



URANIA

No. 21.

MAY-JUNE, 1920.

TWO-MONTHLY.

"Let us break their bonds in sunder, and cast away their cords from us!"—Psalms.

TO THE READER.

URANIA denotes the company of those who are firmly determined to ignore the dual organization of humanity in all its manifestations.

They are convinced that this duality has resulted in the formation of two warped and imperfect types. They are further convinced that in order to get rid of this state of things no measures of "emancipation" or "equality" will suffice, which do not begin by a complete refusal to recognize or tolerate the duality itself.

If the world is to see sweetness and independence combined in the same individual, *all* recognition of that duality must be given up. For it inevitably brings in its train the suggestion of the conventional distortions of character which are based on it.

There are no "men" or "women" in Urania.

"All' ousin hôs angeloï."

A register is kept of those who hold these principles, and all who are entered in it will receive this leaflet while funds admit. Names should be sent to J. Wade, York House, Portugal Street, London, W. C.; E. Gore-Booth and E. Roper, 33, Fitzroy Square, London, N. W.; D. H. Cornish, 32, Via dell' Erta Canina, Florence, Italy; T. Baty, Temple, London, E. C.

Will those who are already readers and who would like us to continue sending them copies, kindly do us the favour of sending a post-card to one of the above addresses? We should much appreciate suggestions and criticisms.

EDITORIAL NOTE.

WE would again venture very warmly to urge those who respond to the ideal of freedom advocated by this little paper, to intimate their concurrence with us. Votes are to be had for the asking—seats in legislatures are open—but there is a vista before us of a spiritual progress which far transcends all political matters. It is the abolition of the "manly" and the "womanly."

Will you not help to sweep them into the museum of antiques

Don't you care for the union of all fine qualities in one splendid ideal? If you think it magnificent but impracticable, please write to tell us so, and say why!

SOPHIA JEX-BLAKE.

FROM the Life of Sophia Jex-Blake, sympathetically and beautifully written by Dr. Margaret Todd ("Graham Travers") we take the following extracts. Strange that the writer of such touching and modest entries in her diary should have proved impossible to live with, gruff, overbearing and exacting! The story of her suddenly severed relations with Octavia Hill is one, which, one feels, has not yet been fully told. The reader of Dr. Todd's book can scarcely avoid the impression that teaching, rather than medicine and surgery, was Dr. Blake's real vocation. She broke through the University wall of exclusion by attacking the Faculty of Medicine. But, so far as her own best energies and their utilization was concerned, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the right thing was to have gone on teaching at Queen's College. She had a real genius for teaching, and would probably have had a greater career as a professor than as a medico. *Dis aliter visum*: and the medical faculty was destined to be the one to feel the weight of her impulsive arm. Someone ought to tell the whole connected story of the feminist movement in action from 1850 on. The time is now propitious.

One feels sorry that Dr. Blake rested so much of the case for opening the medical profession on the so-called necessity of special doctors for a special sex (e. g. p. 247). That is the very reverse of the ground we should take. She even went so far as to say that sooner than go to a man for certain treatment, she would cross the Atlantic to her friend Anna Sewell! But this was an aberration, and we think rested unconsciously on her belief that this rather contemptible argument "hit the public hardest."

And here is a bit of psycho-therapy:

1869. (February 4). In the night I woke and found M's head was "dreadful." So I laid one hand on her forehead and one on her hand and willed and willed the pain away,—till she slept quietly. Curious how weary and achy that arm was, even next morning,—how "washed out" I was! She says—"How do you explain it?"—"Nohow."

It is interesting to know that as early as 1869 (p. 232) the Duchess of Argyle (Princess Louise) "expressed strong hopes" of the ultimate success of the medical prospects of women.

When shown a letter from a lady journalist asking the recipient to help her (Dr. Blake) under the title of "the little woman," "the wee bit thing" she indignantly and rightly blazes—"When *will* women learn, if they claim to stand on common ground at all, to stand upright,—to ask only a fair field and no favour!"

But here are the extracts.

1858. How few ladies there are! Agnes Wodehouse is thorough,.....So is my mother. Few else...I believe I love women too much to love a man. Yet who can tell? Well, S. J. B., don't get sentimental for patience' sake (p. 65).

