

# THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW

"The Anti-Suffrage Review" is published by the Women's National Anti-Suffrage League, and can be obtained through any bookseller or newsagent. 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 Number: 8472 Gerrard.

No. 12.

LONDON, NOVEMBER, 1909.

PRICE 1d.

## IMPORTANT.

Please tell your newsagent that the ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW is published about the 10th of the month, and can be obtained from all the principal wholesale agents.

## NOTICE.

*For the opinions expressed in articles signed or initialled, or in letters to the Editor, the authors alone are responsible.*

The following are the members of the Executive Committee:—

THE COUNTESS OF JERSEY,  
*Chairman.*  
MRS. MASSIE, *Vice-Chairman.*

LADY HAVERSHAM, MRS. HUMPHRY WARD, MISS ERMINE TAYLOR, MRS. FREDERIC HARRISON, LADY GEORGE HAMILTON, MRS. CHARLES TENNYSON, MISS GERTRUDE LOWTHIAN BELL, LADY WEARDALE, MISS JANET HOGARTH, HON. NINA KAY SHUTTLEWORTH, ELLEN COUNTESS OF DESART, MRS. CLARENDON HYDE, MRS. ARTHUR SOMERVELL (*Hon. Sec.*), MR. HEBER HART, MR. ALLARD, MRS. BURGWIN, MRS. SIMON, LADY ROBSON, MR. J. MASSIE, M.P., and The Hon. IVOR GUEST, M.P.

The terms of Membership are:—Members of Council, £1 1s.; Members of the League, 5s.; Associates, 1s.; Membership of Branches, 1s. to 5s. (Branches can arrange for the collection of smaller subscriptions.)

Men are admitted as subscribing or affiliated members.

We should like to remind our men friends of the rapidly spreading influence of our Men's League: *Secretary*, MR. F. W. RAFFETY; *Address*, Palace Chambers, Bridge Street, Westminster, S.W.

## THE SET-BACK.

WE comment elsewhere upon the disastrous result of the Borough Council elections as regards the representation of women. It is only one of the signs, though perhaps the most convincing, of the set-back to useful activity brought about by the ill-advised agitation for the Parliamentary vote, which was begun in the autumn of 1905. Far-seeing people discerned in that agitation at the time a serious menace to the movement for the better education of women, for the improvement in their industrial position, and for the removal of such legal inequalities as still hampered them, which since the 'sixties had made such astonishing progress. Now the work of four decades has been undone in four years, and we have to begin again a task rendered all the more difficult because of the barrier of prejudice which militant Suffragism has built across our path.

The pity of it is that the many have been sacrificed to the few. As the *Times* remarked in an important leading article on the morrow of the Bermondsey election, "All the Suffragist societies put together form only a perfectly insignificant fraction of the women of this country." Probably the leader writer had in mind the extremely instructive figures, which through the energy of our honorary secretary had been made public in its columns. Mrs. Somervell gave the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies 20,000 members. They have since owned to 16,000. She gave the Women's Freedom

League 700, but had only information as to their Central body. Their secretary has since laid claim to 5,000, with a further body of "sympathisers." One of their Branch treasurers, feeling, perhaps, that "sympathy" unbacked by subscriptions might possibly be a little suspect, said proudly that they preferred "to gauge their work not by money, but by energy and enthusiasm." The Women's Social and Political Union, which Mrs. Somervell credited with 8,000, though it boasts of the number of recruits which join it daily, prefers to leave its membership obscure. But even if we give it Mrs. Somervell's 8,000 and double those figures, we still have less than 40,000, or a trifle over .3 per cent. of the 12½ millions of adult women in the United Kingdom. An insignificant fraction indeed! Against this we can place the quarter of a million signatures, which, after only a few months' pioneer work, we succeeded in getting to our petition last March. And we, who know the careful scrutiny to which those signatures were subjected, need not trouble ourselves much about the gibes which our Suffragist friends allow themselves as to how signatures were collected.

To be sure, there are a few societies still uncounted. They spring up daily like mushrooms. But some of them must be a serious trial to the others. For instance, there is the People's Suffrage Society, with its demand for adult suffrage. That was still unborn when Mrs. Somervell wrote. We fancy that Mrs. Fawcett's National

Union and Lady Knightley's Conservative and Unionist body may be wishing that it had been strangled at its birth. For have not both of them denied with all the emphasis at their command that women's suffrage would bring adult suffrage in its train? We have even heard Conservative Suffragists state that it would prevent adult suffrage. Yet at the National Liberal Club on October 18th speaker after speaker got up on the Suffragist side and denounced the limited Bill in no measured terms, pointing out with perfect justice, what Anti-Suffragists have always maintained, that the absurd anomaly of making marriage a reason for disfranchisement in itself condemned the demand for the vote "on the same terms as men," unless those terms were immediately altered.

Thus—to repeat—it is a fraction, and a divided fraction, which has brought about the set-back to the useful public work of women, shown by the Borough Council elections. Fortunately for us, the general reaction which has made itself felt in the municipal sphere is first and foremost a check to the suffrage campaign; and we may reasonably hope, with time and argument, both for the permanence of the check, and for the gradual disappearance of what is unjust in the reaction.

#### THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE MEETINGS IN THE NORTH.

MRS. ARTHUR SOMERVELL, while I write, is still continuing her brave and successful campaign in the north. As one who was her companion and colleague during three of these meetings, I may perhaps be allowed to report a few of my impressions.

The meeting at Manchester (October 26th) was not a meeting held by our League, but a debate on the Suffrage arranged by a joint committee, with Bishop Welldon in the chair. The large Free Trade Hall was crammed, and the proceedings, except for a few unmannerly interruptions, were perfectly orderly, and reflected much

credit on the organisers of the meeting. The opening was entrusted to myself, and I endeavoured to state some of the main reasons why the Imperial vote should not be claimed by women who love their country; while Mrs. Somervell later on met the arguments—what one may summarise as the "wages" and "reforms" arguments—so commonly used for the Suffrage. Our opponents—Miss Robertson, a fluent and effective speaker, Miss Margaret Ashton, a member of the Manchester Town Council, and Mrs. Swanwick, seemed to us merely to evade and not to meet the objections put forward on our side; but I am well aware that no one is a fair judge in his own cause!

