

# Men's League for Women's Suffrage

No. 42.

Office: 136, ST. STEPHEN'S HOUSE,  
WESTMINSTER, S.W.  
Telephone: 4276 VICTORIA.  
Hon. Sec.: Dr. C. V. DRYSDALE.  
Secretary: GEORGE E. STARUP.

Monthly Paper.

ONE PENNY.

President: THE RT. HON. THE EARL OF LYTTON.  
Chairman: HERBERT JACOBS.  
Hon. Treas.: REGD. H. POTT.  
Hon. Political Sec.: J. M. MITCHELL.  
Assistant Organiser: R. de MARIA.

Mar., 1913

## NOTES OF THE MONTH.

From one end of the country to the other meetings have been held during February at which Suffragists of all societies have joined in refusing to accept, as being any fulfilment of his solemn pledge, the Prime Minister's offer of facilities for a private member's Bill next session. We have already set forth the grounds upon which we have ourselves adopted this view, and no circumstances have arisen to shake our conviction. Looking back over the history of the past six years, one wonders how any politician of ordinary sagacity could expect Suffragists to bow down before this image of wood and stone. Mr. Bernard Shaw has invited us to join in attacking the Speaker; others take their fling at Mr. Bonar Law, suggesting that his original question to the Speaker was deliberately intended to draw in the Suffrage amendments by a side-wind. *Quot homines, tot sententiae!*

For ourselves, we cannot pretend to care very much whether, and if so by whom, a trick was devised. The main fact is that Mr. Asquith, on behalf of his Government, and upon his own initiative, gave an explicit pledge to representatives of the assembled societies in November, 1911. That pledge has not been carried out. On the strength of it, the Conciliation Bill was torpedoed a year ago, and now the rules of Parliamentary procedure, as interpreted by Mr. Speaker, have put the Government in the unenviable position of a defaulter before the eyes of the world. Their failure to carry out the pledge has had its inevitable sequel in renewed militancy in a new and terrible form, coupled with forcible retaliation from isolated groups of those superior beings whom Mr. Asquith was so anxious to enfranchise. As a necessary corollary of the Government's ineptitude, even constitutional Suffragists are exposed to brutal reprisals at the hands of the semi-civilised proletariat; a reform which many members of the Government admit to be urgently required in the country's interest is indefinitely deferred; while those earnest Suffragists who see no hope save in militant methods are again flinging themselves under the Juggernaut of a soulless penal system!

The one and only method of paying the debt is a Government measure. Mr. Asquith must see that this is so. If I promise to pay a bill or build a house I am not released from that obligation because I break my leg playing "hunt-the-slipper." If Mr. Asquith cannot bring himself conscientiously to adopt this

course, let him save the honour of his Ministry by giving way to that one of his colleagues who is prepared to carry out the Government's promise. Sir Laurence Gomme, in a letter to the "Westminster Gazette" of February 24, indicates the clear course. A Bill, he says, must be introduced containing the enfranchisement of women. Mr. Asquith may vote against it; Mr. Lloyd George may vote for it. The squeamish Liberal who says fervently, "Asquith, with all thy faults I love thee still," may vote with Sir Edward Grey without embarrassing the Government as a whole. In any case, this is the only possible way, we conceive, in which the Government can wipe away the stain which it has incurred by failing to carry out a specific pledge to voteless women, and then affronting them by inviting them to toil through the Sahara in pursuit of a shoddy, self-evident mirage.

These facts are patent not only to non-party Suffragists, but also to Liberal women—to those at least who are not blinded by the glamour of Mr. Asquith's party successes. We quote as an evidence of the feeling which has been aroused a typical resolution, namely, that passed by the Council of the Women's Liberal Association in the Southport Division:—

"This Association is of opinion that the offer now made by the Government to give facilities for a private member's Bill for Women's Suffrage in the coming session does not contain any adequate fulfilment of the pledge given by the Prime Minister in November, 1911. It therefore calls on the Executive of the Women's Liberal

Federation to summon a special council meeting to consider the very difficult position in which Liberal women are now placed.

The attitude of Liberal women has all along been one of our chief stumbling blocks. It is a pity they do not remember how their male confrères anathematised the Conservative women who, after the law was passed against paid canvassing, responded to the party call for voluntary canvassing—which men would not undertake. Yet shortly afterwards these same Liberals (save the mark!) hastily swallowed their indignation and made the same request to Liberal women, who have ever since been hewers of wood and drawers of water for the self-righteous party caucuses. "You are lovers of freedom," said a famous Roman—"till you get outside your public meetings!" No wonder the Liberalism of the official Liberal Party is a by-word among all who approach politics from an impartial standpoint.

If any honest Liberal is inclined to resent this criticism, let

## This Month's Special Articles.

Laurence Housman,  
**NOT BEFORE THE COUNTRY.**

Joseph Clayton,  
**WHAT CAN WE DO?**

him ask himself what the Liberals in the House would have said and done if Mr. Speaker had promised to accept the Grey amendment and one of the others, while declining to alter the Government's own amendment substituting the residential franchise. What *did* Ministerialists say over the Speaker's ruling in connection with the Irish Bill fracas? They stand convicted out of their own mouths! And let the same honest Liberal turn to the amazing speech of Mr. Herbert Samuel. This great and good man shuddered the other day (at some length) at the dreadful blow which would be death to serious government if the House changed its point of view now that militancy had recommenced. They would have given way to force, forsooth! Does Mr. Samuel feel the same pious horror in contemplating those men who said that the country needed Women's Suffrage badly, and then voted against it because of this same militancy? A man whose Liberalism is a uniform, not an inspiration, is the Pharisee, par excellence.

While these men make broad their phylacteries, constitutional women are labouring with infinite determination to forge ahead once again; militant women are once again volunteering for the forlorn hope. A modern Xerxes might well say: "My men have become women and my women have become men!"

