

Men's League for Women's Suffrage

No. 43.

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

Monthly Paper.

ONE PENNY.

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

April, 1913

NOTES OF THE MONTH.

THE I.L.P. CONFERENCE.

March 29.
The Independent Labour Party held its Annual Conference this week. Two items on the agenda were of special interest. The first was a resolution from the Bow and Bromley branch protesting "indignantly against the brutal and disgusting forcible feeding of Suffragist prisoners, both men and women," and affirming the conviction "that such barbarous methods of dealing with political offenders or other persons are unworthy of a nation calling itself civilised." This resolution, we are glad to see, was carried unanimously.

We cordially agree with the terms of this resolution, which expresses the view advanced on many occasions in these columns. No civilised person who has read the account issued by Miss Sylvia Pankhurst of her own sufferings can fail to agree that forcible feeding is a loathsome and disgusting outrage. But civilised persons are comparatively rare; otherwise women would have received the vote in 1832. The tone of the debate in the House of Commons on the forcible feeding question was on all fours with the process itself—loathsome and disgusting. "On all fours" is a phrase which lends itself with peculiar aptness to persons in whom rationality and humanitarianism are equally conspicuous by their absence. The *Home* Secretary (there is a bitter irony in the title) has at least risen beyond the level of the average brute in this connection. In the course of his reply to his critics, he asserted that if suffragist prisoners were not forcibly fed they would starve themselves to death. We, who know some of the prisoners, have always been aware that death is a penalty which they would willingly accept on behalf of the cause. It is one of the tragedies of modern masculinity that the average male will not believe this essential fact.

NO PLURAL VOTING BILL.

Of more abiding importance is the second item on the I.L.P. agenda. Mr. Philip Snowden, in whose honesty of purpose we have thankfully learned to trust, moved and carried the following resolution:—"That this Conference **condemns emphatically the breach of faith of which the Cabinet has been guilty** in withdrawing from its oft-repeated pledge to take full Cabinet responsibility for any Women's Suffrage Bill which passed its second reading by a free vote of the House of Commons; and declares that the only satisfactory method of

THIS MONTH'S SPECIAL ARTICLES.

OBEDIENCE IN MARRIAGE.

By CECIL CHAPMAN, J.P.

THE ISSUE.

By S. D. SHALLARD.

A WEIGHTY JUDGMENT:

THE RIGHT TO "HECKLE."

dealing with the situation thus created is for the Government itself to introduce a Women's Enfranchisement Bill framed on broad and democratic lines, and invites the Labour party to bring all possible pressure to bear on the Government to secure this, **and, in particular, vigorously to oppose and defeat all proposals for amending the franchise OR REGISTRATION LAWS** unless women are included therein.

Attempts were made to amend this resolution by the omission of the words "or registration laws," and so to leave I.L.P. members free to support the Government's Plural Voting Bill promised for this session. These attempts were defeated, and Mr. Snowden's resolution was carried as above. The essential point is sufficiently obvious. We all know that all except Unionists are pledged to destroy the system under which a man may vote in more than one constituency. The Prime Minister, having been released by the Speaker's ruling from the quagmire into which he had led his party by the Reform Bill, has promised to keep his word, not to voteless suffragists, but to the solid Coalition majority of anti-plural-voters, by introducing a registration reform in the form of a Plural Voting Bill. The I.L.P., following Mr. Snowden and Mr. Keir Hardie, now refuse this measure as constituting an affront to the Women's Suffrage claim. They are more careful than Mr. Asquith and his Liberal followers of the honour of Parliament. The present Government has no kind of right to deal with any franchise problem before its pledge to women has been fully carried out.

THE NEW PRIVATE "BILL."
The fact that Liberal Members are blind to the wrong which has been done to the Suffrage cause by Mr. Asquith's failure to carry out the spirit of his self-imposed pledge is sufficiently evidenced by the solemn proclamation which heralds the introduction of the new Private Member's Bill. This Bill, which embodies the proposal of the Dickinson amendment to the Reform Bill, was discussed by Mr. J. Howard Whitehouse, M.P., in the "Daily News" of March 25, and as Mr. Whitehouse is honorary secretary of the committee which has drafted the Bill, his view may be taken as official.

Mr. Whitehouse says—and his words should be engraven on the recollection of all who know the facts—

"I believe there is good reason for thinking that the Bill will be carried. Personally I have no hesitation in saying that the prospects are far better than were the prospects of the Suffrage amendment to the Franchise Bill."

It is really incredible that any Member of Parliament should write such a sentence. Mr. Whitehouse, earlier in his article, says:—"Much more discouraging to the Liberals in the House is the attitude of the National Union of Suffrage Societies. The weakness of the position of the latter is that their leaders do not realise how bad a method the one which collapsed last January really was, and how much better plan is a private Bill, which will yet have as full facilities as though it were a Government Bill. . . ." The awkwardness of the wording seems to betray a want of conviction in the argument.

ANOTHER SOMERSAULT.

