

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, 1/8, post free.

The OFFICES of the LEAGUE are at 39, Victoria Street, S.W.1. Telegraphic Address: "Adversaria, London." Telephone No.: Victoria 2918.

No. 107.

LONDON, SEPTEMBER, 1917.

PRICE 1d.

THE NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR OPPOSING WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Executive Committee :

Presidents: THE EARL CURZON OF KEDLESTON, K.G.; LORD WEARDALE.

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

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

Honorary Vice-Presidents: Mrs. Moberly Bell, Mrs. Burgwin, Mrs. Greatbatch, Lady George Hamilton, Mrs. (Colquhoun) Jollie, Miss G. S. Pott, Miss Ermine Taylor, The Hon. Charles Lyell, M.P., Earl Percy.

Hon. Secretary: MRS. JEYES. *Assistant Secretary:* MISS NORA GARLAND.

MISS G. LOWTHIAN BELL,

[C.B.E.]

LADY CRAIK

MRS. LAURENCE CURRIE

MRS. GAMBLE

MRS. G. MACMILLAN

MRS. MASSIE

MRS. HUMPHRY WARD

KENNETH CHALMERS, Esq.

LORD CHARNWOOD

HEBER HART, Esq., K.C.

W. G. W. HASTINGS, Esq.

A. MACCALLUM SCOTT, Esq.

[M.P.]

A. MACONACHIE, Esq.

ARNOLD WARD, Esq., M.P.

THE HOUSE OF LORDS AND WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

When the Representation of the People Bill comes before the House of Lords in the Autumn Session, no subject connected with it is more likely to engage the serious consideration of the Members than that of Woman Suffrage. It is true that the Lower House passed the clauses in question by an overwhelming majority, but the fact that no attempt has been made to sound public opinion since feeling was so strong, before the war, against the enfranchisement of women, and the dubious conditions under which a majority vote was obtained for the recommendation in the Speaker's Conference, compel the great turnover in votes in the House of Commons since 1914 to be regarded with considerable suspicion. The proposal still remains a radical constitutional change, and one that has never been submitted to the judgment of the electorate; and at one time or another the shrewdest politicians of the day, even though ardent Suffragists, have recognised that votes ought only to be given to women after a clear expression of the popular will. That Suffragists, such as the Prime Minister and Mr. Asquith, have now found it convenient to drop the idea of a Referendum, and even to oppose it, is a further symptom of the suspicious character of the House of Commons' vote on the Woman Suffrage clauses. In these circumstances we may suppose that Members of the House of Lords will be particularly anxious to gauge the feeling of the country in regard to the subject, and to obtain, if possible, further light on the vexed question, which will enable them to judge dispassionately its merits and demerits. They will realise that, in view of the war, they must not look to the country to signify its views on political controversies in the usual manner. Official Anti-Suffragism, rightly or wrongly, has set its face against monster petitions, demonstrations, and so forth. It has taken up the attitude that the war over-rides all political controversies, and that Anti-Suffragists cannot lend themselves to political schemes and devices on a scale

which must distract popular attention from the work of defeating the enemy to a domestic quarrel. The faith and patriotism of Anti-Suffragists are robust enough to make them feel convinced that the good sense of the people will prevail in due constitutional manner, in spite of the temporary aberration of the House of Commons. The effect of this belief may be to throw a big onus on the House of Lords, but that body has shown itself on previous occasions a true reflex of popular opinion.

For what we believe will be real enlightenment on the Woman Suffrage question, we strongly commend to Members of the House of Lords a careful perusal of Suffragist literature published since the passage of the Representation of the People Bill through the House of Commons. Before that event Suffragists either indulged in vague generalities and pious aspirations, or deliberately threw dust in the eyes of the public. Now that they are confident of having reached their first objective, the necessity for maintaining the old pretences is held to have gone. Woman Suffrage, they think, is upon them, and according to their temperament they are either actuated by an uneasy conscience to see whether it may not be possible to make good some of the glib assurances of bygone days, or they throw off the mask and reveal under the Suffragist exterior the Feminist in full war-paint. It is quite touching these days to read of Suffragists' solicitude for home-life for women. In her ideal world, Mrs. W. C. Anderson assured a Hampstead Garden Suburb meeting most suitably, no woman would be driven from home and children by economic necessity, and every woman's home would be a home in every sense. When Anti-Suffragists made the same point they were ridiculed as being early-Victorian, and their opponents invented the catch phrase, "Woman's place is the home," which they proceeded to put into Anti-Suffragists' mouths, and then placed their own interpretation upon it. Not two years ago, when it was discovered that women's war work was likely to prove a Suffrage bull point, prominent Suffragists urged that, instead of a quarter of the adult women being "engaged in occupa-

tions," in the census term, at least three-quarters or more ought to be so engaged, and that to drive women into industry the State must subsidise crèches and communal kitchens. With votes, as is supposed, in sight, we find Mrs. Anderson declaring that "any respectable person having a perfect knowledge of the facts would agree that, from the point of view of women's best interests and the nation's best interests, much of the work done under national stress had better not have been done." Where then would the House of Commons' award be? Or is it that women's temporary work having been rewarded by the suffrage, they are to be discouraged from any further independent action, for fear they may not prove amenable voters?