### ANNUAL MEETING.

The League is now approaching the end of its sixth year of existence, and the annual meeting will soon be upon us. It will be held in the . . . . Room of Anderton's Hotel, Fleet Street, on Friday, April 25, when the report of the Committee and accounts for the past twelve months will be presented, and the Committee will be elected for the coming year. The following are the rules of the League relating to the annual meeting:—

11.—An annual general meeting of the members of the League shall be held on some day in the month of April in each year, at such a time and place as may be determined by the Committee. Fourteen days' notice of such annual general meeting, or of any other general meeting, shall be given to the members of the League. An advertisement in the official organ of the League shall be deemed to be sufficient notice to the members of the League of the annual general meeting.

12.—At all meetings of the society, the Chairman of the Executive Committee, and in his absence a member selected by the meeting, shall take the chair.

13.—Any member unable to attend a general meeting shall be supplied, on a written request made at least seven days before the date of such meeting, with a copy of any resolution to be submitted thereat, and shall be entitled to vote for or against any specified resolution, by a signed letter, provided that the same is received at the office of the League one clear day before the date of the meeting.

14.—The business at the annual general meeting shall be to receive the report of the Committee for the past year, to elect the members of the Committee, to pass the accounts, and to transact any other business of which notice shall have been given to the Secretary at least seven days before such meeting.

15.—At the first and every subsequent annual general meeting of the League the members of the Committee shall retire from office, but shall be eligible for re-election. Notice in writing of any nomination for election to the Committee must be given to the Secretary at least seven days before the date of such meeting.

16.—After each annual general meeting the Committee may fill any casual vacancy.

Members are cordially invited to send any suggestions for the improvement of the work of the League as soon as possible, in order that the Executive may take them into consideration, and draw up the most effective agenda for the meeting.

### "NOT BEFORE THE COUNTRY."

Woman's Suffrage, we are told, "was not before the country" at the last general election. And we may be quite sure that it never will be before the country in a party sense until party on one side or the other has nobbled it and given it a shape to suit party interests and ends. Then, when it has been made one-sided, unconciliatory, and provocative in character—when the digestive processes of one or other of the party machines have become ripe for it—then, under the guidance of party politicians, it will be ushered into the domain of "practical politics"; then, for the first time, it will be "before the country."

Now what does that claim of the party politician to dictate times and seasons mean? It means that a grievance, of however long standing, and however great be its urgency for redress, has no constitutional claim to attention till it falls into party lines; and it means that our Constitution does not provide any fair opportunity for attention to be paid to it till it has done so. And yet for our party system there is not a word of authority in the laws and Constitution of this country! I was told the other day by a famous author that it was "unprincipled" for Suffragists to demand a Government measure from a divided Cabinet; and when I took him to task on the question of "principle," he shifted his ground and said that he meant "unpractical." My answer to that contention was that **nothing** is so practical when you are out for reform as to give embodiment to your discontent and opposition both toward unremedial government and the unjust system on which it is based. And nothing so exposes and explains the grievance of those who are fighting for a non-party reform as this declared inability of a party Government to deal with it. That inability stands as a reproach against our party system, and as proof of its unrepresentative character. "Set your House in order," we say to the Government. "Your duty is to those you govern, not to party. Because our grievance puts you to inconvenience and disturbs your internal arrangements, our right to have it seen to does not become less."

In countries where the Referendum is part of the constitutional machinery, a most important and essential preliminary to its working—and one which Anti-Suffrage advocates of the Referendum have wholly ignored—is the right it secures for a certain number of citizens to demand legislative attention, whether they be in a majority or no. It insures that their claim shall at least be considered and given a concrete form. That demand on behalf of Women's Suffrage has been made in this country by over a hundred town councils, by thousands of public meetings, by tens of thousands of petitioning electors, by many hundreds of thousands of men and women of all sorts and conditions. It has had behind it a greater ostensible array of support than any other demand for political reform put forward in our own day. The initial referendum proof has therefore been given time and again—the proof that a very large body of public opinion desires Parliament to deal with the matter effectively; and yet because at election time the voice of the country is divided on party lines, and is more articulate in acquiescence to an organised leadership than in giving shape to independent and separate demands, therefore those who are working on non-party lines are to be told once more (as at any time during the last forty years) that the cause they plead has not been "before the country."

Let those who make that assertion realise how utterly it condemns the representative claims of the present electorate, and how absolutely it does away with the pretence that the non-voters' interests and requirements are as well considered and attended to as are those of the electorate itself. Here is a great constitutional agitation in which many thousands of women have been spending their lives and their substance. More meetings, more money, more time, more labour, more unselfish sacrifices of ease and comfort have been expended to make the matter public and its need and urgency understood; and as a reward for all that constitutional endeavour comes the answer that it has not yet been before the electorate. If that is so, then the electorate

is not "the country," and does not represent the country. Nor can an electorate that has been so deaf to the voice of constitutional agitation present us to-day with any certificate of character for itself which can make a Referendum to so unrepresentative a body either justifiable or tolerable.

There are plenty of reasons why the tag-end half of the Referendum expedient is more inapplicable to the Franchise question than to any other that one can name; it is, for one thing, a decision by the privileged upon the claims of the unprivileged, and not, as in all other political questions, one in which both sides are on a par, holding in their hands the same constitutional weapon. But no reason is so confounding to the claim that a Referendum of the present electorate can decide representatively upon this question as that which is involved in the statement so beloved by Anti-Suffragists that Women's Suffrage has not yet been before the country. A few weeks ago a motor-car, manned by "joy-riders," was pursuing its unconscionable course along a road entirely its own at something double the speed limit, when an unfortunate woman got in its way. She was chucked aside and killed. To avoid recognition the absconding motorist switched off his tail-light and disappeared, and when after some weeks of concealment he was brought out of hiding a jury of his countrymen held him guiltless of the woman's death. No doubt, having the interests of motor-cars to consider, jury and joy-rider alike regarded the woman as an excrescence. If she was there before the motor-car she ought not to have been; a motor going at forty miles an hour must, like the party machine, have the road all to itself. The rules of traffic on our highways are to be keyed up to the convenience of the motorist, and ordinary pedestrians must clear out of the ways. And so a referendum of jurymen, who themselves enjoy motoring, exonerates the chauffeur of manslaughter, and we learn presently from a superintendent of police that the slaughter of pedestrians goes gaily on because in ninety cases per cent. the juries refuse to convict.

