

# THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW.

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

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

No. 82.

LONDON, AUGUST, 1915.

PRICE 1d.

## THE NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR OPPOSING WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

### Executive Committee :

*Presidents:* THE EARL CURZON OF KEDLESTON; LORD WEARDALE.

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

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

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

*Hon. Secretary:* MRS. JEYES.

*Assistant Secretary:* MISS HELEN PAGE.

MISS G. LOWTHIAN BELL  
MRS. ARCHIBALD COLQUHOUN  
MRS. LAURENCE CURRIE  
MRS. FREDERIC HARRISON  
MRS. GAMBLE

MRS. MASSIE  
MISS G. S. POTT  
MRS. HUMPHRY WARD  
LADY WILSON.  
KENNETH CHALMERS, Esq.

LORD CHARNWOOD  
HEBER HART, Esq., K.C.  
W. G. W. HASTINGS, Esq.  
LORD HAVERSHAM

A. MACCALLUM SCOTT, Esq. [M.P.]  
A. MACONACHIE, Esq.  
ARNOLD WARD, Esq., M.P.

### WOMEN'S WAR WORK.

In an article published a few weeks ago in *The Times* a "Neutral Observer" described the immense task which German women are fulfilling in the war, not only in the economical management of their homes, but in providing equipment and munitions for the Army. The outbreak of the war, it was pointed out, found them unorganised, unaccustomed to public duties, and devoid of any political education or aspirations, such as have been manifested by women in other countries. But before many months had passed German women appeared to be bearing their full share of the war "not merely as mothers, sisters, wives of the men fighting for their safety and honour, but rather as an organised body politic which has specific duties and responsibilities." Compulsory service has taken nearly all the men of an arms-bearing age for military duty. The burden that has consequently fallen on the women of the country, the same writer remarks, is stupendous, yet it is borne with quiet fortitude. "Everywhere women have been thrust into positions of great responsibility. . . . In all parts of the country I saw women working in the fields doing a man's work with the added handicap of insufficient help. . . . There is scarcely an occupation which German women have not taken up with success; but most interesting of all is their direct share in the equipment of the forces in the field. Forty per cent. of the workers engaged in the manufacture of high explosives, of shells, and in the packing of cartridges are women." Almost identically the same testimony is borne to the part played by French women. They, too, are employed in munitions factories, while another neutral observer writes in a private letter: "As you know, at all times a great deal of work on the land in France is done by women, and now without any talking or organising they are doing it *all*, with the help of old men and young boys, and a very few of the *exemptés*—for the latter are mostly occupied with other things. There is hardly a man

to be seen in the early morning market. The women gather the vegetables and fruit, load the carts, drive them in in the early morning, and set out their wares ready for 5 o'clock to strike. They are burned brown, and their hands are hard and rough; but they do everything—the heavy as well as the light work—and there is no question of the number of hours off, of Sunday work or anything else, so long as necessary work is waiting to be done."

If from Germany and France a neutral observer turns to Great Britain, what is the impression he is likely to form of British women's share in the war? If he is content with superficial observation or relies upon the Press in order to form his opinions, his impression will certainly be a very imperfect one. He will instinctively turn where women's war work is most talked about, most freely advertised, whether it concerns the equipment of hospitals, the organisation of relief, or the swelling of the general volume of employment, professional and industrial; he will hear of women volunteers, of women signallers; in quieter walks of life he may have seen women ticket collectors, lift-women, postwomen, and girl messengers. On the other hand, he may remember the so-called "women's war pageant" in London on July 17, when thousands of women marched through the streets under banners bearing such devices as "We demand war work and service for all"; "We are not slackers"; "Women's battle-cry is, Work, work, work." How is our neutral observer to reconcile these apparent contradictions? If he turns in one direction, he will be assured by the talkers that, so great has been their response to the nation's need that nothing will satisfy them in the future but a share for all women whether they wish it or not (in virtue of their numbers, necessarily, a preponderating share) in the government of the country. From the other direction he will learn that, whereas 87,000 women have recorded their readiness to serve their country, the services of only some 3,000 have been utilised. Our neutral, if he be wise, will accept neither of the ready-made views offered, but

will probe for himself beneath the surface. As a result of his investigations we venture to believe that he will find that the situation in Germany or France is reproduced in Great Britain, with such variations only as correspond with the differences in the national characteristics. In the pictures drawn above of woman's share in war work in Germany and France it will be noticed that, while the result is the same, the means employed are essentially different. In the former country we have yet a fresh illustration of the highly organised State machine. German women are lined up as it were to the order of the drill-sergeant the whole day long, whether their time be spent in the house, the office, or the factory. Nothing is left to their own initiative; they are told what they have to do; for the rest they know that what is not specifically allowed is almost certain to be "verboten." In France the same amount of work is done by women, but the centralised machine is not so much in evidence. For Government requirements all the women needed are forthcoming; the remainder of their own accord turn their hand to the work that lies nearest to them. What then is the position in Great Britain? Certainly the elaborate machinery with which we are familiar in Germany is not to be found here. As far as munitions are concerned, it is obvious that until the Government recognises the need for the maximum output of which the country is capable, there can be no great employment of women in munitions factories. But are British women for this reason falling a long way behind the women of Germany and France in their response to their country's need? We are convinced that they are not. The form of their response may be different. So long as the nation is content with an army of three million men gradually enlisted there must be less dislocation of the ordinary national work than there is in France or Germany. The vacancies caused by the enlistment of men will be distributed over many trades and professions, no single one being entirely depleted. There will, therefore, be the less need for women to take control of, let us say, the agriculture of the country. But women will be required, and are to be found, as farm labourers, railway servants, messengers, and in a hundred other posts normally filled by men. Meanwhile the rest of Great Britain's womanhood is not idle. As a nation we may have been sadly at fault in making ready to destroy life; but in our preparations for the preservation of life and for the amelioration of the horrors of war we stand as far above the nations of Europe as Germany did in her preparations for war. Hospital provision for ourselves and for our Allies, national relief, hospitality for refugees—these are the directions, with all their many ramifications, in which the genius of Britain's womanhood naturally finds expression, and who will say that their response to these particular calls has not been as conspicuous as the response of French and German women in other directions? A country which can supply all its Allies with hospital nurses, as well as staff its own hospitals according to the standards obtaining in times of peace, which can take charge of scores of thousands of refugees and see that they lack nothing, which can make ample provision for the many wants of its own prisoners in the enemy's hands, has no reason to think that its women do not stand comparison with those of other countries, even though they have not been called upon in any great numbers to make munitions of war.