Sir John Simon, who is chairman of the committee, must be exceedingly annoyed to find his hon. secretary thus contradicting his explicit statement (made last

December) that the Reform Bill offered a really good opportunity. Every Member of Parliament, except Mr. Whitehouse, knows that the new opportunity is far worse than that offered by the Reform Bill. The reasons are obvious. (1) A private Member's Bill on the Dickinson basis will require Unionist support in all its stages. This it will receive only in very small numbers. (2) The Irish Party have no kind of interest in supporting the Bill; whereas had any amendment passed last January, the Government was pledged to take responsibility for it, and every Nationalist would, of course, have voted for the remaining stages with enthusiasm. So would nearly every anti-suffrage Liberal. (3) The new Bill will receive—nay, invites—the opposition of the anti-suffrage Liberal from the beginning, and (4) Mr. Asquith's personal influence will further cause many Liberal abstentions. (5) There is one session less in which the Bill may be returned to the Lords, and the present Government is one session nearer its demise.

While, however, we cannot feel optimistic about the new Bill, we none the less wish it all success, and we trust that pledged supporters will rally every single vote. The Government may at any moment go out on a snap division. The honour of the House is at stake: a solemn obligation lies upon every suffragist in the House. J. M. M.

All Suffragists are reminded of the admirable lectures given on Wednesday evenings, at the International Franchise Club, 9, Grafton Street, W. No suffragist can afford to forego the opportunity provided by the Club for discussion and interchange of ideas.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

The attention of the members is called to the difference between the amount paid in subscriptions and to that sent in as donations. People fear the word "subscription." But why? They can, unfortunately, always be dropped. It is most desirable that we should feel that there is a reasonable likelihood of more money being regularly subscribed, if we are to establish our finances from solid foundations. It can be done; there is no doubt about that. I am quite sure the stalwarts who have responded generously to our appeals will do their part always. But I do beg more members to ease our task by saying what they hope to do in the way of regular subscriptions, yearly or quarterly or monthly. Will members, even if they have recently given—and, still more so, if they have not—tell us what we may hope for in this direction. For list of subscriptions, see p. 191.

MEN'S LEAGUE FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT, FEBRUARY, 1913.

Receipts.		Expenditure.	
£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Balance Jan. 31st	70 16 3		
Subscriptions	4 12 6	Salaries, printing, &c.	49 13 9
Donations	16 18 3		
Literature sales	4 6 9		
	25 17 6		
		Balance Feb. 28th	47 0 0

* Against this nominal balance are various liabilities immediately accruing, and amounting to about thirty pounds.

THE ANNUAL MEETING,

Anderton's Hotel, Fleet Street, Friday, April 25th, 8 p.m.

Members are reminded of the Annual Meeting, to be held as above on April 25th. Let us have a large muster. The Agenda will reach members next week, together with the Annual Report which the Committee will present at the meeting.

If you want the new Committee to enter into office with a feeling of confidence, you must be present to give them an enthusiastic send-off.

FORCIBLE FEEDING PROTEST.

KINGSWAY HALL MEETING.

The great meeting in the Kingsway Hall was the occasion of fine speeches by Bernard Shaw and the Bishop of Lincoln, one of our vice-presidents. It is too late in the day to give a report, because everyone has seen accounts in the daily Press. We were glad to see the Bishop braving the inevitable indignation of the Pharisees of 1913, to whom the publican and the sinner, the fallen woman and the thief, are just as obnoxious as they were when Christianity first crusaded against the creed of the whited sepulchre.

Mr. Shaw was at his best in a speech which appeared verbatim in the *London Budget* of March 23. We wish he would overcome his unconquerable shyness, and risk gaining fame on frankly Suffrage platforms. His very speech was a sufficient reply to his own reasons for not doing so.

A KNIGHT "ERRANT."

Sir Frederick Banbury in the House of Commons:—"If you let one woman die (*i.e.*, of starvation) there will be no more." Anything like self-sacrifice naturally elicits a snarl of incredulity from a statesman whose sole distinction is that he has never failed to "obstruct" a single measure which aimed at social or moral advance. He is mentally a bully of the Judge Jeffreys type, whose presence in a modern legislative assembly is of itself a sufficient reason for women having the vote.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTIONS.

£ s. d.		£ s. d.	
W. G. Furmiston	0 1 0	Right Rev. Vernon Herford	0 1 0
Messrs. A. W. and B. Roberts	0 5 0	L. Burke	0 1 0
William H. Jayne	0 2 6	E. G. Clayton	0 4 0
Grove Jones	0 1 0	G. H. Martyn	0 5 0
Ernest A. Bageley	0 1 0	S. L. Francis	0 5 0
H. W. Dickenson	0 5 0	John T. Read	0 2 6
Rev. W. H. Paine	0 10 0	J. J. Broome	0 2 6
A. G. Stevens	0 2 6	H. P. Clarke	0 2 6
E. Morgan	0 1 0	Dr. W. C. Steen	0 10 6
H. J. Gillespie (quarterly)	0 10 0	Arthur Huggett	0 2 6
H. Kent	0 1 0	Harold Jacobs	0 2 6
Frank F. Bird	0 1 0	Eric H. L. Jacobs	0 1 0
H. R. Heather	0 5 0	George Slow	0 2 0
E. T. Harold Godwin	0 2 6	Charles Sayer	0 2 6
W. H. Bennett	0 2 6	W. A. Jewson	0 5 0
H. G. Stalley	0 2 6	R. H. Kidd	0 2 6
R. J. Callaway	0 2 6	Walter Jerrold	0 10 6
Rev. Rupert Strong	0 2 0	Henry C. Taylor	1 1 0
Stuart Woodhams	0 5 0	J. C. Millington	0 2 6
N. S. Nathan	0 5 0	C. E. Larard	1 1 0
S. D. Shallard	0 5 0		
A. Baynham	0 5 0		
G. T. Coates	0 10 0		
		Total	9 15 0

DONATIONS.