1860 (May 17):—A most delicious day at Hurst with Ruth and Octa. Told Octa about Wales—sitting in her room on the table, my heart beating like a hammer.....She sunk her head on my lap silently, raised it in tears and then such a kiss!

1865 (September 9):—I remarked that few had done more harm to the cause than St Paul, by some of his words. She (Mrs. Emerson) replied very truly that the fault lay rather in those who would rigidly apply such words and consider them binding out of all connection of time and place.

1865 (Dec 25):—Darling, I come more and more to the conclusion that any one who wishes to preserve intact all romantic ideas about "Mother's love" &c. had better not live in a Lying-in Hospital!

1869 (Jan. 4):—I quite agree with you, "Never marry if you can help it."

So far as distinctions and consequent separations of rank depend on merely external circumstances, such as wealth and position, I do not believe that we gain much by observing them, but when they rest on real

SCIENCE AND FEMINISM.

differences of culture and refinement, the case becomes different, and it does not seem good policy to risk certain loss to one class, without being sure of securing a more than proportionate gain to another. In short, it seems to me, that if we can mingle different classes of children in such proportions and under such conditions as to ensure that the higher standard shall prevail over the lower, and the tone of all be raised to that of the foremost few, the measure must be an altogether good one: and I am sure that to some extent and under some restrictions this may be done: but if once the inferior standard of refinement is allowed to predominate, the lower dragging down the higher rather than being raised by it, I fear that no results gained can pay for the loss accruing.

—A Visit to American Schools & Colleges.

DIVINE GENERATION.

A WRITER refers to the principal deity of Japan as "that amorous divinity, Amaterasu-no-Mikami." The foundation for the epithet appears to be the fact that the Deity produced children. But how? "By an oath or covenant."

According to the *Kojiki* (the Japanese Genesis), Amaterasu-no-Mikami and Susano-no-Mikoto (children of the same parents) produced eight divine children (Itshikishima-Hime,* Tagiri Hime and Tagitsu Hime with five others), "by an oath or covenant". The explanation is given that this means simply by standing face to face (see Kato, *The Japanese Analects in Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan*, xlv part 2, p. 80), and cites in comparison the Indian writer Vasubandhu's *Avidharma-Kosa-Sastra*. "Some divine spirits produce children exactly as human beings do. But some deities of a higher station.....simply have an interview and thereby produce children."

Another account represents Amaterasu-no-Mikami and her brother as biting jewels into fragments and producing children from the pieces.

* The goddess of the lovely temple at Miyajima in the Inland Sea.

TWO BOOKS have lately come to our notice, both American, about which a word may be interesting to our old world readers. Dr. Emmet Densmore (*Sex Equality*) has written a powerful survey of the emancipation movement. Unfortunately, she is hampered by a desire to argue on a physiological and biological basis, and while earnestly maintaining the essential one-ness of the human spirit, in whatever envelope embodied, she is much too willing to admit that in fact the feminine manifestation is inferior. She calls it "undersized, flat-chested, weak, narrow-minded and unhealthy."—and she looks to conscious effort to improve it by exercise and vigour, in the hope that the acquired improvements will be transmitted to offspring. This we believe to be a wrong and altogether a materialistic way of approaching the question. Stature, strength and physical vigour are all matters of pure comparison. There is no merit in height or muscularity. And it is the fashionable scientific theory that only in rare cases can acquired characteristics be transmitted by generation—which, if true, makes a mirage of Dr. Emmet Densmore's hopes. If we want to increase the health and strength of the feminine unit, it is a far more certain and hopeful way to train the individual, without relying on her progeny, but relying on the persistence of the idea of physical fitness thus exhibited. As to the "narrow-mindedness" we disagree entirely. We may have only narrow interests allotted to us; but that is a defect that can be removed without invoking heredity. We deny that our mode of thought is narrow—it is as narrow as Love. On the whole, however, for all its biological bias, and its willingness to admit that women are poor creatures as a matter of fact, the book contains much valuable matter and is particularly strong in repelling the dogma of "essential femaleness."