This, however, is by the way. For enlightenment on the Suffrage question Members of the House of Lords may well turn to the August number of *The Englishwoman*, to which Mrs. Strachey, who is Parliamentary Secretary to the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies, contributes an article entitled "The Future of the Women's Societies." As it is not permissible in Suffrage organisations to speak of political enfranchisement being a reward for war work, the two reasons for granting it that now hold the field are the necessity for the representation of the women's point of view, and the necessity for the protection afforded by the vote during the reconstruction that will have to take place after the war. As a matter of fact, the sole argument that weighed with the House of Commons was the war-work reward one. It is bluntly stated by Sir Eric Geddes, and echoed with approval by *The Common Cause*, the official organ of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies. "It is perfectly clear to me," he is reported to have said, "that by their service in the war, women have earned a right to an increasing share in the industrial life and destinies of the country. . . . It seems to me that the natural corollary to this must be the admission of women to the franchise, a right which they have earned, and which, in justice, they should receive."

In regard to the women's point of view, it has always been contended by Anti-Suffragists that there is no such thing as a women's point of view, for the reason that women are just as divided in their opinions as men. The nearest approach to a women's point of view is the danger that women with votes may more easily than men be stampeded in a given direction on emotional grounds. Mrs. Lloyd George recently assured Judge Neil, of Chicago, that Suffragists (and presumably Suffragist Members of the Government) were counting on this fact to secure the abolition of public-houses and of the liquor traffic. It must not be forgotten, however, that the weapon thus brought into use is double-edged. Australian women have shown no enthusiasm for such a laudable measure as Prohibition, but they were easily stampeded against Conscription, which the interests of the country, in contradistinction to the interests of the individual, required. Mrs. Strachey is eloquent on the subject of the women's point of view. She writes:—

And first as to this united voice of womanhood. It has been my privilege to listen to discussions among some of the ablest and most progressive leaders of the women's movement upon all the large subjects chiefly interesting to women: endowment of motherhood, reform of the marriage laws, education, housing, internationalism, etc. I can lay my hand on my heart and say that on not one single one of these topics has there been any approach to unanimity. Even such a seemingly harmless proposal as equal pay for equal work bristles with difficulties and arouses the strongest opposition from some of the most advanced Suffragists.

Mrs. Strachey instances the Suffrage movement, and

points out that Suffragists "have sorted themselves according to their various temperaments and habits of mind, into a number of societies, which roughly meet their idiosyncrasies," for "the events of the last two years have made it excessively clear that one universal Suffrage Society would have been an impossibility." In these circumstances the House of Lords may wonder, as the country as a whole has wondered all along, where the particular advantages that are to accrue from Woman Suffrage will come in. If a gathering of leading Suffragists cannot agree amongst themselves on a housing policy, is it likely that their antagonism reflected in the polling for a certain constituency will revolutionise housing conditions in England, or introduce a single feature that has not already been suggested and acted upon by men? The challenge to Suffragists to instance a concrete case in which women's Parliamentary vote can become responsible for reforms that have not yet secured male support, still holds good. Their votes will duplicate men's, with a marked advantage for the Socialist faction, as the experience of other countries proves. A few Suffragists are beginning to realise the possible trend of events. Mrs. Creighton grows alarmed over "sham men"—the goal to which Suffragism has deliberately led its devotees. She reminds her hearers of tired men coming back from the war, "valuing their homes more than ever," and wonders whether they will be disappointed. It will not be the fault of Suffragists and the House of Commons if they are not. Mrs. Strachey, on the other hand, is all for according full recognition to the "sham men," and for keeping in touch with them as useful allies in propaganda work:—

The women's organisations that have done so much towards bringing about this state of affairs (*i.e.*, political activities among women) may also want to take a hand in the game. "These new voters," they may say, "the first-fruits of the dawning victory of feminism, have other and nearer interests than to decide whether imports are only to be taxed for revenue or what is to be the position of Ulster. It is above all necessary that our gains should be consolidated and that the weapon we have forged to our hand should be used to further the cause of womanhood and the progress of feminism." . . . Of course, there is a great deal to be said for all this.

Feminism has no terrors for the Parliamentary Secretary of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies:—

Those women who have been most prominent in the Suffrage campaign will now be more at liberty to turn their attention to these matters, and we may perhaps look for the formation of an organisation composed of the most advanced elements of women's opinion, comprising in its objects a veritable woman's programme. . . . It would have to forgo the temptation of claiming to stand for women as a whole, but its function both of education and of action in the vanguard of the movement would be most important.

A few years ago *The Freewoman* was the organ in the Press of the section that stood in the vanguard of the Feminist-Suffragist Movement, and it might almost be inferred that its resuscitation is to mark the grant of votes to women. That those whose views it represented will have to forgo the temptation of claiming to stand for women as a whole, is certainly a concession, for which it is to be hoped that the Suffragist conscience of the House of Commons will be grateful, if it should have the opportunity of studying the fruits of its overwhelming majority for Woman Suffrage.

Finally the House of Lords may see fit to examine the argument that woman requires the vote for her protection, especially in the difficult conditions after the war. A vote, therefore, is an instrument by means of which the better terms which everyone feels entitled to are to be wrung from the State or the employer. Here speaks the politician, under the leadership of a notable convert to Suffragism. It would

be thought that it was precisely this corrupt abuse of political power that needed to be exorcised from our politics, but the proposal is to invite an additional 6,000,000 voters to come into the game, in order to make for themselves all they can out of their votes. Mr. Asquith considered it a very reasonable proposition. We can but hope that the House of Lords will take a worthier view of politics and of women.

NOTES AND NEWS.

Labour and Woman Suffrage.