But what is our neutral observer to think of processions and deputations of women with their "demand for work."

They have no counterpart in Germany or France. In the former country they would belong to the category of things "verboten"; for Frenchwomen they are just unthinkable, because no one has the time and money to waste upon them, nor the inclination to do anything to harass a busy and anxious Government. In England, unfortunately, these processions and deputations on the one hand, and on the other the more ostentatious forms of women's war "work," which entail the wearing of khaki, the assumption of self-imposed military activities and military rank and the labelling of all such effort with propaganda titles, are, like peace campaigns and stop-the-war committees, indications that there are certain sections amongst us who are unable to grasp the real significance of the war. For anyone who realised the issues at stake in this world-conflict it would be a physical impossibility to combine war work with propaganda belonging to pre-war days. If service for one's country is to have any merit, it must at least be whole-hearted, single in purpose. There is no inspiration behind service that decks itself out with propagandist labels. The fact that both the labels and the service are flaunted in the face of the public shows where the heart of these war workers is to be found. Our neutral observer, therefore, if he is to gauge accurately the services rendered by British women during the war, must turn away from both the work and the demand for work which hedge themselves around with self-advertisement. He must take note of war conditions in these islands, of the relatively small dislocation of industry caused by the enlistment of three million men spread over twelve months compared with the sudden calling to the colours of many more millions in Germany and France, and of the work unostentatiously being done by the women of Great Britain, at once the work which lies to their hand and is particularly suited to the genius of the nation.

### NOTES AND NEWS.

#### The League's Work in War time.

A member of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies, who devotes much time and paper to explaining to Anti-Suffragists how far they fall away from grace, recently wrote:—"It is undoubtedly an absolutely unique achievement for any body of men and women known to history to spend time and energy and money during so awful a time of national anxiety and stress as the present, in first proclaiming (as though it were something to be proud of) that they have had no share in promoting any of the patriotic women's organisations which the great emergency has called into being, and then denouncing their opponents for daring to display the zeal, patriotism, and ability in which they themselves have been so terribly deficient." As a statement of the attitude of the N.L.O.W.S. the sentence is as accurate as many other statements emanating from Suffragists. There is, however, no reason to doubt the author's sincerity, not even when she adds: "Every patriotic man or woman must realise that if the N.L.O.W.S. represented anything more than an infinitesimal minority of the nation, 'it would be all up' with the Empire." Inasmuch as the "amazing phenomenon" which our correspondent records "has made a deep impression upon people who are not numbered in the ranks of active Suffragists," we may conclude that the report of a meeting of the National League

for Opposing Woman Suffrage, which we publish in this issue, will be read with profound relief by "every patriotic man or woman," who will be forced to realise that, even if there were doubts as to the relative proportion of Anti-Suffragists and Suffragists, there is no longer any danger of it being "all up with the Empire."

#### Propagandist Labels.

It is, of course, not true, as our Suffragist correspondent would have it believed, that the Anti-Suffragists connected with this League have boasted "that they have had no share in promoting any of the patriotic women's organisations which the great emergency has called into being." The attitude of the League has been that in a time of national crisis a political organisation which bespeaks division among the people has no right to intrude into the national service even the amount of propaganda that the use of its title would entail. It is an attitude which we would not expect Suffragists to sympathise with or even to understand; but it corresponds with the action of the chief political parties. The name of our League, therefore, is not associated with any definite piece of war work. Individual Branches and groups of Anti-Suffragists have equipped hospitals, built soldiers' recreation huts, and provided canteens, but neither the title of the League nor the word "Anti-Suffrage" is used in connection with such work. It has been left to members of the League, in keeping with the spirit of the political truce proclaimed at the outbreak of the war, to devote themselves wholeheartedly to war service without endeavouring or wishing by such means to promote the cause which they have so much at heart in peace time. Some idea of the extent to which they have carried out this work can be gained from the incomplete list which the Chairman of the Executive Committee read to the meeting held on July 22. But it was almost unnecessary to labour the point, as the list is of necessity co-extensive with the aggregate of war work performed by the nation.

#### Zeal and Advertisement.

The correspondent whose criticism we have quoted above is equally inaccurate in stating that Anti-Suffragists have denounced their opponents "for daring to display the zeal, patriotism and ability in which they themselves have been so terribly deficient." In this connection we may notice that to our Suffragist critic everyone is regarded as being deficient in any virtue which they are not careful to advertise. No good work is likely to be decried at the present time; but in these columns we have inveighed against the regrettable craze for advertisement that stultifies all that the Suffragists elect to do. We are opposed, too, to the propaganda work carried on by Suffrage Societies under the thin disguise of war service. It would never occur to anyone to denounce the work done by the hospital units sent abroad under the auspices of these Societies, but no words of condemnation can be too severe for the action of the Suffragist nurses (of which Mrs. Fawcett has boasted in public) in seeking to extract a promise from their patients to support votes for women. In passing, we may remind Suffragists that their hospitals are supported by public appeals for funds, and that they have officially admitted that "some of our kindest helpers are declared Anti-Suffragists." It is not the "zeal,

patriotism or ability" of Suffragists that is denounced, but the un-English and to-day unpatriotic vice of self-advertisement.

#### A Question of Taste.

A discussion has arisen in the daily Press on the subject of women wearing khaki uniform. The practice has been generally decried in the most emphatic terms, and practically the only defence, that of Lady Isabel Margesson, expatiated on the advantages of uniform, while avoiding any reference to khaki. But as Mrs. Carruthers (Miss Violet Markham) has pointed out, it is the use of khaki and the adoption of military titles by the leaders of certain women's movements which strike a wrong and jarring note. "Services in connection with hospitals, canteen work, or supplying stewards for public gatherings are all useful activities in their way, but they hardly give women a claim to assume the uniforms and titles of men who have fallen on the bloodstained fields of Flanders or in the trenches of Gallipoli." In the long run the question resolves itself into one of taste. And when "Jessie G. Goodrich," writing to *The Common Cause*, signs herself "Lieut.-Colonel," and tells of collecting eggs in the intervals of feeling happy, we must resign ourselves to seeing women in khaki, at least "for the period of the war."