Eliza B. Gamble's *Sex in Science and History* is a more ambitious work. Again it is attempted to base the whole argument on physiology and biology, and the science is all second-hand. "We are assured by our guides in these matters,"—"We are informed"—"From the facts elaborated by our guides"—such phrases occur on

every page. The momentary conclusions of fashionable science—or what was fashionable science twenty years ago—are made to bear a superstructure altogether too heavy for them. One instance will suffice. Whereas Dr. Densmore believes in a specific transmission of characteristics from mother to daughter, Mrs. Gamble pins her faith to an equal transmission of characteristics to daughters and sons. The truth is that scientific conclusions are still in a state of flux, and quite incapable of supporting practical conclusions. In her second part she develops an interesting, but utterly unproved, theory, according to which the first marriage was slavery. Cousins would not stoop to be the exclusive possessions of their relatives; the captured stranger would, and she developed into the wife, whilst the fellow-tribesfolk degenerated into the irregular mate. This theory is developed in great elaboration of detail; but it is all in the air. The evidence is not sufficient. "Mutter-recht" may have been a fact: the question is not whether matriarchy once prevailed, but how it comes that patriarchy alone is found in historic times.

Her conclusions are that marriage is doomed, that only the most robust "will perpetuate the race," and that with the disappearance of war, a great preponderance of the feminine element will be observed, when the present civilization has worked out its self-destruction. For she imagines that in the pre-marriage time, humanity, under the beneficent direction of the feminine, was without war or politics, knowing no class distinctions. This is all unproved hypothesis; but it provides an agreeable ideal to aim at. Mrs. Gamble can put truths in a pithy manner as thus—"The fears expressed lest the human race fail to perpetuate itself would be pathetic were the reason for these fears less obvious. When we reflect that the labour market must be constantly supplied with cheap labour, and that millions of soldiers cannot be produced to protect the.....ruling class, the true inwardness of this insatiate cry for constantly increasing numbers is revealed." She has a bias against Christianity and "the ruling class" which is calculated to lessen the influence of her work and which makes her say things like—"No offering from women to the Almighty is so acceptable as unrestrained reproduc-

tive energy" (p. 393): and to aver that in primitive times "jealousy and a desire for personal aggrandisement had not been developed." But she quotes some useful sayings—thus Socrates (according to Xenophon) declared he had long been of opinion "that the female sex are nothing inferior to ours, excepting only in strength of body or perhaps steadiness of judgment". And Hipparchia, going to visit Lysimachus, said to Theodorus—"What Theodorus could not be called wrong for doing, that same thing Hipparchia ought not to be called wrong for doing."

There is at present a tendency in America to let biology run rampant, and to ignore the fact of the uncertainty of its conclusions. It is perhaps natural for a new community to rush to embrace new and raw theories. But we must found our convictions on something a great deal more substantial than that.

THE MID-VICTORIAN POSE.

THE entertaining *Journals* of the late Lady Knightley throw a ludicrous light on the habit of thought of well-brought-up ladies of the mid-Victorian period. Hear Louisa Bowater, Act. 23 (July 9, 1865—which, by the way, was a Sunday):—"I have lived in such a whirl lately, and feel I do not think enough of the inner life. Dear little Sophy Melville sets me a capital example there—though I cannot quite agree with her that a pink gown is inconsistent with the 'sobriety' of dress recommended in the Bible.....I wish for two things—a little more money, and a husband. But I often wonder whether, after all, I shall be called to a single life. It requires courage, but St. Paul tells us that it is the most blessed. I do not wish for it, but still I trust I may never be led, from fear of it, to make a marriage without affection that must be lowering to the whole tone of the mind!"

Affection, however, was not regarded as all-important. Miss Turnor and she "agreed for one thing, that nothing would induce either of us to marry a clergyman." A year later (May 8, 1866) "I had a long talk with Sophy, resulting in the melancholy conclusion that although we should

A VOICE FROM CHINA.

AT THE Congress of Oriental Lawyers held in Tokio last April, a Chinese Lawyer, Mr. Yang made an excellent speech from which we cite the following passage:—

"We talk fine things about justice and humanity," said Mr. Yang, "but are all the laws in vogue just and humane? There are laws that protect only the interests of a few and these are bad. Then there is the law of inheritance in China—and in a less measure in England—which discriminates against the daughter in favor of the son. Is that right? Men make the laws and exclude the principal members of the community—the women—from obvious rights. Supposing women were the law-makers, I doubt if they would have discriminated half so badly against men. Justice must not be divided as the nations are, and to achieve this end the International Bar Association will greatly help. That is the chief reason why the entire bar of China endorses with heart and soul this beginning of great things."