The voice of Labour, we are frequently assured, is unanimous in favour of Woman Suffrage, and the many votes of various conferences and organisations are cited as proof of the statement. That the great majority of Labour organisation executives are strong supporters of the policy of giving votes to women goes without saying, for they are shrewd enough to see what is hidden from Conservative and Moderate Liberal Suffragists, that they stand to gain much and to lose nothing from the innovation. But a curious light is thrown on these expressions of Labour opinion by *The Herald*, which must be given credit for knowing something about this particular subject. In its issue of August 25th we read:—

As matters are now managed a few men change their minds and huge blocks of votes, because of this change, are turned over from one side to the other. It is no secret that a change of this kind on the part of two or three men put 600,000 votes against the Stockholm Conference, which ten days before was (? were) given in support. This, however, is nothing new, and those who are members of the Labour Party must loyally accept the position until organised Labour chooses to change its methods. We think the difficulty arises because of the composition of the party and the application of methods suitable to industrial matters to the entirely different questions of political action. In an industrial dispute, or in a wages settlement, the majority must always carry the decision; but in politics, or such questions as peace and war, where others are involved, it would appear reasonable to expect that at least the minority and majority votes should be stated.

The Referendum.

If the principle advocated by *The Herald* had been applied to the question of Woman Suffrage, we should doubtless have heard less of the overwhelming support of Labour. For, in spite of the perverid advocacy of the principle by the Parliamentary Party, the fact remained that practically every chance gathering of working men and women was found to record its vote against it. To get over the difficulty in regard to the recent voting on the subject of the Stockholm Conference *The Herald* holds that the Labour Party Conference would have been well advised if it had accepted the proposal to refer the whole question to a referendum vote of the whole movement. A very practical suggestion; and it is of interest to read further:—

The Herald has always advocated the referendum, because we believe that the men who do the fighting, the men and women who make the munitions and carry on the work of the country, the women who suffer by the death or maiming of their loved ones, are the ones most entitled to determine the kind of peace which should be secured.

If they are entitled to determine the kind of peace which should be secured, still more will they be entitled to say, in the case of the men, whether they wish to share with others the duties of government which have hitherto rested on their shoulders alone, and in the case of women, whether they wish to have the responsibilities of government thrust

upon them in addition to the other duties they perform for the State. The words quoted prove clearly that the idea of a referendum is by no means strange to Labour—it would be amazing if it were so—and the decision to submit the question of Woman Suffrage to a referendum cannot fail to be warmly supported by the whole Labour world, as a recognition of the right of the people of the country to be consulted on a matter of such paramount importance and far-reaching consequences.

The Russian Moral.

The Russian Revolution supplies a very striking instance of a Government that does not rest on physical force. If the orders of the Provisional Government are not approved of in any quarter, they are disregarded, and so far there has been no means of enforcing obedience. The result is naturally chaos, and the practical illustration of the fact is gradually having the effect of making the Russian people realise that a State cannot exist unless it can count on compelling respect for its laws; in other words, unless those who make the laws are recognised as having the power to enforce them. But the introduction of Woman Suffrage must sooner or later expose this country to the condition of things which is the despair of M. Kerensky's administration at the present moment. The intention is to start with a decent male majority, but on all hands it is admitted that this cannot be maintained, and sooner or later—sooner, if Mr. Lloyd George is allowed to have his own way—when once the principle of Woman Suffrage is conceded, women will have the vote on the same terms as men, and there will be a substantial majority of women voters. All that is then needed is a sudden wave of emotion, a catch vote, or some political intrigue, and the country will find itself committed to a policy which the robust section of its manhood on reflection will not endorse. To the Labour Party, juggling with its blocks of votes as so many counters, it may not matter much whether the decision of yesterday is reversed or ignored to-morrow, but the government of the country cannot be run on those lines. They may suit an undisguised autocracy, such as that organisation is, but they will not suit a democratic State.

Woman Suffrage and Pacifism.

If any proof were needed that the House of Commons voted blindly in favour of Woman Suffrage without giving any adequate consideration to the question, it is to be found in the gradual realisation at the eleventh hour of the intimate association between Suffragism and Pacifism. It has been forgotten, apparently, that at the outbreak of war organised Suffragedom was wholly pacifist. A spokeswoman of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies elaborated the brilliant idea that the women of the Allied countries ought to have proceeded to Belgium and laid their heads on the rails, so as to prevent the German troops from advancing. The more practical Suffragists set about doing useful war work, but Pacifism was the official creed, and remained strong enough to split the National Union in two even a year after the war had started. Numerous other Suffrage Societies have been frankly Pacifist and pro-German throughout. All the Pacifist pro-German organisations are recruited exclusively from Suffragists, and this applies not merely to the more scandalous instances which are familiar to everyone. A document is being circulated, entitled, "The Basis for a Just Peace." It includes such recommendations as "the restoration to Germany of her Colonial territories or an

equivalent," the "widest application of the principle of the open door," "special economic opportunities might be ensured to German enterprise in Asiatic Turkey" (the italics are not in the original). Naturally, the signatories figure prominently in the Suffrage world. Women, by common consent, have done magnificent service during the war. Those of them who are Suffragists have been most prominent in decrying the war, in making excuses for the Germans, and in seeking to bring about peace in the interests of German militarism. The House of Commons accordingly has decided in its wisdom that the fit and proper way of rewarding the women of the country as a whole is to force upon them all what the Pacifist, pro-German section alone want.

FEMINISM AND DEPOPULATION.

I will first of all restate the feminist programme, i.e., "Competition between the sexes in all walks of life, with Society on an epicene basis," and this programme is to be carried out by Womanhood Suffrage, the only logical conclusion of the present Electoral Reform Bill. By irrefutable facts and figures I will endeavour to prove that depopulation is one inevitable result of Feminism.