#### A LEAGUE MEETING.

On July 22nd Mrs. Lawrence Currie was "at home" at her residence, 1, Richmond Terrace, Whitehall, to members of the London Branches of the N.L.O.W.S. In spite of the inclement weather, the reception rooms were filled. As it had been determined that no Council Meeting should be held this year, advantage was taken of Mrs. Currie's hospitality to present a brief report of some of the patriotic work undertaken by members of the League since the outbreak of the war. The meeting was addressed by the Chairman of the Executive Committee, Mr. E. A. Mitchell Innes, K.C., by Miss Pott and by Mr. J. Massie, the Honorary Treasurer, who made a statement on the financial position of the League. Mrs. Colquhoun, who was to have made a statement on the Paddington Free Buffet, was unfortunately prevented by illness from being present. Her report appears on another page in this issue.

In his first words, Mr. Mitchell Innes, on behalf of those present, thanked Mrs. Lawrence Currie warmly for her kindness in allowing the meeting to be held in her house. He continued:—

We are provided to-day with some opportunity of coming into touch at the Centre, of reviewing the position of our League, and of taking counsel together. But first I desire to say a few words about the reasons which underlay the decision not to hold the Annual Meeting; not because I doubt that decision was generally approved, but, apart from the decision itself, the reasons, to which I have referred, suggest some general observations which may be of interest.

In the first place, then, an Annual Meeting would have been useless. By common consent all propaganda had been dropped for the period of the war, and apart from formal business the main object of an Annual Meeting is to review our fighting policy in the past, and to discuss that policy for the future. When there is no fighting, a meeting, as I have said, would have been a useless proceeding. It was thought by some that, having regard to the activity of our Suffragist friends, it would have been well to give some public evidence, as it was put, of our existence as an Anti-Suffrage organisation. But may I point out that we could not have given the evidence suggested without striking a note of political controversy—the very thing we had decided not to do? Speaking for myself, and I believe for every member of this League, there is nothing upon which I look back with greater

satisfaction, and to which I look forward with more confidence than the loyal observance of our resolution to avoid political controversy during the war. But I have heard it said, "You need not have argued the Suffrage question at the Annual Meeting; you could have used the meeting merely to call attention to our League's patriotic work and to the difference of the methods adopted by us and those adopted by our Suffragist opponents." But surely that would have been a grievous mistake. For we should certainly and, I think, deservedly, have incurred the criticism that we were actuated not by patriotism, but by the hope of political advantage to be extracted from a reputation for patriotism.

And then there are the pessimistic—dare I call them the faint-hearted?—among our supporters. Not a large party; but still, they are there, as they have always been throughout the history of the Suffrage controversy. This is the party who say: "It may be true we cannot advertise our cause during the war; but in any case our cause is done for. The vote for women is bound to come. After all the splendid work done by women during the war, it will be impossible to refuse them the vote after the war." These prophecies of defeat are painfully familiar; but they have never yet come true? Why should they come true now? But, further: I do not believe that there is any foundation in fact for the view that Suffragism is making progress. That view is certainly not supported by the opinion of public men, and those best qualified to judge, with whom I have discussed the point. I should be slow to believe that parade and self-advertisement at such a time as this would help any cause in the eyes of the nation. Lastly, I would ask, how can this war be said to afford any argument whatever in favour of the assimilation of the political functions of men and women? The argument of facts is all the other way. Never has there been presented so strikingly as to-day the spectacle of men and women engaged, each upon their own work. Supreme crises are apt to bring out fundamental truths. The vote is talked of as if it were a reward to women for their efforts during the war. How many of those women desire the vote? So far from being a reward, in the view of many, nay, most of them, the vote is, as it has always been, a burden to themselves and a danger to the State. No! There is one thing that this war illustrates with new and terrible force, and that is the existence of a natural and insuperable demarcation between the functions of men and women; and it supplies further proof, if such were needed, that in the recognition of that fact lies the strength and efficiency of the State.

Now let me turn to what is, after all, my primary object in addressing this meeting, namely, to give some account of what our League has been doing during the last twelve months.

Upon the outbreak of war, in the view of the Executive Committee, our League was faced by a double duty, first the duty of co-operating in patriotic work, secondly the duty of keeping the organisation of the Central Office and of the Branches together for the purpose of resuming political activity after the war. I think I may safely say that so far both duties have been successfully discharged. Of course, I cannot attempt to give a complete account of our activities; but suffice it to say there is hardly any form of patriotic work in which, as Branches or individuals, we have not taken an active part. A large portion of the time of our Central Office secretarial staff, which was not occupied by merely routine work, has been given to the assistance of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Families Association in their difficult and beneficent operations: and most gratefully has that assistance been recognised. This work, I may tell you, included the notification of the dependents of the recruits (sometimes to the number of 400 in one day) of the enlistment of their relatives, and the giving of information which enabled those dependents to obtain assistance, as well as the visiting of soldiers' and sailors' families.

I do not think I can do better than read to you from a statement which Miss Page and Mr. Howe have kindly prepared for me, founded upon information collected both from our Branches and from individual members. That statement tells us that the following are among the forms of patriotic work which we have undertaken:—

- Secretarial help given to Navy League.
- Secretarial help given to Primrose League in purely war work.
- L.C.C. Care Committees.
- Provision of respirators.
- Distribution of Board of Trade notices.
- Canadian Expeditionary Force (secretarial help).
- Local hospital service.
- National hospital service.
- Provision of hospital equipment.
- Convalescent homes.