Those juries are about as representative of the damaged and dead pedestrians as the present electorate is representative of the women whose case it pretends not yet to have heard, and whose presented claim at election times it ignores.

But the women were there all the time, and when the election is over the member, like the absconding motorist, switches off his tail-light, avoids identification, and regards his pledges as though they had never been made!

A jury of his fellow-countrymen may hold him guiltless, but they will not, therefore, be representative; nor will their yea or nay in the matter touch the justice of the women's claim or lessen the injustice of further delay.

LAURENCE HOUSMAN.

### WHAT CAN WE DO?

What can we do? is the immediate question for members of the Men's League and other male persons who support the demand for Votes for Women.

Let us first admit quite frankly our responsibility for the present state of things in the country. With a Prime Minister ostentatiously hostile, and a Government unwilling to embarrass its leader, we, the men of this land, supporters of Votes for Women, have, on the whole, been content to stand and watch the agitation as spectators and critics of the combatants.

I know the exceptions, the men in this League, and in other men's societies, who have really given their health and strength to the movement. Alas! This honourable minority is so small in numbers that most of us can tell off the names of those who compose it!

To the majority Women's Suffrage has been a pious opinion, not a living belief. Passive membership in this League, for instance, has been considered by some sufficient acknowledgment of their faith.

Others have proved their devotion to the cause by never making a speech on the subject unless they could express disapproval of what other suffragists were doing. Generally those who have done

nothing have been content to explain and justify their shabby indolence by declaring their sympathy "alienated" by what somebody else has done or is about to do. Always ask of those who are alienated what they did for the cause before this process took place. Men belonging to this League honestly in favour of Votes for Women have quite calmly in the last year or two pushed on Home Rule, Welsh Disestablishment, or whatever the particular item in the House of Commons might be their fancy to the exclusion of our cause. Over and over again the safety of the Party has been the excuse for shelving and neglecting Votes for Women.

We have got to put the objects of our League before all other political matters if we are to prove our sincerity; and also if we are to make some atonement for our shameful feebleness in the past.

The Home Rulers have refused to consider anything but the success of Home Rule. Are Suffragists really less in earnest for Votes for Women than Irish Nationalists for Home Rule?

We have got to make Votes for Women the chief question for men, and to rid ourselves of the comfortable, futile notion that it is only one of many important questions.

For us at least it must be the one and only question until Parliament has carried out our will in the matter. Many things we can do.

The Press may not print our letters, but at least we can write to the papers?

At every political meeting in our neighbourhood we can heckle candidate or member.

We can drop altogether other political work until Votes for Women has been made a Government measure.

We can refuse to speak on any other subject, or to sit on any committees with anti-suffragists.

The Prime Minister is our open enemy; therefore his friends and supporters can be no friends of ours.

I know the activity of a handful of men in the League; it is those outside this handful upon whom the shame rests that this question is still unsettled.

Not Asquith, or the tiny company of professed male antis, but ourselves, the great majority of ordinary sensible men who are ready for Women's Enfranchisement, are on trial. And we can only escape condemnation by rousing ourselves to action.

JOSEPH CLAYTON.

### OPEN-AIR MEETINGS.

The open-air meetings will begin in April, and the first Hyde Park meeting will be at 3 o'clock on Sunday, April 6. Several of the old speakers are prepared to mount the platform again, but it will be a disgraceful thing if they are left to bear all the burden single-handed. The meetings last year were splendid throughout, but far more would be done if we were able to vary our speakers.

Please write at once to Mr. Gugenheim at the office, fixing a day or days on which you will be able to speak.

Now that the militant anti-Suffragist has resumed his masculine amusement of baiting women, it is further necessary that men who do not speak should make a point of being present whenever possible to prevent platforms being rushed before the police can intervene. Our less muscular friends need not suffer undue apprehension on this score; the anti-Suffragist militant is no hero and takes no risks. That is one difference between the militant woman and the militant anti.

### SUBURBAN MEETINGS.

We are going to hold as many street corner meetings as we can. Members can do a real service by sending us advice as to good pitches. If such members will fix a date, and guarantee to be at the spot with a sugar-box or a kitchen chair, the office will provide a speaker.

In this connection we cordially welcome a letter from Mr. Ernest Snowden, who suggests that we should write to individual members in various districts, where there is a group of members, and arrange for the holding of such local meetings. The Branch Secretary, Mr. Sargeant, will act on this advice at once.

### WHAT ABOUT THE MONTHLY PAPER? NOT BY THE EDITOR!

It's no good saying, as one man did, that you would be ashamed to ask a penny for so little.

No one should say that who isn't prepared to finance the paper in the public service as he might a Polar expedition.

It would have been more reasonable to doubt the wisdom of offering the "Men's League Handbook" at 6d. instead of 1s. (By the way, it's nearly sold out.)

Our nominal subscription, covering the paper, is half a crown, and if every member who gives this or more brought in ten half-crown members that sum would yield a useful surplus, whereas to make it do that now we should have to put our notes and notices into one of the women's papers.

I take it that our men no more want to have this done than to have the office run with women clerks and organisers.

Ponder on this—not too long—and then write and tell us some of these things.

If you have used the last postcard we sent you to your coal merchant, buy a stamp or call at St. Stephen's House.

I ask you:—

(a) What, if anything, do you look for in the "Monthly"? The political notes? The record of what the League is doing or intends doing? Your subscription in the list?

(b) What would you like to see there? More from our Claytons and Housmans? More excerpts and comments for propaganda, or is that coals to Newcastle? More about our active members, their wit and wisdom? Or is this vanity?

(c) Shall we run to a cartoon, an occasional illustration, or portrait, say, of the present writer declaiming, without acknowledgment, a slice of the Handbook?

Here is a sample card to the Editor:—

Yes, I read it, but  
put more stuff in it  
one can mark and  
pass on to a friend  
& perhaps capture him  
Don't be afraid to  
tell us of our workers  
who they are and  
what they do.

