its relation to the cleavage it had caused in Suffragist circles. It is now possible, owing to the publication in *Jus Suffragii* of a report of the proceedings and of the resolutions in full, to form some opinion of what was achieved by the women who attended as the result of their discussions.

The Congress was a Peace-cum-Suffrage meeting. Miss K. D. Courtney, one of the two British women present, summed up the position of the members by stating that "A woman who is not a pacifist has no right to want a vote" (*Jus Suffragii*, June, 1915, p. 304). The context made it clear that by a pacifist she meant someone who believed that war could be permanently abolished, *scilicet* by woman suffrage, and was prepared to make the present war, against which the meeting was a "protest," serve the suffrage agitation. In only one of the twelve countries "represented" at the Congress had women exercised the Parliamentary franchise, so that there was some point in combining peace resolutions and suffrage proposals, in order to secure a hearing for the latter under the aegis of the former. Indeed, in its origin the Congress was the contrivance of one or more active British Suffragists, who were chagrined by the refusal of the International Women's Suffrage Alliance to hold a meeting this year. Miss Chrystal Macmillan, we learn from Mrs. Fawcett, had consulted the Board of Officers of the International Women's Suffrage Association on the desirability of holding a Congress of the Alliance during the war, and a majority had voted against it. "It did not prove productive of goodwill and mutual understanding," adds Mrs. Fawcett, "to ask them (the Board of Officers, of whom Miss Macmillan was one) first of all if they wished for a Congress, and when they said 'No,' to tell them that there was going to be one all the same" (*The Englishwoman*, June, 1915, p. 197).

Before we turn to the resolutions of the Congress some idea of its value as a representative body may be formed from the fact that no attempt was made to obtain for the participating countries either equal numerical representation or representation proportionate to their size and importance. Any woman paying the Congress fee, and expressing general sympathy with the resolutions, was at liberty to become a member, with the right to speak and vote. Accordingly as no limit was put on the number of Dutch women attending, and a variety of causes tended to prevent many women from other countries being present, the Congress consisted of 1,000 Dutch and 129 non-Dutch women. The Congress resolved itself, therefore, into a meeting of the Dutch Woman Suffrage Association. This, however, would have been no reflection upon it, if its deliberations had had any practical value for the world in the present crisis.

The preliminary notice of the Congress, published in *Jus Suffragii* for March, 1915, asserted that "the world was looking to them [i.e., the women, *bien entendu* those who are Suffragists] for their contribution towards the solution of the great problems of the day." The Congress, therefore, cannot complain if its proceedings are measured by the standard which it had set itself.

There was no lack of resolutions. Twenty were grouped under seven main headings, while yet another resolution of great length dealt with the appointment of an "international women's committee for permanent peace." After an initial protest "against the madness and the horror of war," the following resolution was passed on "The Peace Settlement":—

Since the mass of the people in each of the countries now at war believe themselves to be fighting, not as aggressors, but in self-defence and for their national existence, there can be no irreconcilable differences between them, and their common ideals afford a basis upon which a magnanimous and honourable peace might be established. The Congress, therefore, urges the Governments of the world to put an end to this bloodshed and to begin peace negotiations. It demands that the peace which follows shall be permanent and therefore based on principles of justice, including those laid down in the resolutions adopted by this Congress, namely:—

That no territory should be transferred without the consent of the men and women in it, and that the right of conquest should not be recognised.

That autonomy and a democratic Parliament should not be refused to any people.

That the Governments of all nations should come to an agreement to refer future international disputes to arbitration or conciliation, and to bring social, moral and economic pressure to bear upon any country which resorts to arms.

That foreign politics should be subject to democratic control. That women should be granted equal political rights with men.

It is impossible within the limits of a single article to deal with all the resolutions passed at the Congress, which would, *inter alia*, establish a permanent International Court of Justice at The Hague, with women in it, not only to formulate principles of justice, equity, and goodwill for the guidance of nations, but also to "enforce" them. The gathering itself was an indication that the members were wholly out of touch with practical politics, and had no understanding of the meaning of the present war. Some of their resolutions, therefore, were just pious aspirations for hastening the Millennium, others rang the changes on securing for women a direct voice in the government of the world. In the resolution quoted at length above, it will be noticed that the recommendation for an "immediate truce," which figured in the draft resolution, appears in the form of an appeal "to begin peace negotiations." The idea is the same. For the members of the Congress this war is nothing but a brawl between two or more angry men, from which the participants can desist on equal terms, having satisfied their wicked passions by letting fly at one another. The value of the Congress may be gauged from this conception of the present situation in Europe. Little faith is likely to be placed in the remedy recommended by a doctor who is unable to diagnose the malady from which the patient is suffering. The Congress sought to draw a line of distinction between people and Governments in the belligerent countries. Between the people, it pointed out, there are no "irreconcilable differences," therefore the Governments, which must be held responsible for the war, can quite well conclude a "magnanimous and honourable peace." As to how far the premise to this statement represents the actual state of affairs may be left to the judgment of the reader. The Congress did not specify what it would require as a magnanimous peace, but if magnanimity was to figure on both sides, it would be difficult to arrange more effectively for a renewal of the world conflict in the near future. Mrs. Fawcett's dictum that the programme of the Congress "did not appear to offer any guarantee of the practical sagacity or calmness