- Rest stations.
- Red Cross work for British, French, Serbian and Montenegrin troops.
- Territorial Nursing Association.
- V.A.D. work.
- Soldiers' and Sailors' Families Association (outside London).
- Disabled Soldiers' and Sailors' Funds.
- Clothing and comforts for sailors, British and Indian soldiers, for mine-sweepers, and for prisoners in Germany.
- Recreation and reading-rooms for troops (Branches or individual members have provided 5 Y.M.C.A. huts).
- Queen Mary's Needlework Guild.
- Clubs for soldiers' and sailors' wives.
- Women's unemployment.
- Girls' clubs.
- Belgian relief work.
- Belgian refugee work.
- Scheme for supply of pure water to Belgian Army.
- National Relief Fund.
- Serbian Relief Fund.
- Blue Cross work.
- Provision of hospitals for wounded.
- Motor ambulances.
- Help for officers' families.
- Armenian Red Cross work.
- Provision of pillows for stretchers.

I should like to draw special attention to the excellent work done by the Officers' Families Fund, under Lady Lansdowne, with which you are doubtless all familiar. That Fund deserves all the support it can get. Then there are one or two pieces of work, rather special in character. One of our County Branches has been instrumental through its officers, not working as Anti-Suffragists—and that observation applies to all the war work done by our Branches—in formulating an important scheme for the training and employment of girls for farm work; a certain number of Branches have provided a free buffet for soldiers and sailors at one of the London railway termini; one of the officials of the League has been decorated by the King of the Belgians for valuable hospital and relief work at Ostend and Rouen; another worker of the League has the credit of having engineered the movement which resulted in \$100,000 being provided in Canada for a hospital ship.

I think I may say, without undue conceit, that that statement, which is in no sense exhaustive, forms a highly creditable record. May I venture, in passing, to express the opinion that quiet and zealous performance of work such as this is more useful than the organisation of monster deputations to over-worked Ministers for the purposes of asserting the general claim of women to employment?

I should like also to make special mention of the work done by our Information Bureau and Reading Room, now called the Women's Patriotic Bureau, at 415, Oxford Street, under the control and impulse of Miss Blenkinsop. Their working party numbers 120 members, and every day from 20 to 25 have been at work for our soldiers and sailors. It is hoped to take an extra room for the purpose of making surgical swabs and bandages. By the desire of the War Office the Bureau is now undertaking to supply Fulham and Clapton Military Hospitals with extra comforts. At Fulham alone they have 450, and expect presently to have 1,000 wounded men. I have just been informed that at the direct request of the Government Clothing Factory the Bureau has provided 10,000 pockets for respirators for our soldiers. But if this work is to continue, money must be forthcoming to pay the rent of the premises up to Christmas. £50, and as much more as possible, is wanted, and I commend this appeal to generous friends.

And now for the second duty which we had to discharge, that of keeping our organisation together. Things, I am happy to say, are going well at the Central Office. I hope the same is true of the Branches. I can well understand the difficulty, as such a time as this, of maintaining a propagandist organisation, whose propaganda has for the moment ceased. But do not let us forget that the claim for Woman Suffrage will certainly be revived after the war, probably under conditions that will demand far greater and more vigilant efforts on our part than we have made in the past. We have suffered from the war, though less than we feared. Subscriptions and donations have in some cases failed for this year. Mr. Massie, who has been kind enough to attend, will make a financial statement presently. But we have been enormously assisted by the loyalty and self-sacrifice of our staff, who have continued to work with the same zeal, devotion and efficiency as ever at greatly reduced salaries, and who, in so doing, have lightened our difficulty and earned our most sincere gratitude.

The work undertaken by our chief organiser, Mr. Howe, in the Press and Indexing Department, has grown and is growing apace. To-day we are equipped with information on almost every aspect of the Suffrage controversy, collected, scientifically digested and indexed. There have been assembled, I am told, some 12,000 references ready for use at the shortest notice, a most useful piece of work the value of which will be proved when the time comes for renewed political argument.

My review is done; what of the future? Of that there is nothing to be said but this: we are British men and women; our first duty is to preserve the State; when that is done our next duty will be to preserve sound government for the State.

Miss G. S. Pott then spoke. She said that Mr. Mitchell Innes had given such a very full account and review of the situation and work done by the Central Office and Branches that it appeared almost unnecessary for her to try and dot his i's and cross his t's, but as it is known that the voice of a woman in this controversy is, we are told by our Suffragist friends, "inimitable and absolutely essential," she would say a few words. On behalf of the Executive Committee she would first take this opportunity of expressing the deep debt of gratitude owed by the League to the untiring energies and unfailing courtesy of its Chairman, whose help and interest never flagged even during the troublous time of war.

Everyone agreed that political work was quite out of the question at a time of national crisis such as the present. Directly the war broke out the vast majority of the members of the League were to be found taking up the essential work of women with regard to the war crisis, work of every sort and kind, work which must of necessity, if it were done at all, be carried out by women. If it had been suggested to those persons that they should take their attention off such work in order to consider Anti-Suffrage or Suffrage questions, they would certainly have absolutely refused to do so, realising that the true call of patriotism led in other directions. The work that had been done by women had, of course, written its record in the annals of the nation, but the record time alone would reveal. Patriotism called for work, not notoriety, and so far as publicity or fame was sought, so far did the work suffer and the labourer fail. The terrible war had revealed one clear lesson, the necessity of physical force to the nation. Physical force must be prepared to carry into effect the precepts of moral force. No essential conflict existed between the two forces; both were necessary factors in human progression. If certain suggestions put forward by interesting ladies were followed we should simply sit at home and gently reprove Germany. How was it possible at a time of crisis to coerce the abuser of physical force except by the use of like force? Suffragists themselves had told us that the first duty of the Government was to protect the country from the enemy abroad, and the malefactor at home, and surely those who directly elect the governors should be those of the sex who can say, "Come and enforce the laws we have made," instead of "Go and carry out the laws I have made but cannot enforce." It had never been true that anti-Suffragists had said or held that women were of no importance to the nation, but their work lay chiefly amongst the smaller details of life. Too often enthusiastic women seemed averse to carrying out these smaller details, preferring the more exciting or more notorious occupations. The woman, however, who was willing to shoulder the duller routine work was offering just as valuable national assistance as the man who could go to the trenches, though one may be heard of by the public and the other may live and die unnoticed. It had been greatly impressed upon her lately, from experience in private hospitals, how diverse were the essential functions of men and women, one having to consider primarily the community, and the other the interest of the individual. Both might be equally indispensable, but in the one instance all the care and attention of the woman has to be given to the individual need of the wounded man, to nurse him back to health and strength in order that he may return to the front and again take his place as a unit of the fighting force; in the other instance those responsible for the campaign of armies and nations must disregard the fallen and stricken in order to achieve the final success of the community. Surely those two opposing duties ought not to be required of one and the same person at the same moment. One of the hardest things Anti-Suffragists had to face was the accusation that while Suffragists were making so much clamour, Anti-Suffragists were doing nothing. However much we might know this accusation to be false, it was very trying, yet it was better to stick to an honourable truce than lose our temper and thereby break that truce. Patriotism did not consist in carrying out war service with the ulterior motive of exploiting the nation's need for the benefit of one's particular political or personal interests. The true patriot is he or she who is ready to put aside ordinary interests, whatever they may be, even those upon which all one's best endeavours and hardest labours may

have been spent, if such a sacrifice is asked by the nation's need of service.