Paragraphs on single  
books are not so good  
as a short cause  
on pertinent books &  
pamphlets old & new  
Good Luck

H J P.

Send such a card, by all means, but offer help to carry out some of your suggestions if you can.  
Here's another:—

As a country member  
I would be glad of a well  
done Suffragette Review,  
such as "Public Opinion"  
does for the general  
Public

I am very busy  
but I speak locally  
Sometimes, and it  
would be a help.

Why don't we  
have some correspond-  
ence? It would  
help us to know a  
bit more about each  
other if it were not  
anonymous.

Glad.

Jolly good, that! "Public Opinion" is, incidentally, a good friend of Suffrage. So also is that marvellous pen'orth at the week-end, the "London Budget." In recent numbers it has helped us with cartoons, leaders, and interviews. As to correspondence, much can be done if members show whether they want it by writing in agreement or disagreement with suggestions in this article. The anonymous person must be the sub-editor. We cannot let him suffer personal animus when, in the correspondence, effusions from the Rev. Watt A. Screeed and Colonel R. Catmee get pared down or omitted.

Monthly polemics can be kept fresh by having some letters answered in the same number—not by the Editor. No! Not by him, whoever he may be. It becomes tiresome and chokes off others. Let it be a column free to all comers and unhampered by fears of resignations because A. approves or B. abuses, say, the methods of militants or Cabinet Ministers.

Please write and help the Editor to make the paper what you want it to be. Writing a cheque helps a good deal. We can't even then throw in a magazine and a coloured supplement for the children like the "London Budget," but we can with your help turn out something you will be glad to read and to show your friends—or enemies.

### WOMEN'S WORK AND WAGES.

For up-to-date information as to women in the Labour market, read Miss Margaret McMillan in the Men's League Handbook. (Price 6d.) A few copies still left.

### ODDS AND ENDS.

BY THE DEALER.

The Committee and Staff recently discovered that, to reach our Treasurer's house, the directions somewhat similar to those the late Andrew Lang gave to a guest should be followed: "Walk along the Cromwell Road till you drop dead; then turn to the right."

With the advent of real democracy it is reasonable to expect that the age of assured progress will begin. Then for the first time on this planet men will begin to make gains that cannot be lost.—(Chas. Ferguson, in the *London Budget*.)

Votes don't affect wages. Oh, no!

The Progressives appeal to women to vote for them in the L.C.C. elections on the grounds that they will get women a trade union rate of wages.

From the *Co-operative News* (?)

"There is nothing more abominable in British industry than the way that the labour of women has been used to make cheap goods and high profits." I wonder why?

Ex-Sultan Hamid gives it as his opinion that "Woman in Europe has a great deal too much freedom to remain womanly."

It would be difficult to pick a finer example of the worthlessness of such expressions of opinion without some definition of the terms used.

What is womanly to a Sultan? And what is the freedom in England of which the ex-Sultan is thinking?

The freedom from convention of the country house-party, or the freedom of living in at the drapery emporium, or the freedom to live out of the workhouse, or the brothel, by stitching at a penny an hour?

Isn't the freedom demanded by an Englishwoman of to-day the same freedom as the rest of us demand? To be allowed to tread a path of our own choosing through a world in the good ordering of which we have had a hand.

As to your womanly woman, she should have, I take it, all such qualities as go to make your manly man; combined, should this be lacking in him (which is unlikely), with the mothering instinct and a delicate sense of intuition.

More than one paper has been quoting the "Bison" story and others of London children. They remind me of an "Underground" bookstall boy.

"No, sir! But I've little books on fishin', an' golf, an' motorin'."

Me (or I): "What are you talking about? I want that paper behind you, with a picture on it, 'Votes for Women.'"

Boy: "Oh, yus! I thort yer said 'Notes on Swimmin.'"

The Workers' Handbook mentions a shop where the fines deducted from wages, amounting in some cases to five shillings, are marked on a list never shown to the employees, who are obliged to guess what crime they have committed.

The crime? Guessed it in one! The crime of being a woman—too easy. No prize.

It is stated in the "Sociological Review," with reference to the preface written by Alfred Russel Wallace to Prof. Westermarck's "History of Human Marriage," that, to those who know, Finland is easily the first of nations to-day in culture and civilisation. What an irrelevant note; Wonder why I put it here?

### THE ENTHUSIAST.

He has just left.  
He came intending to give me some information for a letter.  
He was half an hour late, so I missed the mail.  
He has not given me any information yet.  
He has left behind him a book he asked me for.  
He has taken away a memorandum of addresses I wanted.  
He has smoked my last "five a shilling."  
He has dropped the fag end with subtlety in the waste-paper basket, and I, in a delicate state of health, have been round the room on all fours to trace by the aroma where he put it.  
Women mustn't have votes, they've no common sense.

France: For what she has done Mme. Paquin gets the Légion d'Honneur.

England: For what her husband has done Mrs. Scott gets rank, style, and precedence.

On the other hand, we have Sir Herbert Beerbohm Tree, but no Lady Ellen Terry, various nonentities in Parliament, but no Mrs. Humphry Ward, M.P.

The wife does not stand apart from aspirations after noble deeds or from the perils of war, but is her husband's partner in toil and danger, destined to suffer and to dare with him alike in peace and war.—Tacitus.

**FORCIBLE FEEDING NOT DANGEROUS! MISS LENTON WAS RELEASED BECAUSE A LUNG WAS PIERCED BY THE FEEDING TUBE.**

### NATIONAL UNION OF W.S.S.

Nothing is more significant in the present situation than the steady trend of opinion towards the standpoint that our cause can have little hope under the present Administration. Private members' Bills, we used to be told, are no use. We have learned our lesson. Now we know that amending a Government measure is out of order! Mr. Asquith won't introduce a Women's Suffrage Bill himself. Ergo, Mr. Asquith must go, and with him Mr. Harcourt and the other antis.