Let me, however, just shortly examine one of the arguments used by Miss Robertson, and see what it comes to. Miss Robertson met the argument that Woman Suffrage will largely increase the political ignorance of the nation, since women are inevitably and invincibly ignorant—because they are women—of many questions which have to be decided through the vote, by the reply that the average male elector is ignorant, that he knows he is ignorant, and entrusts the decision of great questions of foreign policy, diplomacy, and international finance to the hands of "experts and permanent officials." "And," said Miss Robertson, "long may they remain there!" Nothing of course could be more utterly absurd as a description of the course of political action in this country. Questions of foreign policy and international finance are, with us, in the hands of Ministers of the day, selected by a party vote. To say that questions of foreign policy at this moment are in the hands of "the experts and permanent officials" of the Foreign Office, and not in those of Sir Edward Grey, is only to show that amusing vagueness about things political so common among women. Luckily, at the present time, "the experts and permanent officials" in the Foreign Office are probably at one with Sir Edward Grey. But there are many cases in which exactly the reverse happens. If rumour speaks true, should a Tariff Reform Government come into power, the Tariff Reform Chancellor of the Exchequer will find against him a solid or almost solid Treasury of "experts" and "permanent officials." It has happened again and again that the experts and officials of a Government department are all one way, and the Parliamentary head all another. What the

male voter, in deciding an election, has really done is to send somebody to turn out or neutralise one set of experts and put in another. And he has done this on behalf of an opinion or set of opinions that he is supposed to hold. The decision is his, the opinion is his, and the responsibility is his; and all that the experts and permanent officials can do is to come and advise him as to the best way of carrying out his opinion.

That the male voter often forms this opinion under grievous conditions of ignorance and party passion is of course most true. But at any rate throughout all classes—on the questions I enumerated—his means of arriving at an opinion are very much better than those possessed by—or at any time within the reach of—women. So that what you do, by giving women the vote on these matters, is to add to the dangers of male ignorance, already great, a much greater and more certain danger from the ignorance of women. We give the intelligence of the nation—over a large range of questions vital to the country's existence—a hard enough task already, in dragging, persuading, informing the political ignorance of men. And it is now proposed to make that task impossible by adding to this ignorance a new and infinitely graver form of it—an ignorance dependent upon the mere sex of women, and not capable of being educated, as it is in the case of men, by practical experience. Women cannot be soldiers, sailors, Cabinet Ministers, diplomatists, financiers, manufacturers because of their feminine and maternal functions; their knowledge of the various matters connected with these modes of life, matters vital to the bare continuance of the nation as a political entity, must therefore be infinitely less in the mass than that of men in the mass; yet it is proposed to give them a joint control with men—or even, possibly, a preponderating control—over the actions of those men who carry on these fundamentally important and masculine affairs. For that is really what the choice of a Parliamentary majority comes to; and therefore, what the exercise of the franchise means. Miss Robertson's attempt to throw the ultimate responsibility of the voter on to the shoulders of "experts" and "permanent officials" only shows that she has never accurately considered what the franchise really implies.

The meeting at Sheffield carried an Anti-Suffrage resolution by a large

majority. But the great success of our week was the Edinburgh meeting. Here we addressed a crowded audience of Edinburgh electors and their women folk, and there could be no doubt at all as to where their sympathies lay. Mrs. Somervell was quite at her best, and wrestled out her points with the mingled humour and deep feeling which makes her such an effective speaker. I began what I had to say with the assumption that owing to the lawless and violent agitation of the last few years, Woman Suffrage was no longer a matter of practical politics, and that in the long pause before us the nation would have time to consider the matter far more deeply than it has ever done yet. The position was accepted without challenge, and so far as I can see, the majority of English people at the present moment are convinced, willingly or unwillingly, openly or secretly, that it is the truth.

Well! if time there is to be, it can only tell for us. We must "organise, organise!"—think out what we have to say, and say it simply and fearlessly. We have to show that neither sentimentalism nor reaction have anything to do with our opposition to the Suffrage; that it is we who in these days of differentiation and division of labour are the scientific and the modern party; that the vote is only one of the citizen's weapons; that in the attempt to capture it we are neglecting weapons far more truly and appropriately ours; that a fatal agitation is closing against us for the present whole tracts of activity, such as local government, where we should have been to the front; and that the mere process of insisting on interference with the proper tasks and duties of men has already done grave harm to the life and character of English women. That England is abundantly ready to listen to this view of the case, and that it must be pressed forward without weakness or hesitation, is the conviction that I have brought home with me from my week in the north.

MARY A. WARD.

November 8th, 1909.

#### NOTICE.

ALL Branch Secretaries desirous of obtaining cards and particulars of the Working Members' Scheme (of which they have already received specimens from Messrs. Alldays, Ltd.) should apply to Miss Allarton, Secretary, Birmingham Branch, 19, New Street, Birmingham. Smaller quantities may be obtained through this channel than by applying direct to Alldays.

#### NOTES AND NEWS.

IN the September number of this REVIEW we expressed our grave fears lest the excesses of the Suffragettes should react disastrously upon the candidature of women for Borough and County Councils. Our alarm was only too well grounded. On Monday, the first of November, the elections to the Borough Councils took place all over England and Wales, and resulted in a veritable landslide for the cause of women in local government. In London, between fifty and sixty of them went to the poll. Of these only five were returned—Mrs. Salter, in Bermondsey; Mrs. Idris, in St. Pancras; Miss Alexander, in Kensington; Miss Balkwill, in Hampstead; and Dr. Kate Haslam, in Islington. Five councillors out of a total of thirteen hundred and sixty-two! In the provinces we have not the complete results, but the number of women elected is infinitesimal. Successes at Bath and Ipswich are balanced by defeats at Tynemouth, at Hull, and in Manchester. When the eligibility of women for municipal work was established two years ago, it was fondly believed that the electorate was alive to the special qualifications which women possess for that department of public life, and had not forgotten the splendid service rendered by women on the old London School Board. But the mad folly of the last eighteen months had obliterated all feelings of confidence or of gratitude. The women voters were as implacable on this subject as the men, or perhaps even more so. They were burning to show what they thought of their shrieking and kicking sisters, and they made no distinction: in their eyes all women candidates were tarred with the same brush.