£ s. d.		£ s. d.	
Herbert Jacobs	1 0 0	H. E. Turner	0 2 6
Bentley Capper	0 2 6	C. M. Scrimgeour	0 5 0
Rev. Maurice F. Bell	0 5 6	J. W. Hinckley	0 5 0
N. Parley	0 3 0	S. L. Francis	0 5 0
S. B. Lucas	0 2 6	Mr. Tenvant	0 2 6
John H. Greenhalgh	0 10 0	H. R. Lewis	0 10 6
National U.W.S.S.	1 1 0	F. J. Matheson	1 1 0
J. E. Raphael	0 2 6	Rev. R. B. L. Exton	0 5 0
Mrs. Arncliffe Sennett	1 0 0	W. J. King	0 2 6
George A. Smith	1 1 0	John W. Minnitt	0 2 6
J. V. Scholderer	0 5 0	L. B. Reynolds	0 5 0
H. Stuart Horne	0 5 0	John Bartrum	0 1 0
Frank Armstrong	0 10 0	W. Laurence Bradbury	2 2 0
Mrs. Cunliffe	1 0 0	Frank E. Marshall	5 0 0
F. A. Percival	0 2 6	A. P. Spanton	0 5 0
William Adams	0 2 6	Percy Vaughan	0 2 6
H. B. Goulden	0 10 0	G. Spiller	0 1 6
F. Brown	0 5 0	C. W. Haig	1 1 0
J. B. Davis	0 2 6	Rev. F. Lewis Donaldson	0 1 0
W. G. Earengay	0 5 0	J. W. Moore	0 5 0
A. W. S. Mitchell	0 5 0	J. W. Cathrall	0 5 0
J. Lazarnick	0 2 6	H. Golding	0 3 0
John Gordon	0 2 0	M. C. Wray	0 10 0
Edward Hanson	0 2 6	Frank R. Taylor	0 10 6
Laurence Housman	1 10 0	Miss Lilley	0 1 0
Geo. E. Boxall	0 5 0	H. C. Manning	1 0 0
Hugh E. Riviere	2 0 0	Dr. Miskin	1 1 0
G. T. Coates	0 10 0	Mrs. Jane Patterson	1 0 0
Frank Evershed	0 10 6	A. Mandefield	0 3 6
W. L. Hallward	0 5 0	G. Streatfield	3 3 0
W. de Vere Mathew	1 1 0	S. K. Daniel	0 1 6
A. E. Hopkins	0 5 0	Edgar Morris	0 2 6
A. W. Beck	0 5 0	Alex. E. MacEwen	0 10 6
E. A. Matzinger	0 10 0	R. F. Cholmeley	0 10 6
Frank Denney	0 3 0	H. J. Taylor	0 2 6
H. Arncliffe Sennett	2 0 0	E. Stickland	0 5 0
F. Carlton Smith	0 2 0		
F. Gleming Baxter	2 2 0		
A. Wilne Collier	2 0 0		
		Total	44 11 0

THE HANDBOOK.

In response to a number of inquiries, a number of copies of the Handbook are now on sale in a stiff cloth binding in the League's colours. The price is 1s.

It is pre-eminently a book to be retained as the most striking collection of essays on the suffrage question by some of our most prominent publicists. In the new binding it is a book for libraries, and all members and friends are urged to buy it at once, and present it in suitable quarters.

OBEDIENCE IN MARRIAGE.

CECIL CHAPMAN, J.P.

The tide of the feminist movement all over the world is gradually flowing into caves, creeks and crannies, which for centuries have been uninvaded by anything new. The state of marriage, as we are in the habit of calling it, was one of the first high and dry sanctuaries to be reached, and is now on the eve of being covered by the waves. There are thousands of Mrs. Partingtons, of course, bravely trying to keep out the flood with their mops, but they will shortly have to be rescued by those who, coming in with the tide, are bent upon saving matrimony itself from another kind of destruction. The flood is not going to injure, but to heal it, from a process of decay which has come from its being so long shut away from the wholesome air of heaven. The State since 1857 has taken to itself the jurisdiction over marriages which formerly belonged to the Church, and experience has proved to those who have studied the matter that the unequal status of women, which has caused and justified their revolt, is largely due to the teaching embodied by the Church in her marriage service. In that service is to be found the idea that a husband is to be to the wife as God Himself.

"Wives submit yourselves unto your own husbands as unto the Lord, for as the Church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything."

This is the doctrine which Milton interpreted in the lines—

He to God only,
She to God through him.

The husband is called the head of the wife, and she is enjoined to obey him as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him Lord.

She is to reverence him, and be submissive and obedient to him in all things. He is to comfort her; she is to serve and obey.

The excuse for this subordination of the physically weaker to the physically stronger sex, and the ignoring of spiritual values, is the story of the second chapter of Genesis, which allegorically describes woman as having been made out of man's rib to be his companion after every other living creature had been made male and female on perfectly equal terms.