In conclusion, Miss Pott said that her great desire was that our League, at the end of the war, should be able to say that during the whole course of this trying time through which the nation is passing, nothing had been done that could possibly be described as "mean or common."

A hearty vote of thanks to Mrs. Lawrence Currie for her hospitality brought the meeting to an end.

## THE PADDINGTON FREE BUFFET.

The buffet grew out of a question addressed to Mrs. Eardley Wilmot by Colonel Valentine Matthews, then in charge of the refreshment work in London District, whether she could find anyone prepared to organize a free buffet for soldiers and sailors at Paddington. At the time Mrs. Wilmot was one of a small committee appointed by the Secretaries and workers to consider some suggestions as to war work, and she passed it on to Mrs. Colquhoun as Chairman of that Committee. A meeting of secretaries was hastily called, and on the strength of the support which they promised Mrs. Colquhoun and Mrs. Carson Roberts (Vice-Chair) ordered the erection of a suitable enclosure at Paddington. There was no money in hand to meet the necessary expenditure, and the guarantees actually obtained did not cover the probable working expenses, but they acted on faith and were not disappointed. A circular sent to the members of the Kensington Branch resulted in contributions of nearly £100 in a few days, and since that time subscriptions have come in steadily from all the London branches and from outside donors who have seen the work. Our total receipts to the end of June were £385, of which nearly £80 was collected in the box placed on the counter for voluntary contributions from the men.

Before we had begun our work the War Office made certain alterations in the direction of the station buffets, and introduced rules and regulations to which Mrs. Colquhoun was asked to pledge herself before final permission was obtained to open the buffet. She wishes this to be clearly understood as she is sometimes questioned on the subject. The first regulation, which was made clear in personal interviews at the War Office, is that they would not recognise or permit the use of the name of any League or Association. Each buffet must be under the sole responsibility and control of one person, to be approved by the War Office. It therefore happens that while Mrs. Colquhoun would never have undertaken the work without the co-operation of members of the N.L.O.W.S. and its organisation, it is not, and cannot be regarded as officially part of their work, and it is for official purposes connected only with her name. The Committee is confined to members of the League, and the days are apportioned to honorary secretaries of the London Branches, so that the credit of the work will eventually belong to the Anti-Suffragists, but neither money gifts in kind nor personal help from outside sources can be refused.

A large supply of helpers have volunteered, and a rule has now been made that anyone applying to work at the buffet must be personally introduced by someone already working there.

The number of men who use the buffet varies very much, but from 800 to 1,400 per day has been the record of the last fortnight. It has been suggested that we should make a small charge, but this is not in our dis-

cretion, the War Office having decided that the buffets must be free. We are open continuously day and night, except from 12 midnight on Wednesday to 6.30 a.m. on Thursday. No other station buffet is open all night. The numbers in the night vary very much, being sometimes as low as 90 or as high as 400, but there is no doubt that this is one of the most useful parts of the work.

Our expenditure is about £20 per week, of which only a part is covered by monthly subscriptions, and we should be glad of more promises of weekly or monthly contributions. Gifts in kind are also most welcome. At present we have made no public appeal for funds, and do not propose to do so. We have refused all offers of newspaper advertisement and publicity, and in consequence are very high in the good books of the War Office officials, who do not at all approve the methods adopted by some of the buffets. Our books are open to inspection, and a monthly account is sent to the War Office. From the beginning we have run everything on lines of strict economy and with a minimum of waste, so that our visitors, though they may have as much tea, coffee, or lemonade, bread and butter and cake as they please, only cost a fraction over 1d. per head.

Major-General Sir Francis Lloyd, Director of the Refreshment Places in the area of London, told the Transport Officer that the Paddington buffet was the best organised and managed affair of its sort in the district. As he was distinctly hostile to us at first, this praise is the more valued. That it has been earned is due first to the care and thought with which the enclosure and fittings were planned, then to the devotion of the honorary secretary and stores manager, Mrs. Runge and Miss Turnbull, and latterly to Miss Tunley (who has temporarily replaced Miss Turnbull), who gave up a good part of every day to supervising the work, but in the main to the enthusiasm and loyalty with which the various branches have worked to make their "days" a success.

Several Branches have not yet participated, although willing to do so, because the days of the week are limited in number. The Committee wishes to thank them, and also many individual members whose offers of help it has been impossible to utilise.

We have also to acknowledge the valuable services of Miss Mackenzie, who acts as honorary treasurer, and will be glad to acknowledge any contributions. Her address is 6, Grange Road, Gunnersbury. Communications other than gifts of money should be addressed:

The Honorary Secretary,  
Soldiers' and Sailors' Free Buffet,  
Paddington.

It may be added that workers from the buffet are now rendering valuable help at the Woolwich Munition Makers' Canteen.

**The Beehive.**—This month we have been praying and working to send a Furber hand ambulance to the Front. "The most tragic part of the war," writes an officer, "is that 30 per cent. of our men die because the stretcher bearers, four to each wounded man, have to carry the soldier two solid miles." This hand ambulance is on wheels, and takes the wounded man quickly and easily to the dressing station. It costs £17 16s. 6d., and our Society has gladly sent one to the Front. Many more are needed. The War Office has passed them. Sir Frederick Treves recommends them. For further particulars write to the Minerva Motor Co., Chenies Street, London, W. The Bees have done good work. We are also going to have a sale for soldiers and sailors in St. Andrew's, July 31st. We have our Beehive stall.