\* \* \*

THE rout was complete, and it was the more deplorable that only the merest fraction of the candidates were active sympathisers with the militant party. Neither public work nor social position were of any avail to save them. Mrs. Worthy (who had made an excellent Mayoress of Battersea), the Hon. Mrs. Denman, Mrs. Bracey Wright (one of the leading members of the Camberwell Board of Guardians), Miss Sheepshanks (the daughter of the Bishop of Nor-

wich), Miss Farmer (a well-known Poor-Law worker), Miss Hubbard (the daughter of one of the most influential local politicians in Lambeth)—all were rejected. Another prominent victim was Dr. Annie McCall, and two indefatigable members of the Islington and St. Pancras Boards of Guardians shared the same fate. It was cruel, but inevitable. All over the country, silly, hysterical women have been proclaiming that their antics have made converts by wholesale; those who had been brought into close daily contact with the middle and working classes knew better, and on the first opportunity the "Revolt of Man" has taken unmistakable shape. It bodes ill for the Council elections which are to be held in March, and we regard this fierce sex prejudice, which has grown in volume with such rapidity during the last few months, as a national calamity of the first order. \* \* \*

THESE considerations, unfortunately, have no weight with the authors of this lamentable change in public opinion. For them the possession of the Parliamentary vote is the final and exclusive goal: the humbler rounds of usefulness, the sphere in which no one denies the prerogative of woman or disputes her capacity, have no attraction for them. And the very eve of the municipal election was chosen for the perpetration of a silly and dangerous freak, which was certain to exasperate still further the metropolitan constituencies. The women who poured what is euphemistically described as a noxious fluid into the ballot box at Bermondsey seem to have been under the impression that the destruction of a single voting paper would invalidate the election. Such a delusion, which a moment's conversation with any competent person would have dissipated, is an illustration of their intelligence and political capacity. The net result was that two papers were spoiled, that the declaration of the poll was delayed by twenty minutes, and that the presiding officer received injuries to his eyes, the extent of which it is as yet impossible to determine. One of the culprits declares that she had devoted much chemical research to the discovery of a fluid which, in the form of "an alkaline solution of pyrogallol," should be capable of destroying the marks on voting papers and at the same time be innocuous to any human being who might get in its way. Her knowledge of chemistry, apparently, is on a par with her knowledge of law.

It is only fair to say that this gross interference with the right of election, involving great pain and possibly permanent injury to an innocent and inoffensive man, was received with mixed feelings among the Suffragettes themselves. Miss Helen Fraser, as organiser for the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies, wrote promptly to the Press to express her indignation. And she added that she and her fellow-workers had immediately withdrawn from participation in the contest. One of the Miss Pankhursts, on behalf of the National Women's Social and Political Union, was equally prompt in dissociating that body from the action of its rival society. But she characteristically threw all responsibility upon the Government, "who, in their endeavour to crush the agitation for women's liberty, have thrown to the winds all principles of law and justice." But the Women's Freedom League, the association which has supplied the "pickets" for the House of Commons, came forward to glory in the deed, and to proclaim it a blow struck for political freedom. In a grandiloquent letter to the Prime Minister, they informed him that it had become their painful duty to invalidate the Bermondsey election. As we have seen, their triumph was "a little previous," but we do not suppose that this bald fact will shake them in the belief that "our action will be endorsed by all those who earnestly wish to remove the present degrading sex disability resting on women." We had always imagined that the three tailors of Tooley Street were of the male persuasion: and the manifesto of Mrs. Edith How-Martyn may be discounted by the protests which we have already quoted.

\* \* \*

MEANWHILE we have to chronicle another "protest," not directed against a member of the Cabinet, but against a medical practitioner at Handsworth, who, as deputy medical officer at Winsor Green Gaol, had assisted in keeping the would-be suicides alive. During the night of Thursday, the 4th of November, a large window in Dr. Cassel's house was broken with a hammer, and bills of the Women's Social and Political Union were pasted over his front door and elsewhere, while lumps of coal were deposited on his doorstep, with inscriptions, of which the following is a sample:—"Let the Home Secretary do his own dirty and brutal work." It was a piece of

childish malice worthy of the inmates of an old-fashioned boarding school; but it marks a new departure against which strong measures must be taken unless the servants of the State, doctors, matrons, and wardresses, are to be terrorised. We are glad to say that Mr. Gladstone has hitherto presented a determined front to the hysterical outcries of certain members of the House of Commons, and he has shown commendable spirit in his retorts to those who denounce "forcible feeding" as a dangerous practice.

\* \* \*

AND in dealing with this disagreeable topic, it may be as well to give the actual words used by Mr. Gladstone in the House of Commons on the 1st of November:—"Since the outbreak of violence at Birmingham in September I have followed one rule with regard to the prisoners who refused to take food. Where they were reported medically unfit to be fed by artificial means I have advised the remission of their sentences as soon as this was recommended by the medical authorities of the prison. In other cases it has been obviously impossible for me to remit the sentences, and they have received the medical treatment appropriate to their condition. Some of the Newcastle prisoners were released on medical certificates; others served their sentences under suitable medical treatment. In the case of Mary Leigh there was no indication until Friday last of any medical reason for her discharge; but on Friday, owing to a change in her condition, a consultant was called in, and on Saturday I received certificates which showed that her health, weakened by her repeated attempts at starvation, was suffering, and her discharge was immediately authorised." It should not be forgotten that nearly all of these ladies are voluntary visitors to His Majesty's gaols, who could procure their own release at any moment by the payment of a purely nominal fine.

\* \* \*

RECENTLY at Manchester doubt was thrown by one of our speakers on the Suffragist sympathies of Florence Nightingale and Miss Clough, of Newnham. Mrs. Swanwick replied that Miss Nightingale once signed a Suffrage petition, and Mrs. Fawcett wrote to the *Manchester Guardian* to say that, to her knowledge, Miss Clough was in sympathy with the Suffrage agitation. But the matter is not so easily settled. The question is:

Would Miss Clough be a Suffragist now? Is Miss Nightingale a Suffragist now? Many people who were Suffragists ten and twenty years ago have seen very good reason since to change their minds. We believe the truth to be that Miss Nightingale does not wish her name to be used on either side; and with regard to Miss Clough—well known through many years to the writer of this note—it is surely most probable that, could she watch the Suffrage spectacle to-day, her sane and wise temper would reject these unhappy developments of a movement which in her time had not fully revealed its tendencies, and that, in rejecting them, she would feel herself shaken as to the original claim itself.