SUB SPECIE AETERNITATIS.

All things that shall be, are,
Nor need we look afar
Into dim vistas of some future being,
For comfort and release,
For blessedness and peace,
Since Prophecy is but the gift of seeing

That which around us lies;
But more interior-wise
Than this phantasmal world the body bounding;
Which doth but symbolise
Worlds that *within* us rise,
More real worlds,—this outer world surrounding.

There, peaks are all aglow;
There, bud and blossom blow;
The hills of Heaven are not as these of ours;
The glacier and the snow
On those hills lie below;
It is upon the peats that bloom the flowers.

—A. A. WATT.

be quite willing to marry our respective lovers if they had £ 10,000 a year, we are not unhappy to feel that under present circumstances marriage is out of the question for either of us and that consequently this cannot be the true sort of love."

The true sort of love ultimately came for an elderly baronet twenty years her senior—that fine old Sir Rainald whose geneological excursions gave rise to the poetic perversion that like Addison's Moon—

"Knightley, to the listening earth,
Proclaims the story of his birth."

Seriously, did the ladies of 1865 for a moment reflect what marriage was? Or was it all a pose, this eagerness to have a husband with ten thousand a year, or special qualifications? Lady Knightley was quite a thoughtful girl, yet she laments that at the Opera on one occasion she could not have flirted in any comfort, "as we were exactly opposite the Royal box flirting in comfort."

Mrs. Earle's *Memoirs & Memories* are also very naive. Casually she remarks: "I was very near marrying one who was introduced to us in Paris and who travelled with us to Nice. I was not very gracious as I was absorbed in one of the most remarkable books of my time, *Jane Eyre*. [Short digression on *Jane Eyre*.] Seeing more of this man during the early part of the winter (1860), I felt I never could care for him enough to marry him, and so I refused him, greatly to his indignation; and shortly after we left Nice in the spring, he proposed to and was accepted by someone else. "A certain type of men" she adds, "thinks that a girl who has been friendly and wished to know him better, is sure to accept him if he condescends to propose. They should remember that that is an attitude of mind that is not very attractive; and the way this man took my refusal made me more than ever sure I had done right."

But fancy the possibility of her accepting "this man's" advances.

LADIES' CONFERENCE AT AMRITSAR.

AT THE session of the Ladies' Conference held at Amritsar during the national week Mrs. Hasan Imam spoke as follows:—

"Sisters,—I think it a privilege to be asked to address this distinguished gathering and I am sincerely grateful for it. In my opinion the question which immediately needs our attention is the question of Pardah. Practically half the woman-population of our country yet remain in seclusion, and are, to all intents and purposes, unable to take advantage of the expansive times now ahead. We have heard many platform speeches in the various Conferences and have read innumerable literature on the subject. Yet the progress that we see around us is very limited and hardly commensurate with the urgency of the problem. We are a people very slow to move and it is specially so in regard to the removal of Pardah from our Social system. While it is the duty of our men to do all they can to remove this evil from our midst, I think the duty cast upon those of us who have shed the trammels of Pardah is infinitely greater. It is too late in the day to demonstrate that the kind of Pardah that is practised in India has sanction in religion or can be tolerated by any living and progressive community. The causes which led the growth of Pardah in our Social System are now too well-known and it will be uselessly taking up your time to dilate on that aspect of the subject. All the reasons that are usually brought out in support of the system are now fully exploded and all thinking persons realize that Pardah is not only now a meaningless anachronism but also a source of great hindrance to the onward progress of our country. With the new opportunities that are to-day being offered to the country for progress and advancement, our ideals and aspirations are naturally set on a future for our country which should in every way be worthy of her past. Then, why not let us go back in imagination to the past history of our land when women were as free as men, held their own in philosophical and political discussions and were in the true sense of the word the inspirers of men. To Indians the names of Sita and Savitree and so many others in Hindu history have not only been

objects of adoration and pride but have served as examples of womanly perfection worthy of emulation. The Muslim History has her own heroines whose lives amply prove that women are never destined to live that demoralised and devitalized life which unhappily is the misfortune of so many of our sisters in Pardah. What does Pardah mean to-day as life is constituted? It simply means the division of home. Division of home leads to division of function which, carried to its logical conclusion, means division in the nation. There is not that harmonious concord, no blending of functions for common national good, and therefore success of all constructive national programme is bound to be hampered if not altogether denied. It is, therefore, to my mind of the highest importance that Pardah should disappear as soon as possible if our ideal of National emancipation is to be attained within the time we want."