of judgment of those who had formed it," will find endorsement outside the ranks of her followers.

The idea of the Congress was only possible in the circles in which it was conceived. After many years devoted to worshipping the belief that vague generalities are a cure for all ills in the domestic affairs of our national life, it is but a small step to imagining that similar platitudes will be a panacea for all international difficulties. But, unfortunately for the Suffragist pacifists, the war has kindled the fire of patriotism in many a heart where before it was lying dormant. Mrs. Pankhurst and Mrs. Fawcett alike realise in the face of the nation's supreme crisis that there is something more important than the shibboleth to which a year ago they subordinated the country's will and the country's welfare. They have not abandoned the cult of the shibboleth, but they refrain from measuring it against the real interests of the country. So it happens that there is a split in the Suffragist ranks, and as the pacifists command the greater part of Suffragist energy they round on those of their fellow-Suffragists for whom patriotism is still a living force, and say, "A woman who is not a pacifist has no right to want the vote."

THE INFORMATION BUREAU.

415, Oxford Street, W.

The Committee have pleasure in reporting that during the past month the work of the Bureau has largely increased. The meeting held at 67, Westbourne Terrace, on May 19th, by kind permission of Sir Bartle and the Misses Frere, produced an access of many able and willing workers for the daily working party at the Bureau. Mrs. Norris's suggestion, mentioned in the last report, has been acted upon, and the workers devote their energies entirely to the production of every kind of hospital necessary, including pyjamas, hospital shirts, bed-jackets, night-shirts, operation-shirts, swabs, bandages of various kinds, and other useful articles. More than a hundred garments alone have been turned out, some of which have been sent to the St. John Ambulance Association for hospitals at home and abroad, others to a hospital at Woodhall Spa, and in answer to a personal appeal sixteen large khaki arm-slings were sent to King George V.'s Hospital. The work is now systematically organised, certain kinds of work being done on certain days, under competent supervision; two days a week are partially devoted to swabs and bandages, other days to the making of garments. In addition, 322 more bags for respirators have been made for Queen Mary's Needlework Guild, thus more than completing the 1,000 promised by the Bureau in response to the first appeal.

While, however, gratefully acknowledging the efforts of the ladies who have already come forward at the Bureau, the Committee have no hesitation in appealing for more and yet more workers. The daily increasing number of wounded arriving in this country means a corresponding increase in the need for hospital necessities—a need so imperative and so constant that it will tax the untiring efforts of the women of England to keep pace with it. It is hardly too much to say that the appeal made to men to give all possible help in the making of shells might equally well be made to women to give all possible help in the making of hospital necessities. The Committee find that the Bureau is not large enough to accommodate properly its full quota of workers on swabs

and bandages and it is hoped that another room may be had which the Committee can devote entirely to this branch of the work, and thereby greatly extend it.

Two meetings, on May 27th and June 17th, have been held at the Bureau, at which addresses were given respectively by Miss Gladys Pott and Mrs. Alexander Dow, on war emergency work for women.

Miss Pott said that the war blocked out every other point of view, and that any other interest, however important, did not to-day count one iota; that personal loss and sorrow must not weigh in the balance; they were part of women's work in the war, and women must be prepared to sacrifice their chief work and interests for the world-wide work going on round them. The cry of "Business as usual," and the idea that we were a nation of shopkeepers was founded on the fact that we were a small island nation in the midst of the great sea; but to-day neither business nor anything else ought to be as usual, and everyone ought to give of their very best in view of the unusual events happening overseas in lands separated from us by only 20 miles of water. Miss Pott spoke of the letter issued by the Board of Trade and of the rush of women to register themselves under the scheme set forth by that Department. She also gave an interesting account of the work being carried on in Berkshire in conjunction with the Agricultural College, Reading, in the matter of training girls as milkers.

Mrs. Dow's address on June 17th has a fitting corollary to that of Miss Pott, for the former having dealt largely with work suitable for country districts, the latter gave much valuable information as to various works suitable for dwellers in towns.