"O God, who also (after other things set in order) didst appoint that out of man (created out of thine own image and similitude) woman should take her beginning."

It is further justified by the teaching of the Apostles St. Paul and St. Peter, but especially the former. It is a matter for surprise, in dealing with the history of creation, that any persons should accept as a description of fact what is obviously an Oriental picture to account for the relations of the sexes as they were understood by the writer. It is, at any rate, a description which is in direct conflict with that contained in the first chapter of Genesis, where man is created "male and female," and God is said to have created them both in His own Image, and given them both the dominion over other living creatures. It is surely reasonable to prefer the description which accords not only with science, but with our idea that God is a spirit, and that our similitude to Him consists in our subordination of physical to spiritual force.

It is not a matter for surprise that St. Paul, who was accustomed to the veiled and cloistered women of Tarsus, should express himself in terms which are wholly unsuited to the women of England in the twentieth century. It was to the women of Ephesus and Colossæ in the first century of the Christian era that he was writing, and it would be nothing

short of a miracle if his injunctions were adapted to our present stage of civilisation upon anything except moral and spiritual ideas. There are some people no doubt who find moral or spiritual teaching in church regulations. I address myself to other than these in the hope of enlisting their services for the evolution of a higher morality by substituting freedom and equality in the state of marriage for obedience and domination. Institutions and rules are like clothes which are suitable for one stage of a human being's existence, and quite unsuited to another. The history of man's domination is probably traceable, at any rate in part, to the *patria potestas* which was the legislator's way of governing the family by a representative of State power, just as praetors were appointed to govern provinces. In the infancy of Christianity, when the surrounding world was heathen and law was weak, it is quite likely that wives were consciously treated as children for their protection against outside dangers. If a girl was unmarried after a certain age her safety was best secured by her going into a nunnery, and a man who desired to keep himself unspotted from the world was well advised to shut himself up in a monastery. If, however, Nature led them to marry, and to remain in the world, then safety was best to be found in making marriage as much like a monastery or nunnery as possible in the strictness of its discipline and the irrevocability of its vows. Let us be sincerely grateful for all the good which came from such views in the preservation of marriage during the dark ages of our history. We know that, in spite of all the pious intentions of its early regulators, the history of marriage in Christian, no less than in heathen countries, is full of the unrestrained brutality of men, and the unredressed suffering of women. The Institutional idea of women as the property of their husbands was very likely an incentive for defence against outside attacks, but it encouraged, on the other hand, and gave facilities for attacks from within. A woman was not supposed to resent attacks upon her honour by a third party—that was her husband's business. She was looked upon as offending all propriety if she resented liberties on the part of her husband—that also was her husband's business. Psychologically, the giving and taking in the act of marriage, which is Nature's provision for the preservation of the race, has been mistaken for a difference of intellectual and moral qualities which justifies the maintenance unimpaired of an institution in which a free contract between two independent human beings is studiously ignored. Time has proved, as civilisation has advanced, and the force of law has increased, that the outside dangers for the state of marriage have decreased, but the dangers from within have become accentuated as women have learned to feel its restrictive and humiliating conditions. To lessen or remove these dangers the true remedy is the insistence upon the contractual view of marriage, and the gradual removal of the proprietary and institutional view. Obedience to any dictation but that of conscience and reason in the contractual view is as unbecoming to a full-grown woman as to a man. The spirit of love which alone clothes marriage with beauty is fostered by freedom and killed by bondage. The necessity for man being placed in God's seat is clean gone for ever, and the time is ripe for full and ungrudging faith in the competence of women to take charge of their own lives, and share with their husbands on equal terms the responsibility for the lives of the children. The days of regulated submission and obedience for women are no longer consistent with the highest morality, and the Church, if it desires still to be called national, must adapt its services to the urgent demands of the national conscience.

THE INTERNATIONAL ALLIANCE.

Preliminary Conference, Vienna, June 11 and 12.
International Congress, Budapest, June 15 to 20.

According to *Jus Suffragii* for March 15, the International Woman Suffrage Alliance will have two gatherings this year—*i.e.*, two days, Wednesday and Thursday, June 11 and 12, at Vienna, and the following Monday to Friday at Budapest. This arrangement ought to greatly enhance the interest of the reunion. Travelling arrangements have now been made, and very substantial reductions and facilities have been granted by the Austrian and Hungarian railways. Full particulars will be given next month, or may be obtained at our office.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

We deeply grieve to hear from *Jus Suffragii* that Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt proposes to retire from the presidency of the International Woman Suffrage Alliance at the Budapest Congress. Those who have attended previous Congresses of the Alliance well know Mrs. Chapman Catt's remarkable capabilities as a president and leader, and it will be indeed difficult to replace her. The tour which she recently took around the world in order to awaken women in the Eastern nations and the success she attained in inducing delegates from these nations to attend the Budapest Congress should make that Congress of even greater interest than its predecessors.

The Women's Suffrage movement in the United States seems to be rapidly growing in volume and strength. This month the State of Michigan, which was declared to have rejected the Women's Suffrage amendment a little while back by the small majority of 740, will have a new election on the subject, examination of the ballot-boxes having shown evidence of many fraudulent votes. The women are confident that they received a majority of the legitimate votes, and as special precautions are to be taken against fraud in the new elections it is to be hoped that victory will be now secured. The legislatures of Nevada, South Dakota, and Montana have all three adopted Woman Suffrage amendments, and they will be submitted to the electorate in 1914, while both Houses of the New York Legislature have adopted the Bill by large majorities, and it will go to the electorate in 1915. If this is passed, it will most certainly mean the rapid extension of Women's Suffrage to all the States.