Dr. J. C. Dunlop, Superintendent of the Statistical Department of the Registrar-General for Scotland, in an article written in January, 1914, on "Toll of the Mother's Toil," says: "Mortality among the children of occupied married women is 62 per cent. higher than among the children of mothers without remunerative occupation."

In an article in the *Nineteenth Century*, March, 1915, Dr. Brend says: "If the fertility of married women, in proportion to their numbers, had been as high in 1912 as in 1876-80, the legitimate births would have numbered 1,290,480, instead of 835,209 actually recorded. A loss of more than 400,000 infant lives every year from one disease alone would lead to the most stupendous national efforts being made to check it. To compensate for this loss the effects of infants' clinics and schools for mothers are like saving a boatload from a sinking liner." In the same article, after Table 2 on "Legitimate Birthrates in Social Classes: England and Wales, 1911," he says: "The most striking feature in this table is the low birthrate among textile workers, which is very little above that of the upper and middle classes.

Since the infant mortality in this group is twice as great as that of the middle classes, its effective fertility is actually the lowest of any in the list. . . . The custom of employing married female labour in the mills provides special economic inducements to this class to restrict its birthrate. . . . The revelation of the fact that the custom of restricting births has now reached the working classes is one of the greatest significance. . . . The English middle class birthrate has fallen to the extent of over 50 per cent. during the last 40 years, and we have actual figures showing that the well-to-do artisan birthrate has declined in the last 30 years by 52 per cent."

In regard to Society on an epicene basis, Dr. Sullivan is quoted thus by "Alice Vane Johnson" in the *Dublin Review Quarterly* for April, 1916: "Parental ignorance is the chief cause of sickness and death in children, particularly in mill towns, where the girls go straight from the schools to the mills, and are quite ignorant of household duties and care of infants." Domesticity, home life, and domestic service are always anathema to our modern feminists, whose propaganda in this respect—especially as to "preventive means"—has already had the most deplorable results.

Dr. J. Cossar Ewart, F.R.S., in the *Nineteenth Century*, July, 1917, tells us: "There were 100,000 fewer babies in 1915 than in 1914, and in 1916 29,000 fewer than in 1915.

. . . . In 1910 the births in the United Kingdom exceeded the deaths by 413,715; in 1916 the excess over the deaths was 362,354, but in 1915 only 252,201. . . . In 1915 95,608 infants were dead and buried before they were a year old. . . . Unless the birth rate increases. . . . the death rate may soon exceed the birth rate. . . . In Edinburgh, for the first three months of 1917 the deaths exceeded the births by 222. . . . On an average in 1915 nine men of the British Forces engaged in the war died every hour. . . . The loss of children was still heavier, for on an average during 1915 12 babies under one year old died every hour. . . . It is highly probable that in Great Britain the waste of life before birth is as great as that during the first year after birth. . . . Infants do not die, they are killed. . . . Cow's milk is so much to the liking of micro-organisms that it sometimes contains more bacteria than liquid sewage. . . . When Nature's plan is followed—i.e., when the milk of the mother passes straight from the milk gland into the mouth of her offspring—few micro-organisms have a chance of reaching the milk. . . . It was no part of Nature's plan that cow's milk should be substituted for human milk. . . . Unfortunately, the interference with Nature's plan. . . . has led to the loss of a countless number of infants. . . . A careful investigation made some years ago showed that the city of Berlin was in the habit of consuming daily with its milk about 300 lb. of cows' dung. . . . London surgeons are more than warranted in referring to "that filthy food called milk!"

According to very full and interesting statistics, published by Dr. Meyrick Booth, B.Sc., in the *Hibbert Journal* for October, 1914, it is shown that, among the whites in the British Empire and in the United States, only the Roman Catholics and the Jews are really appreciably increasing their numbers. He says: "From the statistics which have been collected, it would appear that modern Protestantism is now—in practice, if not in theory—virtually identified with a very extreme type of Malthusianism, and that, in consequence of this state of affairs, it is being driven back in practically all the great centres of civilisation, both in the Old World and in the New, while the cream of its human material is suffering gradual extinction." And this before the war!

Dr. Phillip Boothyer, Medical Officer of Nottingham, said at a meeting of The Royal Sanitary Institute at Brighton, in September, 1915: "I hope we shall learn in some measure as a nation, the suicidal folly and immorality of cutting down our offspring to one or two individuals per family, as many have in recent years. . . . Large numbers of parents who mourned the death of an only child in this war, might have had other children to comfort them and carry on the family, had they been willing." Verily Bradlaugh's and Mrs. Besant's "Fruits of Philosophy" in the 'seventies bears a crushing burden of responsibility.

If the meeting had been held at Brighton this year, he might have added, that in spite of the renowned quality of Brighton and Hove as health resorts, in Brighton in 1915 the deaths exceeded the births—exclusive of soldiers' deaths. The birth rate being 16.87 and the death rate 17.82. Hove can generally boast of almost the lowest birth rate in the Kingdom, being in 1915 15.74 (13.14 in 1914), while the death rate was 17.24, or as the Report has it: "The deaths exceeded the births by 58." Both towns are hot-beds of feminism.

Dr. Parkes, the Acting Medical Officer of Health for Ken-

sington, stated in 1915 that: "Those who can best afford to bring up children have the smallest families. In North Kensington, which is poor and has many slums, the birth rate last year was 26.6 per 1,000; but in South Kensington, which is rich, the birth rate was only 9.8."