\* \* \*

In this REVIEW party politics have no place, but we hope that we may be pardoned for quoting from the "Episodes of the Month," in the current number of the *National Review* the following vivid and characteristic *aperçu* of the situation as it strikes an independent and original-minded Unionist. "Another of our anxieties," writes Mr. Leo Maxse, "which should be set at rest before the General Election is the sneaking sympathy for Woman Suffrage attributed to some of our Front Benchers. In the House of Commons among ex-Cabinet Ministers only Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Mr. Walter Long, and Mr. Chaplin, so far as we know, have had the courage to pronounce definitely against Suffragettes and Suffragists, though happily Lord Curzon, who is a tower of strength to any cause he espouses, is a convinced and keen opponent of a movement which is losing all serious hold on the Liberal Party, and would rapidly disappear from practical politics but for the hopes entertained by its partisans of Mr. Balfour, who is reputed at some time or other in the dim and distant past to have declared himself a Suffragist. Others maintain that the Unionist leader has reconsidered his opinion, and that with the rest of the world he has been repelled by recent antics, which have demonstrated how utterly unfit for votes are the women who most want them. It is a very long time since he has uttered a single syllable on the subject. . . . It is highly desirable that there should be a clear and authoritative pronouncement. Otherwise, Unionist candidates may be tempted to give the usual meaningless perfunctory pledges, which will be taken seriously by both 'Gettes' and 'Gists,' who will

subsequently pretend that a national mandate has been given for Woman Suffrage, and will make its violation a pretext for treating the next Parliament and the next Government as they have treated the present Parliament and the present Government." A most wise and pregnant warning.

\* \* \*

THOUGH somewhat belated, the following extract from a letter to a contemporary has its interest as bearing on the disturbances which accompanied Mr. Churchill's Dundee meeting:—"It may interest your readers to know that in the 'Scottish National' procession, held this afternoon, October 9th, in Edinburgh by the militant Suffragettes, only 332 women took part in the march. Nobody followed under the banner 'Business woman,' nor could any representatives of the 'General public' be discovered in that section. Its title to be regarded as a 'Scottish' gathering may be judged by the fact that out of a population of 160,000, Dundee had 11 women following its banner, while Dumfries, with 13,000 inhabitants, sent 3 women. Out of 207 Royal and Police Burghs in Scotland, only 8 appeared in the Order of Procession. Numerically the procession was the smallest seen in Edinburgh for many years, and its failure demonstrated that while many in Scotland support Woman's Suffrage, they prefer to keep aloof from those who by their tactics bring discredit on civilisation." And it is instructive to find that out of the five Suffragettes arrested for disorderly conduct at Dundee some ten days later, not one gave a Dundee address. Miss Adela Pankhurst, who was described as "an organiser," is temporarily resident at Glasgow, and Mrs. Archdale hails from Edinburgh. The others were domiciled respectively at Clement's Inn, Cheyne Walk and St. James's Court, and three out of the party were, in the language of the charge-sheet, "old offenders." The female hooligans who earn notoriety by "molesting" members of the Government have a strong resemblance to the traditional Stage Army.

\* \* \*

It would seem that the Suffrage campaign in the United States has to contend with the same diversity of aims and tactics that is troubling it in this country. Mrs. Clarence H. Mackay, President of the New York Equal Franchise Society, has issued a manifesto deprecating the militant policy. "We feel," she says, "that in order

to obtain the enfranchisement of women it is not necessary to imitate the methods being used abroad. American manhood has always treated American womanhood in such a way as to make us feel that we shall ultimately achieve our aim without sensationalism." Not so Mrs. D. H. P. Belmont, who has started an organisation of her own entitled the Political Woman's Suffrage Association. New York society is divided into hostile camps; but it does not appear that the recent elections have been materially affected by these wealthy ladies who treat the movement as their latest distraction. At the same time we are heartily with them in their demand that appointments to Hospital, School, Park, and Health Boards should no longer be confined to men. Unhappily these are for the most part salaried places, and municipal politics in New York are a troubled sea. \* \* \*

In the last number of this REVIEW we stated, on the written authority of a Bristol correspondent, that two branches of the local Women's Suffrage Society out of three had had to be closed on account of insufficient support. We were, clearly, misinformed, as the following letter from Miss E. M. Williams to Miss Fox, the honorary secretary of the Bristol Branch of our League will show:—"It is not true that any Suffrage societies in Bristol have come to an end. Our Society and the 'Women's Reform Union' joined together in a shop on Blackboy Hill during August and September. As the venture answered well, we have taken 49, Whiteladies Road, which was one of Shirley's grocery stores. Both societies will have their offices over the shop. The house had been unused some time, and so needed a lot of repairs, and we have been kept out of it longer than we expected, as the drains have had to be put in order. We hope to open it this week. It is just by the Alexandra Drapery Company. It was no doubt because our societies were left without offices for some days that the report got about that we had come to an end." We can only express our unqualified regret at having given publicity to a local "canard."

#### PLEASE NOTE.

THE "Ideal Woman" Calendar, "A Calendar for all the Years," has been issued by the Women's National Anti-Suffrage League, and can be obtained direct from Caxton House for half a crown; or by post 2s. 8d.

#### OUR BRANCH NEWS-LETTER.

THE past month has been a very active one, and the League's winter campaign began vigorously just after the publication of our last REVIEW. Our branches all send in most satisfactory reports, and are hopeful of great success and growth during the winter. Of course the great event of the past month has been the Northern and Scottish campaign, which is not yet over as we go to press. (Reports that are not included in this number will appear fully next month.) Our speakers have had an excellent and effective campaign throughout the North, in spite of the boast of the Suffragists that the North is their stronghold. Large audiences were everywhere collected, which at Macclesfield, Sheffield, and Edinburgh were strongly on our side, while even at Manchester—one of the fortresses of the enemy—one could not but realise the growing power of the League.