The Danish Women Suffragists have been greatly delighted at the formation of the new Men's League. The Reform Bill in Denmark is now undergoing the ordeal of the Conservative amendments, but no amendment has been proposed to the Women's Suffrage proposition.

The Dutch Suffragists, including the Men's League, are working very actively at present, and the latter has issued a searching list of questions to every Parliamentary candidate. Unfortunately, the president of the Women's Suffrage Association, Dr. Aletta Jacobs, has been seriously ill, and this has hampered the work.

At the approaching Congress at Budapest the question of collecting international information will be to the fore. The National Union will bring forward its Press and Information Bureau scheme, and the French societies are proposing the collecting of information concerning the actual laws passed after the granting of Women's Suffrage, with especial reference to the wages question.

C. V. D.

THE ISSUE.

By S. D. SHALLARD.

This month finds us once more in the midst of the Parliamentary struggle over Women's Enfranchisement. It is a critical moment, and it is not too much to say that none to whom this is a living issue dare neglect any possible means of affecting the result, however remotely.

I often wonder whether we realise exactly what women feel about this matter—whether we realise what we should feel in their position.

We hear much of the necessity of women's votes in order to aid the solution of certain moral problems, to raise the status and wages of women workers and such like reforms.

With the importance of these points you may easily get a majority of the Commons, and a majority of reasonable responsible men everywhere to agree with you, but so could you have done 20 years ago. They were the foundation of the Women's Rights movements in this country and everywhere else. But the enthusiasm and determination of the modern Women's movement, which is now sweeping women into its net by thousands, springs from something more potent than well-reasoned arguments. It has its foundation in feeling and in passion—the only forces which give stimulus to effective action.

In this case the stimulus of the whole movement is in the sound instinctive revolt against social and political domination—the passion for liberty—and it is these which have made the history of the world. Remedial legislation is a modern device, but revolts against tyranny and struggles for freedom are as old as humanity, and it is these healthy world-old instincts which urge women to their irresistible movement of to-day.

As tyrannies have always done, we take women's money from them by the powerful engines of direct and indirect taxation, to spend as we please—to put in our own pockets, say, if we be Ministers, State officials, or Members of Parliament.

We order and direct, as we please, women's lives in many personal relations, even in regard to their own children. We don't allow them—our paymasters—even to hear our often futile discussion over the passage of these laws except through an arrangement of prison-bars. At our mere whim we order them all out of the Court of Justice where the administration of these laws is proceeding—partly at their expense—even though one of their number be the subject of those proceedings.

These are but a few of the aspects of women's relations to the modern State which are rousing them to bitter revolt, but it is well for us to realise something of this if we mean to render them any true service.

The majority of the House—a considerable majority—is already intellectually converted to belief in the justice of a Woman's Suffrage measure, but political prejudice or passion or personal ambition readily outweigh these intellectual convictions. A whisper from a Whip, or from Mr. Redmond, and away go the conviction and the pledge. . . .

One thing, then, we need to do, in whatsoever way we can do it. That is to demonstrate that there are a growing number of men who will see to it that it does not pay Members or Ministers to break their pledges to the women; that they will be held to account for their conduct in this matter; and that if they are determined to oppose or evade a constitutional reform too long overdue, those who are at one with the women in this matter will inevitably be thrown into an attitude of active opposition, perhaps of permanent opposition, to the party which thus violates its professed principles and its proclaimed pledges.

A WORD FROM THE OFFICE.

The last three months have been a very busy time here. Committee meetings and monthly papers seem to have succeeded each other in rapid succession, and it has taken us all our time to do the necessary work and to keep pace with our correspondence. The replies to the Treasurer's appeal, issued to all the members, have been fully dealt with, and the appeal has resulted in a substantial addition to our funds. That, however, is not the only result. The object of the appeal was as much to ascertain the attitude of our members as to obtain their financial support. We now know, upon the whole, where our members stand. Many have responded generously, and many who have been unable to send money have sent renewed assurances of their sympathy and their readiness to help in every possible way. There remains, however, a certain number of members who have not made the least response of any kind. Their interest being apparently so slight, they are not very likely to read these words. If they do, will they be kind enough to send along some reply or other? We welcome money, service, sympathy, and even criticism or opposition, anything, indeed, but indifference. Besides thus obtaining financial help and this invaluable analysis of membership, the office during these three months has been reorganised, the monthly paper considerably improved, the annual report prepared, exhibitions held at Eastbourne and Folkestone, and with all this a constant supply of speakers has gone forth from headquarters to address meetings of our own and of many of the other Suffrage Societies.

We are glad to find that this office is being used more and more by other societies who know that we are always ready to place ourselves at their disposal for any service we can render by supplying speakers, giving information, sending stewards, or in any other way we can.