## SUBJECTS OF THE DAY.

*Subjects of the Day. A Selection of Speeches and Writings by the Earl Curzon of Kedleston. With an Introduction by the Earl of Cromer. Edited by Desmond M. Chapman-Houston. (Allen and Unwin.)*

This volume, containing a selection of speeches delivered by Lord Curzon during the last ten years, could hardly have appeared at a moment more opportune, for the criticism of a contemporary journal, which appears to find the party habit too deeply rooted for eradication, that "there is only one subject of the day," is the outcome of a view blurred by mental and political myopia.

That we are all thinking, or should be thinking, of the duties which the war imposes upon each of us, cannot justify the corollary that "most of the burning questions discussed in this book have, for a year past, ceased to burn," since of the fifty and odd speeches included in the selection only one or two deal with party issues, and through almost all runs one central thought, namely, the being and progress of the British Empire, and it is the existence of that Empire which is at stake to-day. The united front presented to the enemy by colonies and dependencies, no less than by advocates of widely-differing political creeds at home, is a phenomenon that has surprised and disgusted Germany, and this unity was made possible and can be maintained only on condition that we remember that the Empire is a call to duty, that our pride in it is not mere pride of possession, and that we may never sacrifice the interests of a dependency to interests exclusively British. These maxims, which Lord Curzon has laid down in the speeches here reported, and has consistently urged with a power that few orators can equal, contain the sound doctrine, faith in which is enabling our people to stand fast together. The work done in India and for India in the past is the salvation of the Empire now. The advocates of the South African union share, with the Government which introduced it, in the credit of General Botha's great success, and Lord Curzon's speeches upon these subjects have the greater weight in that he has been the advocate of a generous and enlightened policy in both these important parts of the Empire.

In view of the loyalty of our fellow-subjects in Asia and Africa, he must be indeed faint-hearted who allows himself to be swayed by the factious pessimism dear to a certain section of the press; and since that section is loud-voiced and insistent, the warning given in one of these speeches against the spirit of decrying ourselves has its value to-day though given six years ago; on the other hand, seeing that much of our present danger is due to a weakening of the sense of duty, to the neglect of preparation to face a danger threatening our existence, and to the blind folly of those who cried peace when war was even in sight, the speeches of one whose chief themes are duty, sacrifice and forethought, may well serve our present need. Many readers will no doubt turn first to the four addresses upon national service which are here printed, but it is to be hoped that few will distort their meaning after the fashion adopted by a reviewer in the *Westminster Gazette*, who chooses to regard Lord Curzon's advocacy of compulsion as being founded upon a desire to kill Radicalism. Leading Liberals and Socialists, as well as Tories and non-party men, are found in the ranks of those who desire national service, and adherents of all political creeds can be found to support the voluntary principle; in fact, the cleavage of opinion upon this question does not follow party lines at all, and whatever may be said against compulsion, the pretence that it is undemocratic is neither ingenious nor ingenious. Moreover, the suggestion that discipline and a good understanding between social classes would destroy Radicalism is a poor and undeserved compliment to that political creed whose vitality will certainly cause it to survive the discipline even of support from the *Westminster* reviewer. We, however, are not concerned to prop or to oppose the voluntary principle, but merely desire to lay emphasis upon the call to duty which sounds through all Lord Curzon's speeches, and to suggest that since the duty of national defence is clearly of primary importance, our President is not likely to regret having stood at the side of Lord Roberts in upholding the principle that the first duty of a citizen is to defend his country.

The warnings uttered in these speeches that we might be required to land forces on the Continent for the protection of Belgium, and that the chance of invasion was not to be lightly put aside as a mere nightmare, alike reveal an appreciation of the true facts of the situation before the war; and a short visit to the Eastern counties will suffice to assure any doubter that the opinion enunciated in the House of Lords two years ago is now shared not only by all residents in that region, but by the War Office also.

It is painfully evident that we have amongst us visionaries who

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### "SUFFRAGISTS IN CONTROVERSY."

To the Editor of THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW.

Sir,—Miss Pott is good enough in this month's issue of the ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW to comment upon a letter I wrote a short time ago.

As she accuses me of "imperviousness to argument," because she thinks I have never recognised the fact that the low rate of infant mortality—which she does not deny is possessed by all countries where women have the vote—has often preceded the grant of the vote, I hope you will allow me to say that I fully admit that this has frequently been the case.

And the reason seems plain enough. Women do not get the vote the first time they ask for it, nor until a majority of the women in the country desire it. So the granting of the vote has been always preceded by a period of agitation carried on by those women who wish for this reform in order to convince the others, and in the course of this agitation the attention of all is called to the defects in the health legislation of the country, which is always a subject most interesting to the average woman.

For a considerable period before they are admitted as voters they are using their influence with the existing voters for legislation to improve sanitary conditions, to protect young girls, etc. That is very noticeably the case now in this country. Women are taking a great interest in all these matters, and the House of Commons is certainly influenced by their desires.

I am, etc.,

MAUD SELBORNE.

Blackmoor, Hants.

### MISS POTT'S REPLY.

In reply to the above letter, Miss Pott writes:—

Lady Selborne's letter, to which you have asked me to reply, raises a number of extremely controversial points, which cannot be dealt with adequately in a limited space. Whether the statement that "women do not get the vote until a majority of women in the country desire it," is in accordance with colonial history is open to question—the reverse opinion being held by many persons intimately acquainted with Australia and New Zealand, and notably by a strong supporter of Woman Suffrage, Miss Ackermann, who writes: "Up to the present moment (1913) there is not one woman in a thousand in Australia who has the faintest idea how or when the franchise was given to them. . . . The gift . . . was not forced by an overwhelming public sentiment. . . . The truth is the average woman was totally indifferent to the subject. . . . In Western Australia the Bill was made a catspaw to carry a party measure," and again in another passage Miss Ackermann speaks of the vote "having been forced upon women" in Australia who "had not any inclination to take the responsibility involved."