We reprint from the *Manchester Guardian* a report of the deliberations of the National Union Council, held on March 3:—

At the meeting of the Council of the N.U.W.S.S. the former policy was relinquished of working for individual members of all parties who are favourable to the Suffrage. The non-party solution of the question by means of a private member's Bill being considered no longer feasible, and Mr. Asquith having made it clear that no Government measure for Women's Suffrage would be introduced, the Council was strongly of opinion that the policy to be adopted at bye-elections must be aimed at shortening the term of office of the Cabinet as at present constituted. To this end it resolved that no Government candidate should be supported, though the few remaining "tried friends" of Women's Suffrage should not be opposed, and the powers of the election fighting fund for supporting Labour candidates were considerably extended.

In preparation for the next general election it was decided to concentrate on the attack of seats held by anti-Suffrage Liberal members, particularly Ministers, to undertake the defence of seats held by Labour members who have taken a strong line in support of Women's Suffrage, and to support candidates standing in the interests of Labour in any constituency where such action was thought advisable by the Executive—provided always that the Labour candidate was personally satisfactory on the Suffrage question.

The following resolution was passed:—"That the election policy of the N.U.W.S.S. be as follows:—(1) The general objects in all bye-elections shall be to shorten the term of office of the Cabinet as at present constituted, especially by opposing anti-Suffragist Ministers; (2) to strengthen any party in the House of Commons which adopts Women's Suffrage as part of its official programme."

### THE MEN'S LEAGUE IN EASTBOURNE.

The first Suffrage Exhibition held under the auspices of the Men's League with the object of illustrating women's work in Art, Literature, and the Sweated Industries, took place in the Town Hall at Eastbourne on Saturday, February 8, and we may say at once that the experiment was abundantly justified. Thanks to the energy and determination of Mr. Jaakoff Prelooker, who not only conceived the idea, but inspired the other members of the organising committee with his own enthusiasm, the result was never in doubt. By way of advertising the exhibition, a poster procession took place on the previous day. Several members of the Men's League from London took part in it, among them Dr. C. V. Drysdale and Messrs. John Simpson and F. N. Sargeant. Rumours had been industriously circulated throughout the town that an onslaught on the window panes was contemplated, whether from alarm at the news of Mr. Simpson's recent imprisonment we do not know, but many of the more nervous shopkeepers had taken the precaution to put up their shutters.

However, all along the route our reception, though quiet, was certainly quite favourable, more especially on the front, where the well-known yellow and black banner of the Men's League triumphantly encountered the full force of a ten-knot breeze. We had announced an open-air meeting to take place in the evening at the Fountain, but unfortunately the rain, which had held up all day, descended in torrents and flooded us out.

The exhibition was opened by Mrs. Zangwill, and messages wishing success to the enterprise were received from the Earl of Lytton, the Bishop of Lincoln, and Sir John Cockburn, and even from sympathisers in France, Germany, Switzerland, and Bulgaria. The proceedings began at noon, and the excellent and varied programme arranged by Mr. Prelooker was warmly appreciated. Speeches, rag-time selections, Russian dancing, and two humorous sketches were intermingled with discrimination, and not a moment flagged. Mr. Timpany, of the National Union, spoke on the moral aspect of the movement, Mr. Francis turned many a sidelong glance on to the iniquities of the sweated industries, while Mrs. Kineton Parkes pointed out the value of tax resistance as a potent weapon to be used against the Government. Miss Evelyn Sharp, of the W.S.P.U., dealt with the new Parliamentary situation created by the new crisis. Meanwhile good business was done at the stalls. At the literature stall of the Men's League we had quite a run on Dr. Drysdale's pamphlet on "Work and Wages," and the League handbook also sold well. The stall promoted by the Anti-Sweating Society evoked a large amount of interest. In the evening the Men's League took entire charge of the proceedings. Mr. Herbert Jacobs gave his audience excellent reasons why men should work for Women's Suffrage. Mr. Malcolm Mitchell spoke effectively on "Women and Education," and Dr. C. V. Drysdale dealt in his own masterly way with the effect of the vote upon the rate of wages. Nor must we forget Mr. John Simpson, who sent all his hearers into roars of laughter by his humorous recital of his prison experiences. Successful as the exhibition was, the most gratifying feature is the practical result that has been the outcome of it. A branch of the Men's League is now in course of formation—and in this we have been splendidly supported by Lieut.-Colonel R. W. Nicholson, and steps are now being taken to form a Suffrage Club in the town for the use of the members of all the leagues.

We would specially like to mention the publicity given in the *Eastbourne Gazette* and other local newspapers, due to the sympathy of Mr. Arthur Beckett, the well-known writer on the Weald and Downs of Sussex. We desire to express also our warm thanks to the organising committee and to those members of other Suffrage societies who backed us up so generously.

F. N. SARGEANT.

*For Propaganda Work.* Buy, read, and hand to your friends, Jaakoff Prelooker's summary of the Men's International Congress (1912). On sale at the office (post free, 2d.). Dr. Drysdale's pamphlet on Women's Work and Wages (2d.) is essential to all speakers.

### BRANCH NEWS.

#### CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY MEN'S LEAGUE.

On February 20 we held a large public meeting in the Guild-hall. Mr. F. M. Cornford took the chair, and the speakers were Mrs. Swanwick, the Earl Russell, and Mr. J. Malcolm Mitchell. The resolution was passed by a three-quarter majority. There were a few reserved seats, but the rest of the hall was free, and consequently a large body of irresponsible undergraduates came and did their best to make the speakers' work more difficult for them. Suffrage speakers, however, are not so easily disheartened. Mrs. Swanwick's speech in particular was much appreciated.

On February 27 a meeting for members and their friends, held in a lecture-room at Christ's College, was addressed by Mrs. Vulliamy, her subject being "The Vote and Social Reform." The questions and discussion which followed were a most interesting feature of the meeting.

Some of our members have distributed literature on various occasions, and a general increase of activity has been shown.

E. VULLIAMY, Hon. Sec.

#### MANCHESTER BRANCH.

The annual meeting of the Manchester Branch is due to be held this month, but the precise date has yet, at the time of writing, to be decided on. The past year has not been very exciting for us in Manchester, whatever it has been for our friends at headquarters. One reason for this is that the officers have been prevented by the demands of business from giving as much of their time to the work of the branch as they could have wished. As a result, nothing on a big scale has been attempted by the branch, independently of other organisations.