The work of these three months is but a beginning. The most important work lies ahead of us. The question is no longer whether women will obtain the vote, but when; and it is more important than ever that those men who believe in the justice of the women's demands should do all in their power to insure the satisfaction of these claims. The first task, so far as this office is concerned, must be to establish our finance upon a thoroughly satisfactory footing, making a careful estimate of the expenditure required for the carrying on of the work, and taking such steps as are possible to see that that income is regularly forthcoming. There is one way in which the members of the League can very substantially help, and that is by securing fresh members. If all those who have written to us in appreciative and sympathetic terms would secure only one member, at a subscription of at least half-a-crown, this would be a very substantial step towards the achievement of our goal. Half-hearted and half-convinced members are no use. But is it too much to ask that all of us between now and the annual meeting should personally enlist at least one man in our cause?

* * * * *

This month we have lost the services of Mr. de Maria, whose intimate knowledge of the Suffrage movement has been of invaluable assistance to the League, and whose unflinching kindness and good nature were appreciated by everyone who was brought into touch with him. He has the good wishes of us all, and we are glad to know that he is recuperating in Suffolk after the long strain of office work. We wish him all good fortune.

GEO. E. STARTUP.

ODDS AND ENDS.

BY THE DEALER.

Someone has been saying that the famous Venus (de Milo) has a Suffrage face. On the other hand, our anti-Suffragist Premier has more the face, or faces, of Janus.

H. Provost Battersby, in the *Saturday Review*, says that it is not the use of a vote that would do women mischief, but that her position as a voter would make her a marketable commodity. Why she should, on this ground, be denied a vote any more than a man, I cannot say; but it is those who will not give women the dignity of a vote who are keeping her a "commodity" in a far viler market.

"Nuts in May." Suffragist Version:—

"Here we come gathering Votes, Hurrah! Votes, Hurrah! Votes, Hurrah!"

"Who will you give the Votes to, pray?"

"To women the same as men to-day."

"Who will you send to fetch 'em away?"

"We'll come ourselves, and we won't take Nay,

"If we knock from night to morning."

"Hunt the Slipper"—Government version (since Walton Heath), "Pursue the golosh."

"Consequences." Women's Version:—

There's only one consequence to all the consequences women are taking—Votes for Women.

Suffragist "Hide and Seek":—

Seek to give the Government a hiding!

Very terse! No more of them this month.

A sweated shirtmaker said, last week, of her life, "It is not living, it is lingering." And yet men and women who would help her are told to be patient.

Thousands of years ago an old Roman made a good joke, and everybody laughed at it. He said that the only way to insure equality between the sexes was for the woman to be the inferior. Our Mr. Lulu Harcourts are saying the same thing to-day, in other words, and expecting to be taken seriously.

We need no statue to Florence Nightingale—the place we give women in our hospitals is a sufficient tribute to her. We allow them to scrub the floors, to wash the sores, even to tend the stores, and we may one day, when women have votes, allow them to sit on committees responsible for those stores, prescribe remedies for those sores, and walk those floors as freely as the men.

Mrs. Humphry Ward, in her new novel, says that the heroine looked on Votes for Women as a dusty matter of the machinery of Government. Women, of course, are encouraged to think this by Anti-Suffragist men, the least perspicacious of whom is thoroughly conscious that Votes for Women is really going to touch him, in a way he feels he won't like, in his home, in his office, and at his pleasures.

We hear an amazing amount nowadays as to the Government mandate; let us hear something more definite about the

Government woman-date, and see that they keep their word on whatever date they arrange.

Until women have the vote, I would like to see pasted on every notice-board and hoarding the words of Mr. F. D. Acland: "We want comrades, not exasperated suppliants for our fellow voters."

From the *Anti-Suffrage Review*: "As the Suffrage movement has now identified itself with Labour-Socialist politics, &c., &c." "Identified" is good—good enough to mislead innocents who read only the *Anti-Suffrage Review*.

Could anything be more delicious than to see the "antis" bragging that during an election campaign "every beershop" had their card in the window. Just the place for it.

CAPITALISTS GOING ABROAD.

Two more (possibly many more) Anti-Suffragists threatened last week to leave England when women get the vote. They might as well leave at once before the rush. But if they avoid countries still free from the terror they will still feel restless, even in China.

Lord Curzon, at the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, spoke almost with tears of the fact that boys were still allowed to amuse their leisure hours in wanton attacks on them. He might turn his attention with advantage to the Press that backs him in his Anti-Suffrage views, and is inciting idle lads to make wanton attacks on women. This will have a far worse effect on the characters of the lads than birds'-nesting. And Lord Curzon, unless deceived by the gutter-Press which publishes outrageous snapshots of Suffragist women, suggesting that they are vulgar viragoes, must know that it is true also of women, what he says of his feathered protégés, that we "still keep captive some of the most beautiful objects of God's creation, which were never intended either for imprisonment or for torture."

A learned article on St. Valentine's Day solemnly states that "from more liberal times the valentine has degenerated until it has ceased to be anything more tangible than a word of kindness or a courteous kiss." To women valentines without votes must be like porridge without oats.

WOMEN LAWYERS.

Sir Joseph Ward, speaking of women's opportunities in New Zealand, says that they are admitted to the Bar, and that their *clientèle* appears to be, in every instance, men, not women, and the number of cases they succeed in winning shows their ability to influence judges and juries. And then he adds, "I do not believe that women are inferior to men." Quite so! No more do our professional men. They fear them as competitors, and keep the door shut on them where they can.