An enthusiastic audience filled the Assembly Room of the Macclesfield Town Hall on October 25, when a debate was taken by Mrs. Arthur Somervell with Miss Margaret Robertson, B.A., Organising Secretary of the North of England Society for Women's Suffrage. The chair was occupied by Mr. Harold Whiston, of Langley, supported by a representative platform.

The resolution, put by Miss Robertson in a twenty-five minutes' speech, that the Parliamentary franchise be extended to women on the same terms as to men, was defeated by a large majority (84 to 62), after Mrs. Somervell's answer had been heard. The hearty applause which followed from many who had not voted showed the strong feeling on our side.

The chairman said he had endeavoured to form his own ideal of women, and he had asked himself certain questions. Will the social happiness of our English home life be lessened by the aggressive political work of women? Will the lot of the little children be made harder, and will they have less of a mother's care by this great change? Will women themselves lose their charm and gentleness by becoming closely associated with that direction of the stern battle of life which men had hitherto entirely controlled? He asked those important questions to himself, but he was not there to answer them.

Mrs. Somervell said it was necessary to make her position, and that of those who thought with her, clear. She wanted to clear the ground, because a great deal of what Miss Robertson had said was based on the misconception of their position. They were not opposing the suffrage because they thought the sphere of women should be limited in any way. They did not think that a woman should be kept from having a vote, if it could be shown that it was for the general welfare of the nation. The Anti-Suffrage League was not opposed to the present position of women with regard to the municipal and social affairs of the community, and they were told it was illogical to stop there. She contended that the Parliamentary vote meant considerably more than the municipal vote, for it was a symbol of the sovereign power of the State.

Miss Robertson had given what she (Mrs. Somervell) regarded as a false conception of what the Parliamentary vote meant when she spoke of it as the elementary right of a citizen. The anti-suffragists said it was not that at all, for it was the symbol of sovereign power, it was the final decision of the nation.

One of the reasons advanced in favour of female suffrage was that about five and a half millions of the women of this country were earning their daily bread, but she challenged those figures, because the last census return showed that the five and a half million of female workers included children from ten years of age and upwards. It was urged that if women had the Parliamentary vote they would be able to improve their industrial conditions and increase their rate of pay very considerably; but looking at the matter broadly women were not worth so much in the labour market as the men, and therefore it was idle to expect them to command the same rate of wages. If they equalised men and women's wages it would mean that thousands of women would be thrown out of work, because the men would be better worth the pay.

Tremendous interest was evinced in the debate on women's suffrage between our League and the North of England Society for Women's Suffrage, at the Free Trade Hall, Manchester, on October 26. The vast hall was crowded to its utmost capacity. Bishop Welldon presided, and the resolution submitted was that "the grant of the Parliamentary suffrage to women is against the best interests of the Empire and of their own sex." Mrs. Humphry Ward and Mrs. Arthur Somervell represented the Anti-Suffrage League, and Miss Margaret Ashton, Mrs. F. T. Swanwick, M.A., and Miss M. Robertson, B.A., spoke against the resolution. For Mrs. Ward's impressions of the debate, and of the Sheffield and Edinburgh meetings, we may refer our readers to her special article.

The night after the Manchester debate a meeting of the League was held in the Sheffield Temperance Hall, when Mrs. Ward and Mrs. Somervell addressed a very enthusiastic audience. Mr. A. Maconachie was in the chair.

Mrs. Ward began by a reference to the result of the Manchester debate, when a resolution hostile to the suffrage was defeated by a majority largely composed apparently of young girls, members no doubt of the W.S.P.U., voting under command.

"We were outvoted," said Mrs. Ward, "by a majority of women, many of them, so far as I could judge, in the flower of an impetuous youth! Very few of them indeed, except under the Adult Suffrage Bill, would have been eligible for the Parliamentary vote."

She went on to refer to a letter she had received from a working man on the day of the Manchester debate, giving his own experiences and explaining how the agitation tended to wreck and break up the working-class home. Mrs. Ward appealed to her hearers to work for the defeat of a movement so fraught with danger to the English home and to the English country. "We have to show the women of this country that there is a better way," said Mrs. Ward, "a way in which they can serve their country, partly through the great moral forces which have always been at the command of women, partly through devotion to the home, and

partly through those ways which have been opened to women by recent legislation."

Mrs. Somervell spoke admirably in the face of some heckling, which her adroitness put to excellent use, and our resolution was finally carried by a large majority.

At Edinburgh, on November 1, the Marchioness of Tweeddale, President of our Edinburgh Branch, presided over an audience of over 1,500 that was heartily Anti-Suffrage in sympathy, and Mrs. Humphry Ward and Mrs. Somervell spoke at length in support of the League. Lady Tweeddale declared that their Society was making great strides, and in view of late events, they should be glad to feel that they were banded together to show their disapprobation of the conduct of certain women. The Suffragettes were cutting their own throats by their actions. They were unsexing themselves. They were disgracing their sex.

Mrs. Humphry Ward said there was no danger of any Parliament passing a women's suffrage Bill, for many years at any rate. The tactics of the militant party had brought this about. The suffrage cause had been losing ground steadily of late.

The public meeting held in St. Andrew's Halls, Glasgow, on November 2nd, under the auspices of the Glasgow Branch, was attended by a good number of Suffragists, who made their presence known. Mr. George Calderon presided and commented on the fact that most of the women on the suffrage side said they were fighting for freedom. The use of the word "freedom" in this connection was a mistake. One of the women's suffrage societies was called the Women's Freedom League. If the Women's Freedom League, which was now giving official sanction to deeds of violence and disorder, and was in fact a society existing only at present as a conspiracy against law and order, was a society of men, it would not be treated so leniently.

Miss Violet Markham, founder of the Chesterfields Women's Settlement, said she had never denied the existence of very good planks in the suffrage propaganda, but they were built into a very rickety structure, on which, if they were wise, they would not attempt to build their national life. The average woman was specialised pre-eminently for one great function, and that was to deal with the affairs of the home. The anti-suffragists said that law-making implied the physical qualification necessary to carry out the offices of citizenship; in other words, personal responsibility for the law when made. Women by virtue of their sex could not fulfil this condition. The demand for the vote was minority legislation of a most flagrant character.