In 1883 the population of the British Isles was about 36 millions, while that of the German Empire was 45 millions—a difference of but 9 millions. Now more than 20 millions are required to fill the gap. Since the 'seventies the English birth rate has decreased from 36 to 21 per 1,000.

It is a noteworthy fact that in some of the Australasian Colonies, where women enjoy the suffrage, and where economic conditions can have no bearing, and in France, where women are actively engaged in business and commerce, the birth rate is almost the lowest in the civilised world. In Australasia about 1910, the decrease in the birth rate in Queensland was 23.2 per cent.; West Australia, 23.9; Victoria, 24.2; New Zealand, 24.5; South Australia, 28; New South Wales, 30.61.

In the middle of last century, the population of France and Germany were about the same. In June, 1914, the German population was estimated at 67,812,000; the French at about 39½ millions, or 28 millions in favour of their enemy. If French women had not thus wilfully refused to bear offspring, there would have been no war.

History repeats itself. Sir John Seeley, the historian, in his essay on "Roman Imperialism," attributes the decline and fall of both the Greek and Roman Empires primarily to race-suicide, or the deliberate refusal of their women to bear offspring. He says, speaking of the Roman Empire: "The immediate cause to which the fall of the Empire can be traced is a physical, not a moral decay. In valour, discipline, and science, the Roman armies remained what they had always been. . . . but the problem was, how to replenish those armies? Men were wanting, and the Empire perished for want of men. . . . The Lex Julia is the irrefragable proof of the existence. . . . of that very disease which. . . . destroyed the Empire. . . . The enactment consisted of a number of privileges and precedences given to marriage. It was, in fact, a handsome bribe offered by the State to induce the citizens to marry. . . . To enquire into the causes of this aversion to marriage in this place would lead me too far. We must be content to assume that, owing partly to this cause, and partly to the prudential check of infanticide, the Roman population seems to have been almost stationary. The same phenomenon had shown itself in Greece before its conquest by the Romans. There the population had greatly declined, and the shrewd observer, Polybius, explains that it was not owing to war or plague, but mainly to a great repugnance to marriage, and reluctance to rear large families, caused by an extravagantly high standard of comfort."

In "Heredity and Society," Mr. W. C. D. Whetham, F.R.S., writes: "Both in Athens and in Rome, during the period of splendour which ushered in their decay, the dearth of children in the patrician and upper classes, and others who successively came to the front to fill the empty places, was regarded with alarm by the responsible statesmen of the day, and the tendency of the best women to remain, if not unmarried, at least childless, or to find occupation and interest in the political and literary spheres of life, was recognised to be a source of national danger."

Dr. Burrows, the present Bishop of Sheffield, said at the Southampton Church Congress in 1913: "There was no degradation so terrible as the refusal to carry out God's purposes in the creation of life." While Browning goes so

far as to assert that "Womanliness means only Motherhood: All love begins and ends there."

There have been many writers, including Tolstoy, Zola, and Ibsen, who have written books—such as Zola's "Rougon Macquart" series—on the inevitable decadence and degeneracy in families from inherited evil characteristics, even to their ultimate extinction; but I am not aware that any of these writers have written on the regeneration of families attributable to the same law—which of course applies both ways. In fact, only by this law of heredity do I believe it possible, in accordance with the Divine Providence, for the world to become finally regenerated. But this consummation will never even commence unless the most fit, morally, mentally, and physically, produce abundant offspring from generation to generation. Nowadays, because of the refusal of the most fit, the population is mainly maintained by the offspring of the least fit, with accumulating disastrous consequences. It has often been remarked that the more highly educated and intellectual women hardly bear any children, or at the most one or two. From the standpoint of heredity and regeneration this is absolutely deplorable, for only by offspring can the most fit increase and multiply, and more especially as clever men generally marry clever, even if not hyper-educated, women. There is in George Meredith's "Egoist" an instructive parable of the double-blossomed cherry-tree, which bore such a wealth of flowers that it was barren of fruit. It was, in fact, a beautiful and innocent imposition, so finely cultured that it had forgotten the main purpose of a fruit-tree's life. Whether the too strenuous brain-work entailed in the higher education renders these women unproductive, or whether they are guilty of wilful restriction, the result is the same. According to the criterion of unselfishness and patriotism, nay, even more of use and Godliness, the potentially clever, if less highly educated, wife and mother is, out of all comparison, a far higher order of being than the most learned but barren woman of genius, whether married or single. If this is not very quickly recognised and acted upon, the higher forms of civilisation will gradually become extinct, and the British Empire, at any rate, will decline and fall, even as the Greek and Roman Empires before it, and for much the same reason. We must never forget that the will to produce offspring, or the contrary, is as much a matter of heredity as any other personal or national characteristic, which, if allowed to become atrophied and moribund from want of use, must be fatal to any nation. Social life on an epicene basis, with competition between the sexes in all walks of life, means "the passing of the child," and as population is the bed-rock of Empire, the eventual overthrow of a feminist community by a more virile, God-fearing people, is only a question of time.

Break the Divine laws of order, and in an accelerating ratio decadence and disorder ensue.

As our great and much-loved Queen Victoria said: "God created men and women different—then let each remain in their own position." I submit that the foregoing indictment against the feminist programme proves the truth of her words. Men's work in normal conditions is not women's work. If our women would mind their own business, and concentrate their wonderful organising abilities on home-life, wifehood, and motherhood, and leave their men to do their own work, for which they were created, the British Commonwealth may yet recover from her almost overwhelming losses, and peace and happiness may bless our country; but if, through Woman Suffrage, the feminists succeed in enforcing their programme, the decline and fall of the British Empire must inevitably follow.