In Austria tax-paying women have had to be content with showing their political views by proxy. They can get men to act for them—usually voters who have already voted in some other district. The English Anti-Suffragists have been content with something still poorer; they have sent non-voting youths and riff-raff to represent their views with noise and mud at Suffragist meetings in Hyde Park and elsewhere.

WOMEN AND LITERATURE.

The best saying in recent books about Women's Suffrage occurs in "The Odd Farmhouse," by "The Odd Farmwife" (Macmillan. 6s.). The authoress accepts the woman's claim as a demonstrated proposition, and adds: "You can lead an ass to the water, but you cannot make him drink. This particular ass will not drink for fear of disturbing the flattering reflection of himself. It is the donkey Narcissus of male egotism that opposes you, the most obstinate ass going." Will not someone delineate Mr. Lulu Narcissus Harcourt as the Immaculate Egoist?

Immaculate Asinine Lulu,

Well—"groomed" and so proud of his "coat"!

With the obstinacy of a Zulu,

When women came asking the vote.

Drink, pretty creature, drink!

Members will be wise to look out for C. Gascoyne Hartley's *The Truth About Women*, to be published on April 6. Those who know the authoress recognise in her a woman of real aspiral qualities, and one favoured beyond most with a delightful fluency and ease of expression. The book is a serious contribution to the modern problem of the relations between men and women, historical, political, economic, and biological. The authoress, who writes under her maiden name, is the wife of an old Men's Leaguer—Mr. Walter Gallichan.

The *Christian Science Monitor* has a rather unconvincing title, but an admirable sense of direction. Talking of militancy, it says: "If public sympathy is being alienated from a principle, public sympathy must be as near a scullion's as Falstaff found honour. If . . . are behaving nothing like as badly as the incendiaries of the Reform era or the cattle-maimers and dynamitards of the Home Rule struggle, it can only be said that the charge of insincerity is perilously nearly established." Excellent, but why waste good space on two unnecessary adverbs?

WESTERN MEN WITH EASTERN MORALS.*

To the man or woman accustomed to close his eyes to and shun the investigation of all problems of morality, Mr. Willis's book dealing with the relationship of the white man to the coloured woman in Eastern lands will come as a startling eye-opener.

Armed with a thorough first-hand knowledge of what life in the Far East means to the white settler, of the horrors of isolation and loneliness in the Burmese jungle, and of the dangers and difficulties besetting the white man, especially the young white man, in the Malasian towns, where prostitution is the order of the day and disease is unbridled, the author of "Western Men with Eastern Morals" approaches his subject frankly and fearlessly, without prudery, giving, as illustrations of the facts he lays bare, examples which have come under his own observation. His pictures of Oriental life are vivid and realistic, and although at first the literary style of the book is somewhat weak and the diction is not infrequently careless, nevertheless at times, particularly when strongly stirred, Mr. Willis writes with some considerable force, and whilst he never tires his reader through over-lengthy discussion, he also never degenerates into sensationalism.

* "Western Men with Eastern Morals," with an introduction by the Editor of "Truth." W. N. Willis. Published by Stanley Paul and Co. 5s. net.

Two points, in particular, he strives to impress upon his readers—the urgent necessity for the control and prevention of disease, and the responsibility of the white man towards his half-caste offspring. Dealing with the former problem, Mr. Willis quotes the words of a young and highly educated Chinaman, who, after delivering himself in no mild terms upon the subject of "the hypocrisy of Western morality," concludes thus:—

"The one evil, the greatest of all evils in the countries governed by you, is the unrestricted licence to spread disease. You do not realise how it is sapping your national vitality. Perhaps some day you may wake up. Some of you are always telling China to wake up. If you don't soon wake up to the importance of this question at home and abroad you will have a rude awakening."

No less forcibly does the writer urge home the second problem.

"We are faced," he says, "with the problem of an educated and semi-Christianised coloured race to whom we deny equal rights and equal privileges. . . . This breeds in his heart hatred and revenge." And later, "An unemployed nation is the asset of the devil, and underpaid labours of a nation are a curse and a blot on boasted civilisation. In the East unemployment means making agitators of the men and prostitutes of the women, that is, if you intend to educate them and then drop them."

"The matter is one of much more than local concern, because it affects the credit of the British name in the eyes of natives we rule, and in the eyes of foreigners who may sit in judgment upon us, that one of the results of British rule and British influence in semi-barbarous countries should be the creation of a large population of wretched fatherless half-caste children."

The point of view of the half-caste himself and the anomaly of his position are sympathetically portrayed. To the problems he raises, however, the author offers but few solutions, and it is difficult at times to agree with the remedies he puts forward. The book should, however, prove of considerable interest both to students of eugenics and to the general public, and if it does but arouse public interest in the burning questions with which it deals, the book will have fulfilled the prime object which its writer had in view.

PUBLIC SPEAKING AND CHAIRMANSHIP.

The excellent "Advice to Chairmen" in our last number, which, if any of our speakers missed it, they should turn to, ought to have been acknowledged as an extract from "Public Speaking and Chairmanship," by G. E. O'Dell.* This little book is full of wit and wisdom, uses our cause as one of its chief subjects for examples, and refers the student not satisfied with its size to standard works on the subject.