Mrs. Dow began by speaking of the recent air raids, and the desirability of making minor preparations for them, and also of the importance of comforting and reassuring the old and nervous. With the possibility of a winter campaign before us, it would be a good thing to make provision of comforts for the troops beforehand, there being always ample use for warm garments for adult men. The various services that can be rendered by women include V.A.D. whole-timers, some of whom would meet and look after friends of wounded men going to France, and who would also help to care for the nurses. There were women police and women patrols, but the pity was that of these there were three independent bodies instead of one organisation. Valuable work could be done in spraying respirators and in visiting in their homes men who had been totally disabled by the war. Mrs. Dow also considered that the Kentish farmers might be glad to avail themselves of the services of ladies as fruit pickers during the season. Those who sought such employment should group themselves together in bands of six.

An auxiliary working party has been started at Ealing. It is supplied with materials from the Bureau. As such working parties can be of great help to the Bureau, it is hoped that other Branches will follow Ealing's excellent lead. Branch Secretaries who desire to initiate working parties should apply to the Bureau for information. There will be a meeting at the Bureau on Thursday, July 15th, at 11 a.m. Mrs. Harrison will be the speaker. The Secretary will be glad to know how many hearers she may expect.

[Owing to pressure on our space this report has had to be curtailed and a list of gifts received is held over.—Ed. A.S.R.]

SUFFRAGISTS AND THE WAR.

The following letter has been sent by Mr. J. Massie to the Press:—

SIR,—I observe that certain editors are giving much of their space (even in times when space must be particularly valuable) to contributed glorifications of Suffragist action in what is designedly mis-called "war work" in order to bring it as nearly as possible into equality with fighting in the trenches; and this these editors do, though their space is alleged by them to be too valuable for the admission of replies. Perhaps the most grotesque illustration of this studiously contributed misrepresentation has been the story, appearing and re-appearing, of a Primitive Methodist minister's wife who is just now going the preaching round of her husband's district while he is acting somewhere as chaplain to the troops, as if women preachers were not a common characteristic of Primitive Methodism always and everywhere.

But the ordinary contribution from Suffragist headquarters mostly concerns hospital work, and I have seen it headed "Women Heroes in War Hospitals: What Suffragists are Doing." It is natural to wonder what war hospitals have distinctively to do with the Suffragist party, any more than they have distinctively to do with the Conservative party, or the Liberal party, or the Labour party. The exclusive association of women's "war service" with one party of women more than another is unfair and misleading, though it is instructive. It carries with it the entirely groundless insinuation that the women who object to the Suffrage and the women who are indifferent to it are less active in the service than the women who insist on putting a Suffrage stamp upon it. As treasurer of the National League for Opposing Woman Suffrage, I am in a position to know from abundant evidence the unsparring devotion of our branches and our members, not only to hospital work, but to all the varied kinds of service for which the country is calling. But the principle of our central organisation since the war began has always been that we should throw ourselves into this work and service hand in hand with our fellow-countrymen and fellow-countrywomen without distinction of party. At the present juncture there is no room for any party except the national party; and yet the Suffrage party seem to be bent on making room for themselves.

The object of Anti-Suffragists (I speak for the body as a whole and not for individuals here and there) is not to make capital for their propaganda out of the patriotic work they do, and hence they sink their party name. But when paragraphs are headed for the Press, "What Suffragists are doing," it is plain that the eye is not single; the ulterior object for which the patriotic action is made use of cannot be mistaken. The policy of those who merge their party and the policy of those who obtrude their party could not be more distinctly differentiated. The Suffragist policy is intended to catch the unwary and unreasoning with the specious argument, "See what noble service the women are rendering; will they not deserve the vote when the war is over?" But nothing could be more illogical than to claim that, because women can serve the nation nobly and effectively in their own way, therefore they have a right to govern it; and the prospect of government by women, even if they have been heroic hospital nurses or hospital matrons, will, even after the war, remain repellant to the vast majority of reflecting women as well as men.

The service of women is no new thing; if the vote were simply an Order of Merit it would have been due to them before. But it is not a reward, it is a trust assigned to the sex which alone is capable of performing the essential national duties of defending the country and maintaining the laws. And the lesson which this war thrusts and even thunders upon inconsiderate ears is that on men and not on women depends the fight for national existence. Women may be substitutes for men in some degree of non-combatant work, but not in "war work" in any proper sense of the term. Men and men alone can bear the whole brunt of the battle for the life of the nation.