Γνώθι σεαυτόν.

THE INFORMATION BUREAU.

415, Oxford Street, W.

The political events of the last seven months have caused the Bureau Committee—in common with all loyal Anti-Suffragists—no little anxiety, and much time and thought have been spent in deliberation as to the proper course of action to be pursued in the circumstances. At the meeting in April, at the house of Mr. Mitchell Innes—at which the entire body of the Bureau Committee were present—there was much discussion of the matter, and various opinions were expressed as to whether or not it would be desirable to convene meetings and to carry on other kinds of propaganda. One speaker, whose Parliamentary experience renders his advice of great value, gave it as his opinion that meetings should be held whenever possible, and that although Anti-Suffragists were engaged in many kinds of work immediately connected with the war, it was eminently necessary that, for the sake of the country, they should spend every spare moment in Anti-Suffrage work. The Bureau Committee resolved to act on these suggestions, and organise what they considered a test meeting in order to try to find out something of the feelings of the London Branches on the subject. The Paddington and Mayfair Branches agreed to co-operate with the Bureau Committee, and thanks to the kindness of Miss Cochrane, the meeting, already mentioned in the REVIEW, took place at 81, Eaton Square on the 23rd of May. The result more than fulfilled the expectations of the Committee. The audience, a truly representative one, and fully two hundred in number, was most enthusiastic, and showed that the Anti-Suffrage spirit was far from being dead.

The two open-air meetings in Hyde Park organised by the Mayfair Branch may be said to be part of the outcome of the Eaton Square meeting, and it is hoped that the brave and patriotic efforts of endeavour to help the country ward off one of the most serious dangers that threatens it from within will, in the near future, stimulate others to follow such a good example. The Committee have great pleasure in announcing that, at the request of Mrs. Whittick, President of the Battersea Branch, a meeting has been arranged, and will be held at the Bureau on Wednesday, September 12th, at 2.15 p.m., to which the members of the Mothers' Union in Battersea will be invited. The speaker will be Mrs. Stocks, who has kindly promised to give an address on certain aspects of the Woman's Movement that should make a strong appeal to all right-minded women, and especially to wives and mothers.

The Committee also hope to be able to arrange a second meeting, to be held on the same day at 8.15 in the evening, for the benefit of young workers in certain offices, who are already keen on the Suffrage question, but who, so far, have had little opportunity of learning the true state of affairs, and how the measure now before Parliament will, if it should become law, affect the country.

The Committee desire to tender their very sincere thanks for donations and subscriptions towards the general purposes fund and the rent of the room to Mrs. Moberly Bell, Mr. and Mrs. Geo. King, Mrs. Bonner, Mrs. Bell, Mrs. Rawlinson, Mr. and Mrs. Foster, Mrs. Warren, Miss Wadsworth, Miss Blenkinsop, Dr. and Mrs. Gibbes, Miss Edith King, Mrs. and Miss Taylor, Mrs. C. Smith, the Misses Martin, Mrs. Greatbatch, Miss Emily Luck, Miss Cator, Mrs. A. E. George, Mrs. Whittick, Miss M. Barnes, Miss Shand, Mrs. Willoughby Dumergue, Miss L. Frere, and Mrs. Dalgarno Robinson. Donations have also been received from the Sanderstead and Purley Branch, and from the Scarborough Branch, and the Dulwich and Richmond Branches.

There is still, however, wanting, the sum of ten pounds to complete the amount necessary for carrying on the Bureau and all its works until Christmas, and the Committee earnestly appeal to all Anti-Suffragists who have the welfare of the country at heart to help this good object. The Committee venture to think that during its existence the Bureau has done much useful work in the Anti-Suffrage cause, and that there is still much for it to do during the coming autumn, when the fate of the country with regard to Woman Suffrage will probably be decided. During the past three years the Committee have given their attention chiefly to various activities immediately connected with the war, as is already well known to readers of the REVIEW, but they have always been loyal to their Anti-Suffrage principles, and kept themselves in readiness for the time when those principles should have to be put once more into active practice. That time has come all too soon, and it is to be regretted that political work should have to be taken in hand during the war, but to shirk any responsibility at this crisis in the affairs of the nation, to falter in the only course of action honourably possible, would be false and treacherous, not only to the men at the front whose electoral rights are in danger, but also to the sacred and glorious memory of those who can never return to work for the cause in which during their lives they believed so firmly.

The Committee will be grateful for any contributions—however small—to the general fund above mentioned; these may be sent to the Honorary Secretary of the Bureau, Miss M. Barnes, who, since the resignation of Miss Lindsay, has generously placed her services at the disposal of the Committee. It is a matter for regret that the working party has been considerably depleted during the past few months, and has lost many members from various causes. Nevertheless, a great many useful articles have been sent to certain of the military hospitals, and an order for forty overall caps for the doctors from one hospital was executed with the customary promptitude. Two commissions were sent from Queen Mary's Needlework Guild, one consisting of three hundred cap covers, to be lined, for the men in Salonika, the other, of two hundred pairs of shorts for the men in France; these latter are in process of making.

The Committee will be glad to hear from any readers of the REVIEW who would be willing to join the working party at the Bureau, or who would become home workers, and make surgical sponges, for which there is a constant and increasing urgent need. Patterns and directions for making these can be obtained on application to the Bureau. The Committee beg to acknowledge with many thanks valuable consignments of many useful articles from Miss Hastie's working party, Mrs. Deane's working party, Mrs. Dyer's mothers' meeting, and the Arneside Ladies' Bandaging Association. They also tender their thanks to Mrs. Young for her kind gift of a great many knitted woollen squares in various beautiful colourings. These have been made into two Serbian blankets by the skilful hands of Miss Shand.