Lady Selborne's opinion appears to support the plea that women without the vote can bring about changes in the domestic legislation of their country. With that I heartily agree. But in considering the extremely complicated questions of infant mortality and public health I would suggest the justice of giving due weight to the discoveries of modern science in connection with the spread of infection, the causes of disease, etc., which have completely revolutionised even expert views held by the last generation. Also a point pertinent to the implications contained in Lady Selborne's letter, namely, that men as well as women have devoted untiring energies to children's welfare and the public health. Mr. Alderman Broadbent deserves from all women and children a gratitude second to none in such matters, and the Notification of Births Act, which he was largely instrumental in obtaining, was passed in England several years before New Zealand adopted it; yet authorities from the latter country have recently referred to it as the most valuable piece of legislation in existence with regard to infantile welfare.

### A WORKING WOMAN'S PROTEST.

To the Editor of THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW.

DEAR SIR,—I am only a working woman. I have brothers and relatives serving in the Army, and my married sisters and I are doing all we can in the way of "war work"; but we do not for one moment hope it will lead to a vote. Our hope is freedom for our country, our Allies, and all who are fighting against the monstrous German tyranny.

The first anniversary of the terrible war will soon be upon us, and I think I may truly say that during the past 12 months Englishwomen have not failed either their men or their country in

pin their faith upon arbitration as a means of making war impossible, and probably theirs are cases of invincible ignorance, wherefore they will not be persuaded by Lord Curzon any more than they were by Admiral Mahan, but will prefer, in the words of the Birmingham speech reported in this volume, to "hug to their bosoms the dangerous and criminal illusion that there will be no more war." The bleating of such persons, though for the moment nearly drowned by shouts of disapproval, has not ceased, and will no doubt swell into a Norman Angelic chorus so soon as—or before—peace is in sight, and yet one cannot insist too often that as Lord Curzon and Admiral Mahan have told us, "in cases of national honour or national existence arbitration cannot and will not be adopted." Yet in spite of this evident and elementary fact, our Unions for democratic control, our Lanes or Devilles, Morels or Angells, our Maude Roydens, Conybeares and the like, not content with heartening the enemy by decrying everything British and libelling their country on every possible occasion, stoop to acts which are very near to treason.

The Imperial note heard throughout these speeches will give them a special interest for readers of the ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW, since Lord Curzon lays stress upon the point that the Empire is the heritage of women as well as men, and long before the Suffrage question reached its most acute stage, he had taken part in the movement which was designed to enable women to enter more fully into that heritage. The speech which he delivered at Oxford on the occasion of the opening of the new buildings at Lady Margaret Hall shows how false is the charge constantly made by Suffragists that their opponents desire women to be merely domestic drudges or ornamental hangers-on to the community. The speech pleads that women graduates ought not to be content to be limited to one or two vocations only, and shows that many callings are open to them and would be benefited by their service. With the other speeches dealing directly with the Suffrage issue readers of this paper are, of course, familiar; and as to them it is enough to say here that no one has summed up the case supported by the National League with greater cogency than has its President in his fifteen reasons against Woman Suffrage, whilst none of the advocates of that revolution have even attempted to answer the challenge categorically.

The concluding speeches in the book deal with the war, and it is impossible to miss the contrast between the attitude of Lord Curzon and that adopted by prominent Suffragist leaders; the former is described in the last sentences of a speech delivered at Glasgow last year, "Let every man and woman, in contributing his or her part to the fight, whether it be large or small, whether it be personal service or some other form of gift, have no other object in view than, first, to vindicate the honour of this country; second, to destroy for ever this overhanging menace; and third, to build up a new and happier Europe." If this counsel be sound—and who will in set terms deny it?—if we are fighting against the weals of the German mind and cannot dream of making terms until those weals are relegated to the limbo of shameful idolatries, how is it possible to defend or excuse the action of those misguided fanatics, all of them Suffragists, who tried to attend the abortive peace conference a few months ago?

For us, however, the Suffrage question has for the present ceased to exist. We take our stand with our President and Ex-President, Lord Cromer, and maintain that national defence comes before all other considerations, for which reason we have no other objects in view than the safety, honour and welfare of our country, and the destruction of the Prussianism which threatens civilisation, nor can we consent with the recalcitrant Suffragists to give it a new lease of its malignant life.

A. P.

### FOR BRITISH PRISONERS OF WAR.

Mrs. L. A. Carter, of Rose Bank, The Mount, Shrewsbury, makes the following appeal:—

Sir,—Will you kindly allow me space in your columns to call attention to the needs of our soldiers who are prisoners of war in Germany. For the past seven months I have been working hard on their behalf, and each week sees fresh demands on my slender resources.

The most frequent request is for food, then comes tobacco and boots. At the present moment a request from a sergeant at Gottingen for shirts, handkerchiefs, soap, health salts, cigarettes, vests, pants and tinned food is giving me some anxiety. I have managed to send a good consignment of everything asked for except the pants and vests. If any of your readers have such things (which need not be new, but in good condition), also boots, size nines, or indeed any of the above-named goods, and would generously let me have them, I should be most grateful.

any way, and that Lord Kitchener was justified in his tribute to the work women have done. We are also to be included in the National registration that we may render further help where necessary, but I do protest against the processions and self-advertising of the Suffragettes as being unnecessary. Women have already signified their willingness and registered for, and are actually engaged in the manufacture of munitions.

Also, hundreds of women, many with aching hearts, have stepped into their dead men's shoes, and are doing their work faithfully and well, and now, if after 12 months the Suffragettes demand the right to organise the whole womanhood of the country, we shall certainly resent and entirely repudiate all their claims.

Yours faithfully,  
BEATRICE TIERNEY.

Holborn, July 11th.

[Owing to pressure upon our space we have been obliged to omit portions of our correspondent's letter.—Ed.]

#### WOMEN'S WAR SERVICE.

The following letters have passed between Mrs. Pankhurst and the N.L.O.W.S. on the subject of the procession and deputation to Mr. Lloyd George on July 17th:—

THE SECRETARY, THE NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR OPPOSING  
WOMAN SUFFRAGE, WESTMINSTER.

DEAR MADAM,—We are faced by the danger of losing our freedom as a nation. The question is literally one of life and death.

If the country is to be saved, women must be allowed to help. The service that they can render is enough to make the difference between defeat and victory in this war.