The two principal local efforts of the National Union and of the W.S.P.U., respectively, however, have received our cordial assistance. In the summer the latter society held an imposing procession through the streets, followed by a most successful open-air demonstration in one of the largest of the parks in the city, and in this gala day the branch took part, contributing four members to the score of speakers on whom the task of haranguing the great crowd that assembled devolved. In the autumn, the branch co-operated with the National Union in the organising of a big mass meeting in one of the largest of Manchester's public halls, and contributed a substantial sum towards defraying the cost of the demonstration.

In the course of the by-election in North-West Manchester—as in that of the South Manchester by-election which preceded it—we approached both the candidates with regard to their attitude on the Suffrage question. Both candidates expressed themselves as being favourable. While in the case of South Manchester the victorious candidate, Mr. Philip K. Glazebrook, had avowed himself an "Anti," the new member for "North-West" is a "Conciliation" man.

During the autumn the branch kept in touch with the Labour leaders, and brought what pressure they could to bear on them in the hope of securing an anti-Government Labour vote in the event of the now defunct Franchise Bill reaching third reading stage without any women's qualification being included. We were assured by Mr. Snowden of his support in this direction. Attempts to interview two of the leaders of the Labour party were made, but without success.

W. BENTLY CAPPER (junior),

Manchester.

Joint Hon. Sec.

#### EASTBOURNE.

As the outcome of the recent Exhibition of Woman's Work at Eastbourne a branch of the Men's League is now being inaugurated. Lieut.-Colonel R. W. Nicholson is kindly acting as temporary hon. secretary, and with the assistance of Mr. Arthur Beckett, the well-known writer on the Weald and Downs of Sussex, is now getting together a strong local committee. Our thanks are also due to the

### THE MILITANT ANTI

The general Press is a curious study for a cynic. When the militant movement began, its chief *raison d'être* was the impossibility of inducing the Press to publish any real account of constitutional propaganda. The militant agitation thrived very largely owing to the readiness which the Press displayed to announce in advance and to report at great length any and every militant activity. In fact, the Press welcomed the increased circulation which it derived from scare placards about militancy, and a small army of so-called journalists besieged the offices of the W.S.P.U. and the W.F.L. asking for advance information.

In other words, editors of the daily Press, in search of profits, deliberately aided and abetted a form of Suffrage propaganda which they denounced editorially with whole-hearted hypocrisy. Then they demanded condemnation from non-militants. When condemnation came, they either suppressed it or satirised it as insincere.

Nowadays they are seeking for increased circulation on another tack. They are sedulously inciting the less intellectual among their readers—who are, of course, the large majority—to furnish "copy" by retaliating upon Suffragists generally. Of course, they are very solemn and sententious about it. The "Westminster" lamented the probability of such retaliation, and has indulged its mania for respectability by a half-hearted criticism of the woman-baiting which has recently occurred. But it had the supreme audacity to add that women had brought it upon themselves! We do not remember seeing any remark in the "Westminster" to the effect that the House of Commons had brought militancy on itself by its policy of shuffle and make-believe.

We bitterly regret the contemptible attitude of the Press, and for the sake of the male sex are ashamed that men should dishonour themselves by attacking women in Hyde Park and elsewhere. The militant Suffragist in pursuit of an ideal is on any showing courageous and self-sacrificing. What are we to say of the militant anti-Suffragists who in dozens set upon a handful of isolated women, who may or may not be militant, and knock them about in the street? Such men (save the mark!) have the courage of wolves; they hunt in packs, and the risk they run is nil.

The smug leader-writer pours out crocodile tears over the folly which has invited this retaliation from the superior sex; mock force, they say, will evoke real force. Yes, but years ago before militancy began the same cur yelped round the women who wanted to be doctors: the early Suffragists were mobbed and beaten before militancy began; the male wolf publicly tore and bit at the fallen woman whom some fellow-wolf had dragged through the mire.

Quite a number of saintly gentlemen (especially Liberals) have waxed indignant at women (and Tories, too) who have heckled at meetings. Are such gentlemen aware that large bodies of men are now attending even constitutional Suffrage meetings, and—knowing that there will be only women stewards—are violating the great principle of freedom of speech? Are their pure souls shocked at such occurrences? "You brought it on yourselves," they say. And again comes the reply, "So did your Liberal Government."

"The woman tempted me, and I did eat," said Adam, and the modern parallel is nearly complete. The "Westminster" and its colleagues of Fleet Street are typically serpent-like in their methods, but, while the modern Adam is always munching the apple, Eve is forcibly fed.

J. M. MITCHELL.

### TO THE LEAGUE SPEAKERS.

#### IMPORTANT NOTICE.

Speakers are earnestly requested to send in the list of their engagements fulfilled during the past month, and their fixtures for the current month, in time for publication in the paper. Unless these are received at the office at the very latest on the 26th day of each month, they will be too late for insertion.

proprietors of the *Eastbourne Gazette* for the notices given in this newspaper.

Mr. Startup was recently invited by several friends in East Grinstead to address a meeting for men only. The meeting was presided over by the Rev. G. B. E. Riddell, and amongst others present were the Rev. Rupert Strong, curate of the parish church at East Grinstead, who lately held a religious service for the cause. It was unanimously agreed to form a branch of the league, and Mr. Harold Godwin was elected hon. secretary. It was also decided to invite Lord Robert Cecil to act as local president, and Messrs. Spalding and Corbett to be vice-presidents.

The meeting arranged by the Bournemouth branch was duly held in the St. Peter's Hall on February 14. The Hon. Rev. R. E. Adderley was in the chair, and dealt with the question from the religious and the educational standpoint. Earl Russell spoke in his usual effective manner, and Mr. Laurence Housman's speech was much appreciated by a large and enthusiastic audience. We are glad to learn from the hon. secretary that the branch is making steady progress.