In the list of appointments to the new Order of the British Empire, none probably has a more interesting record behind it than that of Miss Gertrude Lowthian Bell as Commander. The meagre annotation which accompanies the honour, "has done special war work in the East and rendered valuable service to the Red Cross," does little to lift the veil on Miss Bell's actual work, which is unique among the many and varied parts that women have been called upon to play in this war. Members of the National League for Opposing Woman Suffrage will be particularly gratified that Miss Bell's services have been recognised, and will await with interest the time when more can be said about them.

WAR-TIME COOKERY.

THE CASSEROLE.

Casserole cookery is at least one of the methods of solving the increasingly acute servant problem. In many French households, and especially where the mistress does most of the cooking, casseroles abound, and I know one French house where they are proud of the fact that with the exception of the kettle, there is not one iron utensil in the kitchen. Anyone who has to do much of their own cooking soon learns to appreciate the cleanliness of casserole cookery, which reduces work to a minimum. The only reason casseroles are not more popular in this country is because they are more breakable than iron; but after all, they only need reasonable care. They should never be put down roughly on the range, especially when they are full, and no casserole should be transferred from a hot range to stand in a cold sink, or it will crack instantly. Nor should they have cold water run on to them when they are hot. Before being used for the first time they should be left soaking for twenty-four hours in cold water, and then filled with cold water and be brought slowly to the boil. The older the casserole is the more seasoned and fireproof it becomes, but it should never be brought into direct contact with a flame.

The great merit of casserole cookery is not only its cleanliness; for there is no comparison between food cooked in iron and that which has been prepared in earthenware. Anyone with a keen sense of taste can tell instantly if fruit or vegetables have been cooked in iron, because there is always a certain metal taste, and again anything like scrambled eggs is quite different when done in a china frying pan. But the great joy of cooking with casseroles is the rapidity with which they can be cleaned. For instance, when one has dealt with an ordinary iron stockpot and cleaned it for a few days, one quickly comes to the conclusion that if having soup involves cleaning a stockpot properly every day, life is not long enough, and it would be preferable to do without the soup. The soup is far better when made in a large earthenware casserole; not the expensive kind which are glazed outside, but the cheap kind which are only glazed inside. Again, when the range is crowded, it is often more convenient to make the soup in the oven, which is easily done with a casserole, but impossible with a stockpot. Incidentally, as all good cooks know, "baked soup" is far better than soup made in the ordinary way. Quite the most nourishing way of making beef tea is in a casserole in the oven. The maximum of nourishment is extracted from the beef, and it is given to the invalid in the most digestible form. To make it, shred a pound of the shin of beef (the shin is the most nourishing part) very finely, and leave it soaking all night in half a pint of cold water. Then seal the lid of the casserole hermetically with a paste of flour and water, and put it in a slow oven for six hours. Strain it, and leave till cold, when the fat must be taken off. It will not be a hard jelly, and if you wish to have a hard jelly, put it in a hotter oven, but it is more nourishing when made in a slow oven.

The following are some very good recipes, and the soups are particularly good when made in earthenware:—

ALMOND SOUP.

1 quart of white stock well flavoured with mace and onion; 4 oz. ground almonds; 1 breakfast cup milk; 2 table-spoons rice flour or ordinary flour; half a tea cup of cream; salt and pepper.

Simmer the ground almonds in the milk for one hour. Make the flour into a perfectly smooth paste with a little milk, add to the stock and bring through the boil. Rub the almonds through a sieve, and add them. Lastly add the

cream and season with salt and pepper. The cream must be heated before adding it to the soup. There is the same difference between soup to which hot cream has been added and that to which cold cream has been added, as there is between coffee made with hot milk and that made with cold. English people are chary of using even a spoonful of cream in cooking, though they waste a lot of money on bought sauces; but if you decline to use cream, put the yolk of an egg in the tureen and mix it well with a little of the hot soup (this must be done slowly and carefully, or it will curdle), and then add the remainder of the soup. This soup can also be made with Brazil nuts or pine kernels; it is very nourishing.

MOCK BISQUE SOUP.

Required:—1½ lb. tomatoes; 1½ pints milk; ½ tablespoon flour; ½ oz. butter; ½ teaspoon sugar; pepper and salt.

Boil the tomatoes in a very little milk and water till they are cooked, and then rub them through a sieve. Make the butter and flour into a smooth paste with a little of the milk, then add the rest of the milk, and boil for ten minutes. Add the tomato pulp, season, and re-heat, *but do not let it boil again.*

CREAM OF HERBS.

Required:—1 breakfast cup cream; 2 breakfast cups milk; 1 breakfast cup stock; the yolks of three eggs; 2 heaping table-spoonfuls of tarragon, thyme, chervil, and parsley; pepper.

Boil up the cream and milk, and when cold whip the yolks in it. Add the stock and the herbs, and heat slowly, *but do not let it boil.* Serve with dice of fried bread.

POT AU FEU.

The following is a genuine French recipe for this soup, which is the national broth of France:—

Required:—3 lb. shin of beef; 2 carrots; 1 turnip; 1 root parsley; 2 onions stuck with cloves; 1 parsnip; 1 cabbage; mace, peppercorns, and all-spice salt and a small bunch of herbs.

Remove the bone from the meat, tie up the meat and break up the bone. Simmer in three quarts of water for quite five hours. In French households the meat and vegetables are served as a separate dish, and the broth is poured over pieces of bread. Please notice the inclusion of the root of parsley, which the average English cook does not appreciate at its proper value. E. S.