After Mrs. Somervell had spoken, both Miss Markham and she answered effectively a number of questions.

The annual meeting of the Bristol Branch was held at the Queen's Hotel, Clifton, on October 23rd, under the presidency of Mrs. Robeson, who was supported by Mrs. Harold Norris, Miss Long Fox, and others.

Miss Long Fox read the year's report, which was a record of excellent progress, and Mrs. Robeson and Mrs. Harold Norris spoke well in support of the Anti-Suffrage resolution, which was carried unanimously.

Mrs. Norris said at the present time this country was on the eve of the greatest Constitutional struggle that had befallen it, at least within the present generation. What

was the attitude of the very women who were asking to take a leading part in the affairs of this nation? All the suffrage societies were ignoring that great Constitutional struggle, and were fighting only for their own ends.

At the invitation of Mrs. Forwood, Mrs. Cooke, and Mrs. Spens, a crowded meeting was held in the Village Hall, Frimley, on October 19th. Mr. Nathaniel Spens presided and made an excellent speech, pointing out that the burden of life fell on men far more heavily than on women, as was proved by the statistics of mortality.

Mrs. Somervell said if they gave votes to women the result might not be felt in small things, but it would be seen when a crisis came, for they might have a Government in power which was not prepared to enforce its authority, because it had been put in power by a majority of women against a majority of men, who would not submit to be ruled in this way at such a time. They contended that as women had not the power to exercise the supreme test of citizenship—that of fighting and enforcing the laws—it was only common justice that they should leave the government of the country and the enforcing of law and order to men. While women had to give compulsory financial service to the country, men had to give both compulsory financial service and compulsory personal service.

It was unanimously decided to open a branch of the League at Frimley.

There was a large gathering of supporters of Anti-Suffrage in Sheffield on October 20th, at a reception which Mrs. C. H. Bingham gave at her residence, Brinklands, Brincliffe, to meet Miss Lindsay, the organising secretary of the League. Miss Lindsay spoke at some length, and put very forcible arguments against the extension of the franchise to women.

The annual meeting of the Ashbourne Branch was held on October 27th, at Ashbourne. Colonel R. H. Jelf, C.M.G., presided, and deprecated the action of militant suffragists, who by their behaviour were doing damage to the cause they advocated.

Miss Lindsay, of the Central League, gave an address, in which she said neither political party would gain anything by granting women suffrage.

A Manchester Anti-Suffrage Debating Society has been formed, and at its first meeting the subject of "Women's Wages" will be treated by Mr. J. Tolmie. The articles entitled "The Woman M.P.," which have been appearing in the Manchester *Evening News*, have now been published in pamphlet form, price 2d., or 1s. 6d. a dozen. The author, Mr. A. C. Gronno, has generously presented the articles to the League, and has also promised to guarantee the League against any loss on their sale. We hope that a substantial sum will be realised for the League, and shall be glad if members will make the pamphlet known as widely as possible.

A great triumph in debate was scored at Hampstead on October 18th as a result of a debate between Miss Fothergill and Mrs. H. Nevinston, the motion put by Mrs. Nevinston being "The tactics of the Militants are justifiable," at the West Hampstead Literary Society. The Anti-Suffragists carried the day by 180 votes against 18! The resolution and the majority by which it was carried were sent to Mr. Asquith.

## ANNUAL MEETING OF SOUTH KENSINGTON BRANCH.

The first birthday celebration of this branch passed off most successfully, despite inclement weather, the hall being quite full, although none but those who had invitation tickets were admitted. The only cloud was the absence of the President, Mary Countess of Ilchester, through illness, but the chair was ably filled by Sir David Gill, K.C.B., who began by saying that his presence there, in the teeth of other pressing duties, was a proof of the superior power of women without a vote. "No woman," declared Sir David, "in my belief, is ever so devoid of charm and power that she cannot influence one man, and if you give her the franchise then she will have two votes, and not one!" Miss Ross, hon. treasurer, then read the balance-sheet, which showed a satisfactory financial position, though as the hon. secretary afterwards explained, the expenses of an office and a secretary, which now have to be incurred week by week, will prove a heavy drain, and must be met by special efforts. Mrs. Archibald Colquhoun, hon. secretary, prefaced the reading of the report with a few remarks about the Bermondsey outrage, remarking that though some suffragettes disclaimed the actions of others, yet for her part she could see no difference in principle between the woman who went out with a bag of stones and the one who carried a hatchet or a bottle of vitriol. If they meant to do an injury with these things they were criminals, and if they didn't they were fools. The report showed a total membership of 575 (which had increased by five since it had been typed). About 35,000 names have been collected under Miss Manisty's auspices towards the Great Petition, and thirteen public meetings and ten drawing-room meetings have been held. A grand entertainment, consisting of music and comedy, is being arranged in aid of funds, and the ordinary evening meetings in Kensington Town Hall begin on December 1st. Major Frank Johnson, who said it was his first anti-suffrage speech, then gave a vigorous and patriotic address. He estimated that, from the statistics of suffrage societies available, not one woman in a thousand really wanted the vote.

Mr. Thos. Carson, K.C., then proposed a vote of thanks to the chair and speaker, and in an effective speech pointed out that the Royal Commission on Divorce included two women, which is a fresh indication that a "government of men" is quite prepared to seek advice from women. The proceedings ended with the National Anthem.

A MEETING will be held at the Conservative Hall, East Molesey, on Wednesday, November 24th, at 8.15 p.m. Speakers: Mrs. Burgwin, Mr. H. Morgan-Veitch, Mr. Pembroke Wicks. Admission free. Reserved seats, 1s. and 6d., can be obtained of Miss Peachey, Esher, Surrey, and at the door.