F. N. SARGEANT.

### HILARY'S CAREER.

(Author, Parry Truscott. Publisher, T. Werner Laurie, Limited.) The aim and spirit of this book are good, but we are sorry we cannot praise it as a work of art. It is a rather long drawn-out and tedious sermon, without any pretence to literary style, and with sundry irritating repetitions and mannerisms which might easily have been avoided. The text of the sermon, taken from a speech in the middle of the book, is admirable, and we give it in full.

"My text begins: 'The Mother is not the Parent of her own Child.' This startling assertion is strictly, legally correct. Provided the child was born in wedlock and the father is alive, the law does not recognise the mother as a parent. Moreover, under all normal circumstances, the law supports the wishes of the father against those of the mother in every detail of the life of the children—as to their education, religion, domicile, vaccination, or any other matter. This is equally true of girls and boys, and cannot be voided by pre-marital agreement. Even after his death she may find her wishes for the future of her children subject to those of a guardian appointed by her husband's will. The mother, on the other hand, can only nominate a guardian to act with her husband after his death, and the appointment will not take effect unless the court ratifies it. This the court will not do unless the husband is notoriously unfit."

To expound this text the writer gives us the story of a mother's love for her boy and of her resolve to give him the career that seemed best for him. Her husband opposed her wishes and had he been really her husband she would have been obliged to yield, with the result that the boy's career would have been ruined. It so happened that in a moment of folly Hilary's father had married an unsuitable woman who had run away after three months marriage. The discovery of this by Hilary's mother gave her the key to the solution of her difficulties, for in the eyes of the law the boy was illegitimate and his mother therefore had full control over him. The book has many pretty and natural touches (as well as some unnatural ones) in its account of the relationship of mother and son, and doubtless it will not fail altogether of its purpose.

G. E. S.

### LITERATURE.

The New Constitutional Society for Women's Suffrage has published a translation of Monsieur A. de Morsier's pamphlet on Woman's Suffrage which should prove a valuable addition to the literature of all Suffrage speakers and propagandists. Monsieur de Morsier's philosophy on this greatest question of the day is broad and deep, and emphasises that side of it which Anti-Suffragists so frequently forget—i.e., that above and beyond the narrow view of sex lies the eternal one of human rights and liberty. The catechetical form of Part II., "Answers to Objections," ought to make this convenient little pamphlet an indispensable *vade mecum* of all new speakers. Price 2d.