But apart from the merits or demerits of their case Suffragists seem just now to need the reminder that this is not the season to push the claims of their particular party; and that in the midst of the common danger it would be more in harmony with national unity and the national temper if they would be content to qualify themselves for service under the Flag whose record in history shall be "Then none were for a party; then all were for the State."

I am, etc.,

JOHN MASSIE.

Old Headington, Oxford, June 19th, 1915.

BRANCH NEWS.

Chiswick.—By kind permission of Mr. and Mrs. Harold Norris, the Chiswick members and their friends were entertained at a most successful tea and garden meeting at "Ryffel Haus," on June 16th. The purpose of the meeting was to put local members more directly in touch with the war work being carried on by the League at the Bureau, and to obtain, if possible, further offers of regular systematic help. Mr. Chamberlain, of the Y.M.C.A., very kindly came down and bore witness to the help which the League had afforded to his Association by the erection of the recreation hut at Seaford. Miss Blenkinsop then explained very fully the work being done at the Bureau.

"The Beehive."—The yearly meeting of "The Beehive" took place at the Christian Institute, St. Andrews, on May 25th.

Lady Griselda Cheape, President, opened with prayer, afterwards reading a statement of the Society's work: "The Beehive" was the idea that each woman should do her little bit, and bring in her bag of honey and make the forlorn sad world by God's teaching a little better, a little brighter, a little happier. All were welcome to join, and the joyous camaraderie was the principal feature of the gatherings.

The Report showed that they had sent £5 os. 11d. to Foreign Missions, £3 to the Quarrier's Homes, and £3 10s. to the Aughterhouse Invalid Children's Home. They had also sent two boys to an orphanage and had placed a family in the country. A garden party had been held at Strathtyrum, at which Captain Brittain spoke for the Church Army and showed the wonderful work they were doing. A little sale realised £5 11s. 10d. and 18 garments were given—one lady gave a diamond and emerald brooch. Another garden party had been given at Strathtyrum, this time for the Belgian Refugees and for the Base Hospital. The meetings in every case are opened by prayer. On this occasion Lady Griselda Cheape showed that there was a worse enemy than the Germans, namely the devil, and that we must not be weary of well-doing. That tiny country Belgium had given us a grand example of pluck and endurance, and we must do our part. £25 was collected and 111 garments were given in.

Another garden party took place by kind permission of Major and Mrs. Cheape at Dyers Brae for the Soldiers and Sailors Help Society, which was doing a grand work. Men who had served their country nobly were looked after, cheered and helped. It was not only a matter of money, but of loving sympathy. These men had bled to protect us; we owed them a debt and our aim was to help them to gain a happy life by teaching them to earn their own living, thus making them independent, even if they had lost limbs. The work, baskets, brushes, etc., made by the men was sold to the amount of £44 10s. 7d., and a stall of gifts from the "Bees" realised £5. Tea was served and the guests were free to wander in the pretty garden; 62 garments were given for our soldiers.

At Christmas, the children's time, three treats were given to the St. Andrews children. A good feast, hymns and a Tree made many little ones happy. In Dundee the "Bees" had provided gifts for 100 of the poorest civilian children. The district nurse brought them in. Lady Griselda opened with prayer and gave a simple address to the little ones of the Baby Jesus. Tea followed and music and recitations, and the little ones had a lovely time. The Tree was lighted and all sang "God Save the King." Another treat was given at Lady Jane Ogilvy's Orphanage, Baldovan. Fifteen children sat down to an excellent tea given by the "Bees."

Our work has also collected £15 for the Royal Infirmary, Dundee, £1 for Lady Margaret's Hospital (for which we got two reduced fee in-patients' letters, which have been sent to one of our "Bees" in London to send two sick people into the country).

Miss Lindsey, Lady Secretary of the Irish Invalid Children's Society, sent a box of lovely lace made by the "helpless," which realised £7 11s. 3d. Also we help with the temperance work—three Bibles were given for the best essays on that subject in St. Andrews and at Rosemartin. Our Society remembers animals, too, and sent £2 for the Home of Rest for costermongers' horses. Up-to-date we have been working hard for the Queen's Fund and so far have sent up over £14.

We have sent one child out to Canada through Dr. Barnardo's and are very anxious to send another. Who will help?

For the period from May, 1914, to May, 1915, we have 570 members on our roll. We hope to increase. The present is ours. Let us work while it is day. Our balance shows £4 18s. 9d.

President, Lady Griselda Cheape, Strathtyrum, St. Andrews; Secretary, Miss Jacobs, 11, Pilmour Links, St. Andrews; Committee, Mrs. Cheape, Mrs. Newall, Mrs. Methuen, Mrs. Mathewson.