THE DEVIL'S BEATITUDES.

I HAVE not been led to alter my views of the apocalyptic part of Christianity at all; but a cause which you would hardly guess has made me feel much deeper admiration for the ethical and spiritual part. We were all so saturated with Christian ideas from childhood, that one took it for granted that they were a part of human nature. But the men of science, with their reversal of all the Beatitudes—Blessed are the strong, for they shall survive; the self-asserting, for they shall inherit the Earth; the merciless, for they shall obtain useful knowledge—have made me realize, as I never did, how immense was the change introduced into the whole current of human life by Christ.

—*Frances Power Cobbe* (in *Champney's Adelaide Drummond*, p. 276).

[But had not Buddha already done much? The Roman formalism, which judicially balanced evil against evil and the Roman coarseness, which shrank from no brutality, are the real parents of modern scientific callousness. Paganism is not in itself essentially cruel.]

PAGANISM AND CATHOLICISM

AND A LITTLE POLITICS.

IN CONNECTION with the above paragraph it may be of interest to read one or two excerpts from the *Life and Letters* of Dr. T. Hodgkin ("Italy and Her Invaders"). He was a Friend.

"Everywhere the grand old Paganism shows itself so much nobler and better than the caricature of Christianity which is pasted over it!" (P. 83, A. D. 1870).

"Travelling in Italy makes me now (5 Febr., 1882), as it always does, a bitter Protestant; I feel what a frightfully degrading influence this kind of Christianity has exercised on the nation. One looks at the great works of Paestum and in the Museo Nazionale at Naples, and feels how utterly the power to reproduce, almost to comprehend, them, has passed away from the people. Would it not be almost better for them to be Pagans after the fashion of Phidias and Aeschylus, than so-called Christians and stupid worshippers of San Gennario? To say that Paganism was false, does not dispose of the question; for, to my thinking, all this tawdry, overloaded saint, image and relic-worshipping Christianity is just as false as Paganism, and far less beautiful than Paganism of the Hellenic type." (P. 126).

"Girgenti, 9 Febr. 1896 On the crest of a much lower hill are the glorious ruins..... of five or six temples. It must have been a superb place. To wander through the dirty lanes of the little modern Girgenti, and to hear the jabber of the inhabitants, to look at their narrow foreheads, and get hints of their poor, limited lives,—all this is rather depressing, because it makes me feel that here the world has not gone forward, but has gone decidedly back in the last 2000 years. But Christianity!—perhaps one ought to make an exception for that, and in a sense I do. Only, when one gets into the Churches, and sees the kind of function that is going on in them, one is not quite sure whether there is any real advance on the worship of Apollo and Athene. Except that all, even the dullest of the saints and martyrs wor-

shipped now, led at least respectable, and some of them holy, lives....." (p. 191.)

In 1896 he wonders, throwing his thoughts forward to the coming centuries—"What will have become of the claims of the Infallible Vicar, what of the claims of the Biological Professor." p. 206.

Hodgkin was a liberal, but—"I suppose, in a certain sense, Demos and Caucus must be accepted as the powers that be; and, therefore, 'ordained by God,' or, at any rate permitted by him like the unlovely monsters that wallowed in their slime while the earth was preparing for man's habitation." (p. 134, A. D. 1886)

And this is apposite to the League of Nations—"I suppose if the Parliament of Man were assembled in vigour (1871), it would have to execute its decrees against a recalcitrant France or Prussia by a process like the federal executions of the late Germanic Diet. Must not these executions, though in theory federal, practically be entrusted (as those were) to one or two of the strongest obedient members of the federation? The probable result last year would have been that while France and Prussia were belabouring each other, England, Austria and Italy would have been belabouring both to compel them to be quiet,—until after some months of this chaotic strife, Russia would have walked in and appropriated Constantinople, which exhausted Europe would then have been powerless to protect from her. This is perhaps an exaggerated view of the case, but I think complications like this would often arise" (p. 141).