## BRANCHES.

WILL the following subscribing members of Council kindly forward their address to the League's head offices, Caxton House, Westminster: Mrs. M. Hepham, Miss M. F. Moreton, Mrs. Ross, Mrs. Charles Smith, Miss Wilkin, Miss Minet. Also the following members of League: F. B. J. Barnett, Esq., — Hardcastle, Esq., Andrew Smith, Esq., J. W. Bream, Esq., Mrs. Alston, Mrs. Henley, Mrs. (Charlotte M.) Hillard, Mrs. Hussey, Mrs. Harold Johnson, Nurse Kempster, Mrs. (?) Emily R. C. Malcolm, Miss Amelia Matthews, Mrs. Franklin Richards, Miss F. A. Samen, Mrs. H. Sullivan, Mrs. Sutton, Miss M. E. Waterham, Mrs. F. Watkins, Mrs. Winter. Also the following Associates: Miss Griffiths, Mrs. Harris, Mrs. Hoyle, Miss Landur, Miss Leckie, Mrs. G. L. Porter, Mrs. S. Radclyffe, Mrs. Seddon, Miss Talon.

[Owing to pressure on our space the List of Branches is omitted for this month. Our readers wishing to consult it are referred to the October number.]

## DEBATE AT THE NATIONAL LIBERAL CLUB.

(Abridged from the excellent report given in the "Manchester Guardian.")

On October 18th a debate on women's suffrage was held in the National Liberal Club, London. The hall was open to the public, and was crowded to the doors. More than half the audience were women. About a quarter of the men seemed to be members of the club, and among the remainder there were several workmen and a number of young men who seemed to attend the meeting for reasons of sport. The sympathy of the audience seemed fairly divided, with a slight balance against the suffrage. As customary in public debates, the speakers did not deal very carefully with one another's arguments, and the two speakers for adult suffrage societies availed themselves of the opportunity to demonstrate their own case.

### A "MILITANT" SPEAKER.

Miss Rachel Barrett, representing the Women's Social and Political Union, who began the debate, dealt chiefly with the matter of tactics, thinking it hardly necessary to point out to practical politicians the reasons for the vote. After a slight historical sketch of the movement, she pointed out that since the days of Magna Charta nothing had been won from the privileged classes by constitutional methods. Women's militant tactics began in 1905 with questions asked insisting on an answer, and attempts to send a deputation to the House of Commons. Violence was used against them, but they did no violence. They were angelically mild. They went on gaining the sympathy of the country. After years of these mild methods and suffering violence themselves, they began methods that might be termed violent. Would the Government now interpret the spirit of the times and give the women their emancipation?

THE WOMEN'S ANTI-SUFFRAGE SOCIETY.  
For the Women's National Anti-Suffrage Society Miss Violet Markham said that men and women were highly specialised instru-

ments for the carrying on of life, with profound and unalterable natural distinctions. The ordinary woman had one great primary sphere—the home. Women, owing to "nature's Salic Law," could not be the defenders of the State. People who make law must be able to enforce it. Suffragists say that public opinion makes the law, but the law rests primarily on public opinion's power to enforce it. Again, women were in the great majority under an adult suffrage. It was true to say that women would not all vote in one way, and would hold to the various parties; but when it came to any big question, such as, for instance, the shutting up of public-houses—(some cries of "Never")—a majority of women with a minority of men would, of course, prevail over a majority of men with a minority of women.

Mrs. Montefiore, speaking for the Adult Suffrage Society, said that as a mother and a grandmother she knew what was meant by the home, but her society thought of the home rather as colonials speak of England as "home"—the country they love. Women helped to pay policemen, just as other rate-payers did, and in that sense they enforced the law. Women would defend their country by undertaking the commissariat—"no more diseased tinned meat." The rest of her argument dealt with the importance of adult suffrage and the absurdity of giving votes to women on a property basis and creating yet another privileged class. Adult suffrage would have behind it all the organised Labour forces of the country. It was no use the women working apart from men and without the country behind them.

Mr. Heber Hart stated the case for the Men's League against Women's Suffrage.

Miss M. M. A. Ward, for the People's Suffrage Federation, made a very finished speech

... THE ...  
**COUNTESS OF JERSEY**  
AND THE  
**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**  
**OF THE W.N.A.S.L.**

WILL HOLD A

**RECEPTION**

On Tuesday, December 7,

At 3.30, at

**CAXTON HALL, WESTMINSTER,**

S.W.

TO MEET

**Mr. and Mrs. Harold Norris**  
**and Mr. A. Maconachie,**

who will give an Account of their Motor Campaign in the North of England.

TICKETS (including Refreshments), 2s. 6d. each; to be obtained of THE SECRETARY, WOMEN'S NATIONAL ANTI-SUFFRAGE LEAGUE, CAXTON HOUSE, TOTILL STREET WESTMINSTER.

for adult suffrage. She held that the women's suffrage societies as a whole had a strong fear of democracy and were blocking the way to real women's suffrage. They were asking the Radical Government to put its head into a noose that would kill them.

"WOMEN DO NOT WANT THE VOTE."

Mrs. Arthur Somervell held that women did not want the vote, and that everyone now knew that this was the case. She dealt at length with the figures of the various suffrage societies.

Further speakers were given five minutes each. A suffragist pointed out that even if the majority of the women did not want the vote that did not affect the claim of those who did want it. Mr. Hart's argument that it should not be what women want but what is good for them was amazing to come from a Liberal. It was the defence of autocracy.

The meeting ended without the audience being allowed to vote.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

DEAR MADAM,—May I call your attention to a mis-statement in the ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW for September? In the, I believe, opening article there occurred a paragraph to this effect: In a recent meeting at Girton College one of the speakers said: "If we really are men's political equals, how is it that no one here—neither teacher nor student—ever reads the paper?" Your organ goes on to say: "A dexterously planted shot which received no reply." Madam, I was present at that meeting, and on seeing your paper, I immediately recollected the speaker—a student—who had "planted this shot" about the paper-reading. I also remembered that the lady in question said nothing whatever about the staff—I should have been surprised if she had, for students are not cognisant of what goes on in the combination room, where the newspapers for the staff are placed. However, to make assurance doubly sure, I wrote to this student and received a letter, from which I quote the following:—"Of course, I said nothing about the staff in my remark re newspaper-reading. I would not have thought of doing such a thing. I didn't even couch my question in such words at all. I think I said not 'no one,' but 'so few of the students,' and I made no reference whatever to the staff, so please contradict that account as flatly as you like, and you can say that the speaker herself objects to her views being so grossly exaggerated."