## FEBRUARY SPEAKERS' LIST.

Feb. 1	Camberwell S.L.E.S.	Dr. C. W. Saleeby	Feb. 25	Bolton B.C.D.S.	F. Stanton Barnes
" 1	Holloway W.F.L.	John Simpson	" 25	St. James's Suffrage Club	J. W. Jeudwine
" 1	Watford L.S.W.S.	J. M. Mitchell	" 25	Egham N.U.W.S.S.	J. M. Mitchell
" 1	Westminster M.F.W.S.	Dr. A. D. Macpherson	" 25	Knightsbridge N.C.S.W.S.	Rev. Hugh Chapman
" 1	Westminster M.F.W.S.	Victor Prout	" 26	Weymouth C.U.W.F.A.	Laurence Housman
" 2	Hyde Park N.C.S.W.S.	Reginald H. Pott	" 26	Battersea W.S.P.U.	Dr. A. D. Macpherson
" 2	Victoria Park M.F.W.S.	Victor Prout	" 26	Kilburn W.S.P.U.	Reginald H. Pott
" 3	Holloway W.F.L.	Dr. C. V. Drysdale	" 27	Farnham N.L.Y.L.	Sir William Chance
" 4	Birmingham C.U.W.F.A.	H. Baillie-Weaver	" 27	Oxford C.L.W.S.	Rev. T. A. Lacey
" 4	Birmingham C.U.W.F.A.	Dr. F. Stanton Coit	" 27	East Ham F.C.L.W.S.	Rev. Fleming Williams
" 4	Ashford, Kent, N.U.W.S.S.	J. M. Mitchell	" 27	Fulham M.F.W.S.	Dr. A. D. Macpherson
" 4	Holloway W.F.L.	D. W. Caddick	" 27	East Grinstead M.L.W.S.	Geo. E. Startup
" 5	Queen's Hall, N.P.L.	Rev. C. Fleming Williams	" 28	Westminster L.S.W.S.	Rev. Llewellyn Smith
" 5	" "	H. W. Nevinson	" 28	Camden Road W.S.P.U.	Rev. R. B. L. Exton
" 5	Holloway W.F.L.	J. Y. Kennedy	" 28	Edmonton M.P.U.	Arthur Mackinlay
" 6	Sibford, Banbury, N.U.W.S.S.	Arthur Gillett	TOTAL: 100 speeches. Daily average, 3'6.		
" 7	Eastbourne M.L.W.S.	John Simpson	<b>INSTRUCTIONS TO CHAIRMEN.</b>		
" 7	" "	Jaakoff Prelooker	As soon as there is sufficient audience—and not a moment later—introduce the speaker, or the first speaker, of the occasion. The more briefly the better. Do not describe him in terms of fulsome flattery; always remember that, whether out of doors or indoors, the worst turn you can do a speaker is to over-praise him. If he is not up to his usual form, it is an unkindness; if he is above it, his wine does not need your bush. When he has done, call on the next speaker. Do not seek to improve the occasion by interpolating remarks of your own. If there is a succession of speakers, arrange their respective time-limits before they begin, and keep them to these; do not have the slightest hesitation in quietly telling a speaker at a convenient pause that he has just a few minutes left. As chairman, you are responsible to subsequent speakers that they receive fair treatment in the matter of time.		
" 7	Westminster L.S.W.S.	F. N. Sargeant	At the close of the speeches invite questions, and, before taking them, make any necessary announcements as briefly as you can. Questions are generally asked of individual speakers through you. But if addressed to the platform in general, courtesy usually allows the last speaker the right to answer. With this in mind, let it be arranged that the last speaker is someone competent to give general replies. When a question has been answered, even if but moderately well, do not add a further reply of your own, except you have, perhaps, some local information bearing on the point, which the speaker could not be expected to know. Otherwise it is exceedingly bad platform manners for you to add a single word.		
" 7	Muswell Hill L.S.W.S.	R. F. Cholmeley	<b>THE SUFFRAGE ANNUAL AND WOMEN'S WHO'S WHO.</b>		
" 7	" "	J. Y. Kennedy	(Stanley Paul and Co. 6s. net.)		
" 7	Hampstead C.U.W.F.A.	D. W. Caddick	The ever-increasing magnitude of the Women's Suffrage movement makes it difficult for even the most enthusiastic worker in the cause to keep abreast of its various phases. For this reason, and as giving another indication of the importance of the movement, the present volume is to be welcomed; and it will doubtless be found of considerable interest and value to organisers and speakers as well as to the rank and file of suffragists. Some idea of the magnitude of the movement can be gauged from the fact that the book contains more than 400 pages, and 1,000 biographies, although the latter are admittedly very incomplete owing to the non-reception of information in time for publication. Particulars are given of 44 Suffrage Societies in the United Kingdom, and their numerous branches; of the International movement; and a history of the progress of Women's Suffrage and cognate questions in Parliament from 1832 to the present date. The book also contains particulars of the various Suffrage papers in this country and abroad, and a list of the M.P.'s and their votes on the last reading of the Conciliation Bill.		
" 7	Bow M.P.U.W.E.	Frank Denbenham	The biographies occupy about two-thirds of the book and contain much interesting information. Although several men appear among them, it is somewhat strange to find no mention of such stalwart supporters as Mr. H. N. Brailsford, Sir John Cockburn, Sir Victor Horsley, and the Earl Russell. We hope these omissions will be rectified in the next issue, which we understand will appear before long.		
" 7	Eastbourne M.L.W.S.	Reginald H. Pott	C. V. D.		
" 8	" "	Herbert Jacobs			
" 8	" "	Dr. C. V. Drysdale			
" 8	" "	J. M. Mitchell			
" 8	" "	F. N. Sargeant			
" 8	" "	Jaakoff Prelooker			
" 8	" "	John Simpson			
" 8	Chelsea M.F.W.S.	Dr. A. D. Macpherson			
" 9	Hyde Park N.C.S.W.S.	J. M. Mitchell			
" 9	" "	J. Y. Kennedy			
" 9	Victoria Park M.F.W.S.	Victor Prout			
" 9	" "	Dr. A. D. Macpherson			
" 10	Newport N.U.W.S.S.	Laurence Housman			
" 10	Banbury N.U.W.S.S.	H. Baillie Weaver			
" 10	Pavilion W.S.P.U.	Rev. R. B. Exton			
" 10	Caxton Hall W.F.L.	John Simpson			
" 11	Guildford N.U.W.S.S.	Rev. A. H. Fletcher			
" 11	Cambridge N.U.W.S.S.	W. M. Mirlees			
" 11	Bracknell N.U.W.S.S.	Sir William Chance			
" 11	Clevedon N.U.W.S.S.	Laurence Housman			
" 11	Bermondsey C.L.W.S.	Rev. F. M. Green			
" 11	Northwich L.D.S.	F. Stanton Barnes			
" 13	Cambridge N.U.W.S.S.	W. M. Mirlees			
" 13	Winchester N.U.W.S.S.	H. Rolleston-Stables			
" 13	Street (Somerset) M.L.W.S.	Laurence Housman			
" 13	Hampstead W.S.P.U.	H. W. Nevinson			
" 13	Battersea W.S.P.U.	A. J. Billingham			
" 13	Westminster M.F.W.S.	Dr. A. D. Macpherson			
" 14	Barnsley N.U.W.S.S.	H. Baillie Weaver			
" 14	Bournemouth M.L.W.S.	Laurence Housman			
" 14	Bournemouth M.L.W.S.	Earl Russell			
" 14	Westminster N.U.W.S.S.	Philip Snowden, M.P.			
" 14	Chelsea M.F.W.S.	H. S. L. Fry			
" 14	Edmonton M.P.U.	H. J. Gillespie			
" 16	Hyde Park N.C.S.W.S.	J. M. Mitchell			
" 16	Victoria Park M.F.W.S.	Dr. A. D. Macpherson			
" 16	Victoria Park M.F.W.S.	Victor Prout			
" 18	Knightsbridge N.C.S.W.S.	Joseph Clayton			
" 18	Bath C.L.W.S.	Rev. Claude Hinscliff			
" 19	Ardrick S.B.L.D.	F. Stanton Barnes			
" 19	Mayfair I.W.F. Club	Reginald H. Pott			
" 19	Heathfield N.U.W.S.S.	Dr. C. V. Drysdale			
" 19	Battersea W.S.P.U.	Dr. A. D. Macpherson			
" 19	Bayswater C.L.W.S.	Rev. Claude Hinscliff			
" 19	Edmonton M.P.U.	A. J. Billingham			
" 20	Cambridge M.L.W.S.	Earl Russell			
" 20	" "	J. M. Mitchell			
" 20	Wandsworth N.U.W.S.S.	Walter Hogg			
" 20	Pinner C.L.W.S.	Rev. Claude Hinscliff			
" 20	Chelsea M.F.W.S.	Dr. A. D. Macpherson			
" 20	Kensington W.T.R.L.	Reginald H. Pott			
" 21	Harringay W.F.L.	Rev. F. M. Green			
" 21	Harlesden N.U.W.S.S.	Rev. Geo. E. Startup			
" 21	Chelsea C.L.W.S.	Rev. Claude Hinscliff			
" 21	Edmonton M.P.U.	Reginald H. Pott			
" 21	Wincanton N.U.W.S.S.	Laurence Housman			
" 21	" "	Rev. R. B. Exton			
" 21	Portsmouth N.U.W.S.S.	J. M. Mitchell			
" 23	Hampstead J.L.W.S.	Herbert Jacobs			
" 23	" "	Philip Hartog			
" 23	Hyde Park M.P.U.	H. J. Gillespie			
" 24	Canterbury W.S.P.U.	Joseph Clayton			
" 24	Bow M.P.U.	H. J. Gillespie			