He was an Individualist, yet—"I also feel that if war is absolutely condemned under all circumstances by the Sermon on the Mount, business, as we understand it, is equally condemned." (p. 241, A. D. 1900). And six years later, writing to Lord Justice Fry—"You know that I was rather disposed to think the Boer War an inevitable one: but I am rather sliding away from that opinion and am more and more feeling what a terribly expensive luxury 'Joseph' has been to England."

BEHIND THE PURDAH.

"ANOTHER phenomenon that I must not forget to speak of is the passionate love of one woman for another woman which is frequently found amongst us. It may be due to our being shut out for the greater part of the day from men, and being permitted to see women only. It is more than friendship, and takes on the line of platonic affection, and our scented sandal-boxes often contain love letters written by one woman to another. No harm results from it, and in a country where marriages are not the consequences of voluntary love, but develop into love often, though not always, human affection finds a safe vent in this manner. The husbands would no doubt be jealous of this innocent sentiment, if they knew of it; but they are generally ignorant, and we pass hours of rapturous joy in each other's company, and pine for the next meeting, and blame one another for the days of parting which we fondly imagine the coy beloved of our own sex has voluntarily inflicted on us to fan the flame of love, so that the impetuous moth may dash itself into immolation with greater zest. This, too, forms a frame-work for the joys and woes of the idle rich..."

—Whispers from Behind the Purdah,
EAST & WEST, DEC., 1919.

STAR--DUST.

VII.—DRESS.

I. PARIS.—One of the most interesting figures was Madame Dieulafoy. Madame Dieulafoy in trousers, swallow-tail coat, high collar and a white tie, was a somewhat disconcerting figure at first; she looked a slim littlish man, with much of the boy in the figure, till one saw a middleaged face, wrinkled, sunburnt, fair, with small features and smooth hair. Madame Dieulafoy had worn trousers (or rather, I suppose, then knickers) from her youth up. Her parents, wealthy landowners, having only one girl, and badly wanting a boy, had dressed her as one inside the seclusion of their own estates. Outside her home and, as the traditional "jeune fille," she had worn skirts. Then she married M. Dieulafoy and went exploring with him in the deserts of Babylon (there is a whole *salle* named after them in the Louvre) and she wore trousers there. Finally, with the permission of the police, she wore trousers everywhere and all the time—ordinary, fashionable men's trousers. I have watched her calling...with a correct silk hat balanced on a slim knee. Whatever it was for her, it was somehow disconcerting for others; and so difficult to remember that this apparent man was really a woman all the time.

—(Paris Through an Attie—A Herbage Edwards,
London J. M. Dent & Sons, 1915).

ERRATA, No. XVIII, P. 5.

The paragraph entitled "The Empress Marie Theresa" should be placed after the group of *Notes*.

DISTRIBUTOR'S NOTE.

URANIA is not published, nor offered to the public, whether gratuitously or for sale or otherwise.

Nos. 1 & 2 are out of print (Oct. 1916, June, 1916).

No. 3 never appeared, owing to No. 2 being a double number

No. 4 was issued in July, 1917.

No. 5 " " for Sept.—Oct., 1917.

No. 6 " " " Nov.—Dec., 1917.

No. 7 " " " Jan.—Febr., 1918.

No. 8 " " " March—Apr., 1918.

No. 9 " " " May—June, 1918.

No. 10 " " " July—Aug., 1918.

No. 11 " " " Sept—Oct., 1918.

No. 12 was issued for Nov.—Dec., 1918.

No. 13 " " " Jan.—Febr., 1919.

No. 14 " " " March—Apr., 1919.

No. 15 " " " May—June, 1919.

No. 16 " " " July—Aug., 1919.

No. 17 " " " Sept.—Oct. 1919.

No. 18 " " " Nov.—Dec. 1919.

No. 19 " " " Jan—Febr. 1920.

No. 20 " " " March—April 1920.

No. 21 " " " May—June 1920.

Copies of Nos. 4 to 21 inclusive can be had by friends. If copies are wanting to complete sets, application should be made to T. Baty, 3 Paper Buildings, Temple, London, E. C., when they will gladly be supplied as far as possible.

Printed and published for private circulation only by D. R. Mitra, at the Manoranjan Press,
3, Sandhurst Road, Girgaon—Bombay, for T. Baty, Esq., Paper Buildings, Temple, London, E. C.