Also, so far from being unanswered, two of the staff sprang up simultaneously to reply. I may add that it is part of the duty of students reading for the Historical Tripos to read the papers every day.

As this is not the first time mis-statements arising out of that meeting have been made, I must ask you to be so kind as to publish this letter *in extenso* in the next copy of your REVIEW.—Believe me, Madam, yours faithfully,  
DOROTHEA D. WOLLERSEN,

Ex-President of the Girton College Women's Suffrage Club and of the C.U.W.S.S.

October 12th, 1909.

[The writer of the article referred to sends us the following comments on Miss Wollersen's letter.]

"As an eye and ear witness of the meeting at Girton, I can only say that my remembrance differs greatly from Miss Wollersen's account. If the student who made the remark

did not include, and did not intend to include the staff in it, I, of course, accept her own account of her intentions and her words, though my own recollection differs. But certainly the impression made upon me, and, I think, upon a good many others, was that the statement did affect the college generally, both students and staff. In saying that there was no reply, I meant no effective reply, no contesting of the facts. Two of the staff did certainly rise to comment on what had been said, showing plainly, I think, that the meeting at the time considered that the staff had been included in the scope of the speaker's remarks; but what I understood from their short speeches was that a plea was made of lack of time and pressure of occupation. It is often difficult, in the rush of question and answer at the close of an animated meeting, to disentangle exactly what is said; but that the general charge of lack of continuous interest in political affairs—no very heinous one, after all—as prevailing in a college two-thirds Suffragist in opinion, hit home at the moment, and was regarded in the private discussion of the meeting afterwards as one of the most telling strokes of the debate, cannot, I think, be denied. I certainly remember no mention of the fact that students for the History Tripos are expected to read the papers, though it may quite well have been made; but in any case, it would have had very little bearing on the matter."

## LIST OF LEAFLETS.

2. Woman's Suffrage and After. Price 2s. 6d. per 1,000.
3. Mrs. Ward's Speech. Price ½d. each.
4. Queen Victoria and Woman's Suffrage. Price 2s. 6d. per 1,000.
5. Is Woman Suffrage Inevitable? Price 5s. per 1,000.
6. Nature's Reason against Woman Suffrage. Price 5s. per 1,000.
7. Shall Women Receive the Vote? Price 3s. per 1,000.
8. Woman's Suffrage and National Welfare. Price 2s. 6d. per 1,000.
9. Is the Parliamentary Suffrage the best way? Price 10s. per 1,000.
10. Women of Great Britain. Price 2s. 6d. per 1,000.
11. The Latest Phase of the Women's Suffrage Movement. Price 5s. per 1,000.
12. Why Women should not Vote. Price 3s. per 1,000.
13. Women's Position under Laws made by Man. Price 5s. per 1,000.
14. (1) The Franchise for Women of Property. Price 3s. per 1,000.
14. (2) Women and the Representation of Property. Price 3s. per 1,000.
15. (1) Woman's Suffrage and Women's Wages. Price 5s. per 1,000.
15. (2) Woman's Suffrage and Women's Wages. Price 3s. per 1,000.
15. (3) Votes and Wages. Price 5s. per 1,000.
16. Look Ahead. Price 4s. per 1,000.
17. Why the Women's Enfranchisement Bill (1908) is unfair to Women. Price 5s. per 1,000.
18. Married Women and the Factory Law. Price 5s. per 1,000.
19. A Suffrage Talk. Price 3s. per 1,000.
20. A Word to Working Women. Price 2s. 6d. per 1,000.
21. Votes for Women (from Mr. F. Harrison's book). Price 10s. per 1,000.

22. "Votes for Women?" Price 2s. 6d. per 1,000.
23. Anti-Suffragist's Letter. Price 6s. per 1,000.
24. Reasons against Woman Suffrage. Price 4s. per 1,000.
25. Women and the Franchise. Price 5s. per 1,000.
26. Woman Suffrage and India. Price 2s. 6d. per 1,000.
27. The Constitutional Myth. Price 2s. 6d. per 1,000.
28. We are against Female Suffrage. Price 2s. 6d. per 1,000.
29. Mrs. Arthur Somervell's Speech at Queen's Hall. Price 5s. per 1,000.

## PAMPHLETS AND BOOKS.

- A. Freedom of Women. Mrs. Harrison. Price 6d.
- B. Woman or Suffragette. Marie Corelli. Price 3d.
- C. Positive Principles. Price 1d.
- D. Sociological Reasons. Price 1d.
- E. Case against Woman Suffrage. Price 1d.
- F. Woman in relation to the State. Price 6d.
- G. Mixed Herbs. M.E.S. Price 2s. net.
- H. "Votes for Women." Mrs. Ivor Maxse. Price 3d.
- I. Letters to a Friend on Votes for Women. Professor Dicey. 1s.
- J. Woman Suffrage—A National Danger. Heber Hart, LL.D. Price 1s.
- K. Points in Professor Dicey's "Letter" on Votes for Women. Price 1d.
- L. An Englishwoman's Home. M.E.S. Price 1s.
- M. Woman's Suffrage from an Anti-Suffrage Point of View. Isabella M. Tindall. Price 2d.
- N. "The Woman M.P." A. C. Gronno. Price 2d., or 1s. 6d. per dozen.

## .. GRAND .. ENTERTAINMENT, Music and Comedy,

In Aid of the Funds of the South Kensington Branch of the Anti-Suffrage League.

Under the Personal Direction of  
**MRS. HUTCHINSON,**  
On **NOVEMBER 18th,**  
at **Eight o'clock,**  
AT THE  
**Kensington Town Hall,**

Under the following Distinguished Patronage:

Duchess of Wellington.	Viscountess Bridport.
Duchess of Abercorn.	Lady Biddulph of Ledbury.
Countess of Harrowby.	Dowager Lady Ashburton.
Countess of Jersey.	Dowager Lady Kensington.
Mary Countess of Ilchester.	Lady Valda Machell.
The Lady Edward Cavendish.	

Reserved Seats, 5s. and 2s. 6d.  
Entrance, One Shilling.

Tickets to be had from the Anti-Suffrage Office, 14, Church Street, Kensington (10 to 1), or from Messrs. Oetzmann, 157, High Street, Kensington.