So grave is our national danger, and so terrible is the loss of precious lives at the front due to shortage of munitions, that Mr. Lloyd George, as Minister of Munitions, has been asked to receive a deputation and hear women's demand for the right to make munitions and render other war service.

Mr. Lloyd George has consented to receive the deputation on Saturday afternoon, July 17th.

Before the deputation is received a great procession of women will march through London, in order not only to impress the Minister of Munitions, who, I believe, is with us, but to show the politicians and the men generally, as well as our Allies and the enemy, that British women are devoted to their country and determined to save it.

Will you take part in this procession? I am sure that you will. I believe that women were among the first to realise that this war is no ordinary war, but is the greatest struggle between two opposite ideals—between civilisation and liberty on the one hand and barbarism and despotism on the other—that the world has ever seen or dreamt of.

We in this country must do more than we have yet done to support our splendid Allies, who so far have suffered the worst of the enemy's attacks. We must do more to help our heroic soldiers who have gone out to the front to win or die. We must do more to maintain British honour and prestige; we must do more to save the liberties which the enemy would destroy; we must do more to save this country and the Empire. In short, we must win.

Will you help? The first thing to do is to join the procession in order that, as a result of this great demonstration of women of all classes, we may gain our full right to serve.

Please fill in the form below and send it to me.

United with you in the desire to serve and in devotion to our country, to our Allies, and to the great cause that is at stake,

I am, yours faithfully,  
E. PANKHURST.

National League for Opposing Woman Suffrage,  
515, Caxton House, S.W.,

July 12th, 1915.

MRS. PANKHURST,

DEAR MADAM,—Your letter of the 9th July regarding the proposed demonstration of women with the view to employment during the war has been laid before me by the Secretary of my Executive Committee. I have not had the opportunity of meeting my Committee since its receipt, but I have very little doubt that I speak for them as well as for myself when I say that I deprecate most strongly such a demonstration as is proposed. Such action can, in my view, only result in complicating a situation already sufficiently grave and in harassing His Majesty's Ministers in the performance of their national duty.

I am, Madam, yours faithfully,  
E. A. MITCHELL INNES  
(Chairman of Executive Committee).

## THE INFORMATION BUREAU.

415, Oxford Street, W.

The Bureau Committee have pleasure in reporting that the daily working party has accomplished much useful and important work during the past month. A large number of hospital garments, besides swabs, pads, bandages and special cushions, have been made and sent to the St. John Ambulance Association, the military hospitals at Fulham and Clapton, and the Red Cross Hospital at Woodhall Spa.

On July 8th the War Office issued an urgent demand for two and a half million respirator pockets for the troops. Of these the Bureau contracted to make 10,000. The work was promptly and successfully carried out, the large body of workers responding to the appeal with the utmost alacrity and willingness, working late each day and during the whole of Sunday, July 11th.

The Committee particularly desire to thank, among others:—Lady Calthorpe, Lady Haversham, the Hon. Lady Tryon, Mrs. Bischoffsheim, Mrs. Rydon, Mrs. Behrens, Mrs. Buttar, Mrs. George Macmillan, Miss Pott, the Misses Brewer, Mrs. Percy MacMahon, and Mrs. Deane, who rendered great assistance in this emergency by getting some hundreds of pockets made at their own residences. The working parties at Ealing and Dulwich also were exceedingly helpful.

The following ladies have given valuable help at the Bureau working party in the making of pockets and hospital garments:—Miss Wadsworth, Miss Nona Hill, Mrs. Chapple, Mrs. Bonner, Miss Adam, Mrs. Rose, Miss Courtney Boyd, Miss Worsley, Mrs. C. Smith, Mrs. Woodruffe, Mrs. Pitt, Mrs. Bevan, Miss MacLeod, Miss Harvey, Mrs. and Miss Taylor, Mrs. Conrad, Mrs. Newnham Davis, Miss Cator, Mrs. d'Egville, Mrs. MacLeod, and Mrs. Lennox.

The working party at Ealing, mentioned in the last report, now numbers about thirty workers, and the Committee have pleasure in stating that a working party on similar lines and also in connection with the Bureau has been formed at Dulwich. Mrs. Percy MacMahon and Mrs. Deane have intimated their intention of forming a working party in the autumn to be held at Mrs. Deane's residence, No. 1, Carlisle Mansions, Carlisle Place, S.W., and other offers have been received.

The Bureau has sent contributions of clothing to the Irish Women's Association for Irish regiments and prisoners of war.

The Committee are grateful to Mr. Mitchell-Innes for his kind reference to the Bureau and its work in his address at the meeting at Mrs. Lawrence Currie's residence on July 22nd, and for his eloquent appeal for funds not only to enable the work to be carried on, but also for the rent and expenses of maintaining the Bureau. It is obvious that the latter must be kept going, if its work for the country is to be continued. The need for a second room is great, as the number of workers is increasing, and the Committee would be exceedingly thankful if they could obtain the loan of a room not too far from the Bureau for the duration of the war.

The Committee desire to acknowledge gratefully the following donations for material: through Mrs. Taylor £10, Mrs. Knollys £10, and Mrs. Bogg £2.

Mrs. Woodruffe, in addition to her other kindnesses, also provided material for and cut out six bed jackets, which after being made up were sent to the military hospital at Fulham.

Subscriptions for the Bureau's second Recreation Room have been received from the Beaconsfield Branch (monthly instalments), from Miss Conolly and Miss Cave. The Committee would appeal earnestly to Branches, members and friends for donations to enable them to complete the sum necessary for this room, which is badly needed for the troops, and which could have been opened long ago had the fund been completed.

The Committee have to acknowledge gifts of socks and other articles from Mrs. Slagg, Mrs. d'Egville, Mrs. Mould, Mrs. C. Smith, Mrs. Bogg, Mrs. Dill, Mrs. Finlay, the Misses Martin, Miss Barnes, Miss K. Nichols, and Miss Smyth.

THE marriage of Mr. D. Austin Harries to Miss Edith Jones took place last month at Cardiff. Mr. Harries was the founder of the Cardiff Branch of the N.L.O.W.S., and has for many years been its active and capable Honorary Secretary.