Here are a few of the good things Mr. O'Dell says: "To learn to speak simply for the vain pleasure of being heard is a deadly sin. Public speech is a sacred thing; leave it to the serious people." He is very emphatic on slow speaking. He says, "If you have been speaking rapidly, recommence at a slower pace." Excellent advice. Then again, "Raise the voice, speak deliberately, as though your hearers must wait on your good pleasure."

*The "Clerk" Publishing Society, 110, Cheapside, E.C. Price 6d.

He has much to say on the importance of keeping in good health, and having the humility to go and hear trained speakers. "There is no escaping this," he says; "it is an essential part of your training."

Mr. O'Dell does not, perhaps, lay the stress he might on the benefit to be derived from listening to fellow-speakers instead of lolling about and looking as though what you had said yourself, or were going to say, was so much more valuable.

He further says, "Don't apologise. If you have a cold, you have no business to have one; you have, likewise, no business to be unprepared, and you have no business to speak for too long and to aggravate the trouble by apologising for it."

The whole of his injunction headed "Be deferent." is well worth while studying.

The book is so useful that my speaking readers really must buy it; but here is one more quotation, perhaps the best thing in the book, which many might remember who do *not* pose as public speakers, "It is so easy to think you have ideas because you have a certain attitude of mind."

CORRESPONDENCE.

The Editor, MEN'S LEAGUE Monthly Paper.

DEAR SIR,—

It is no unusual thing to find people who think that the movement to get votes for women has only been common talk for the last two or three years. If this were so, we should not find their demand treated as a matter of common knowledge as we do in a prologue written by the celebrated Canon Haig-Brown in November 28, 1891, Head Master of Charterhouse, and in writing the lines I quote below for Old Carthusian Theatricals, it is obvious that he did not imagine victory for the women's cause would be long delayed. It should be noted that Carthusian Monks had to take a vow of celibacy, and, moreover, that the present school was founded by Thomas Sutton in the year 1611 A.D.

After referring to Mr. Allen, who for many years arranged and acted in the Old Carthusian Theatricals, Dr. Haig-Brown concludes with these words:—

"Brother Carthusians,—It should be our aim
To keep the record of a famous name,
And prove in this—as in whate'er we do—
Worthy of Charterhouse, ourselves and you.

But stay—the ladies—whose entrancing art
Will grace and beauty to our play impart;
Alas! a stern and tyrannous decree
Excludes them *now* from our fraternity.

In days to come—when women's rights are won—
They shall be Old Carthusians, every one,
And, added to our roll of fame, shall crown
The brow of Sutton with a new renown.

Now raise the curtain—when our parts are played,
Say if we keep the promise we have made."

No one can imagine that a great Head Master of a great school would have written this to be recited in public over twenty years ago to the boys of Charterhouse if the women's demand had not already made itself strongly felt at that time.

Yours, &c.,

WALDRON SMITHERS.
O.C.

Mariners Lodge, Knockholt,
April 2nd.

VOLUNTEERS WANTED.

WILL YOU HELP.

A certain amount of work in the office could well be done by a capable volunteer suffragist, in the direction of answering suffragist inquiries by word of mouth and by letter. Will anyone offer for definite days or half-days or hours. Irregular work is of no use for this purpose.

A WEIGHTY JUDGMENT.

A very important judgment has been delivered in the police-court this month. We take the following account from a local paper:—

"MR. PROUT A WITNESS.

"Mr. Victor Prout, the artist, of Stonard-road, Palmers Green, was a witness in a case heard at North London Police-court on Saturday, in which a man was summoned for assault by Mr. Mark Wilkes, a schoolmaster, who was ejected from a public meeting at Upper Holloway, held in connection with the L.C.C. election. Mr. John Burns, the President of the Local Government Board, was addressing the audience, and Mr. Wilkes asked him about equal pay for women teachers and men teachers. People yelled, "Turn him out," and he was pushed to the door, where defendant, a man named Fordham, seized him and, with assistance, dragged him into the street, in which process his coat was torn.

"Mr. Victor Prout, who also attended the meeting, said he saw defendant struggling with complainant in the passage, hanging on to his neck and shoulder. Witness had been turned out from the meeting for asking Mr. Burns whether his Government opposed the citizenship of women.

"Mr. Hedderwick, the magistrate: Were suffragettes at the meeting?

"Witness: No, but I feel very strongly on this subject.

"Mr. Hedderwick said that at a meeting of the kind anyone had the right to put a question so long as it was pertinent to the occasion and put in a proper way. People who were at meetings to preserve order had the power to take legal action against anyone there for the purpose of interrupting. The proper course was to take such a person's name and address and apply for a summons. Before persons were ejected from a meeting they should first be asked to leave immediately. He came to the conclusion that complainant was assaulted by defendant, whom he fined 10s. and 10s. costs."

It does the magistrate credit that he did his part to preserve, for men at any rate, the reasonable right to put questions at a public meeting, even of the President of the L.G.B.

Mr. Hedderwick's words were more emphatic than the report in the local Press would suggest, for he said he didn't care whether the meeting was Mr. John Burns' or Mr. Asquith's, anyone had a right to put any question he liked so long as it was pertinent and put properly. We congratulate Mr. Hedderwick upon his courageous independence.

[We regret that lack of space prevents the insertion of our monthly list of speakers, and also of extremely interesting contributions from Dr. Mansell-Moullin, Miss Blouw, and Mr. E. Lipson.—ED.]