BUBBITTY.

Under this captivating title Messrs. Dent and Sons promise several educational books, in French and English, as soon as war exigencies permit. They are written by Mrs. Gladstone Solomon, and include numerous illustrations by the author. There are to be Bubbitty French Books and Bubbitty Reading Books, and it is claimed for them that they make learning interesting to very young children.

HOW THE VOTE WAS WON.

In *Votes for Women*, over the signature "Henry W. Nevinson," we read:

"In this country it is not by abstract considerations of logic, or even of justice, that a cause is won. The concrete realisation of woman's capacity and public devotion—the sight of women working in munition factories, in the hospitals and fields and streets—these are the solid arguments which have appealed, not only to the country, but to such feeling and passion as the House of Commons possesses."

In other words, the country (which has expressed no view at all on the subject) is to be saddled with Woman Suffrage, not on any logical grounds such as considerations of justice or its own interests, but entirely owing to the emotionalism of Members of Parliament who are out of touch with their constituencies.

SECOND THOUGHTS.

The Suffragist Press supplies many instances of the change of thought that seems to have overtaken the advocates of votes for women since the Representation of the People Bill passed the House of Commons.

Lady Frances Balfour writes in the *Lady's Pictorial* of August 25th:—

"We may grant at once that whatever proportion of women are given the vote it will neither alter things so much for the better as they themselves hope and desire, nor for the worse, as their enemies fear." (Apparently "their enemies" are the majority of women, who do not share the views of the Suffragist minority. If things are not to be altered for the better, what becomes of the assurances upon the strength of which Suffragism has secured its converts?)

In *The New Statesman* we read:—

"Man as a social animal is far too closely surrounded by his womenkind for his mind to go on its political way regardless of theirs; the mother, the wife, the sister, the daughter, influence him at every turn."

(In the past no statement was more vigorously challenged by Suffragists than that which declared that women had ample opportunities of exercising their influence on legislation through their men-folk.)

Mrs. Fawcett now writes in *The Lady's Pictorial*:—

"The vote is ours, not to use simply in furtherance of our own interests or at the direction of unreasoned impulse."

(For fifty years or more Mrs. Fawcett and her Suffrage society have been preaching the doctrine of the promotion of woman's self-interest by means of the vote. On a pamphlet the factory girl is represented as looking at a copy of the factory laws and saying, "What cheek! They never consulted me." And the last argument adduced for the bemusing of Parliament has been, "the special claim of war-working women to have the protection of the vote during the period of reconstruction.")

Finally, the most confirmed of the Suffragist organs in the Press, the *Daily Telegraph*, now writes (August 27th):—

"The Representation of the People Bill is the most democratic leap which this country has ever been asked to take. It is an absolute 'leap in the dark' so far as the enfranchisement of women is concerned, for no one can foretell what the influence of their vote will be."

So that is the upshot of all the grand assurances of what women's votes are to secure for the country.

THE CHAIN GUILD.

Lady Griselda Cheape reports: Mrs. Lindsay (formerly Miss Edge) has written to thank the members for having bought £10 worth of the Invalid Children's lace. Thanks have also been received from other Societies who have benefited by the Guild. The Guild's three children at Aberlour and Baldovan are doing well. Another child—a not-wanted—aged three months, has also been entrusted to our care. I am sure if people realised the loneliness and misery of an illegitimate child, it would do more to stop sin than anything else. But once they are there, we as Christians must do all we can for them. The child was successfully operated upon at the Royal Infirmary, Dundee, and was taken care of for a few days at Mrs. Nicol's Children's Shelter, before being sent to its foster mother. There is more than enough work for women to do, without stepping out of their sphere.

Our help this month is to be given to the soldiers; next month to the sailors. Membership, with REVIEW, 2s. per annum.—Lady Griselda Cheape, Strathtyrum, St. Andrews.

ANECDOTES AND ANTIDOTES.

In his "Parliamentary Reminiscences and Reflections" (London, John Murray), Lord George Hamilton has compiled a most readable book, which even political antagonists will welcome, while frowning upon the outspokenness with which "heterodox" views are urged. We are introduced to all the chief personages of a by no means uninteresting period, and few fail to have some fresh light thrown upon them. Contemporary history is interspersed with anecdotes, but the trend of events is kept clearly before the reader. Consequently, while the "Reminiscences" are confined to the years 1868 to 1885, we are instinctively ready for the abrupt transition to the "Reflections," which plunge into present-day conditions. Lord George's thesis is that the Pacifist or Manchester school of politicians has been harmful to the body politic, inasmuch as "they have promoted the very evils they tried to extirpate, and they have,

at the same time, drifted into an attitude of antagonism to the cultivation of patriotism and the self-sacrificing qualities associated with that virtue." Those who quarrel with the dictum must follow the argument in detail. But whether the fault be laid at the door of a political school or not, there can be little doubt that the result is there: "The worship of self has been cultivated with such persistent assiduity that the discharge of the plainest duties to the State are subordinated to the convenience and wishes of the individual." In the years under review "Woman Suffrage" had not become a burning question; but if the time limitation of the present volume implies that a further instalment from Lord George Hamilton's storehouse of reminiscences may be expected, we shall look forward to having even this vexed question illuminated by the author's good humour.

EXTENSION OF THE EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN.

The figures in the following table are based on returns made by employers to the Industrial (War Inquiries) Branch of the Board of Trade; they relate to employed persons only, excluding home workers, and the persons employed are classified according to the nature of the employer's business.

The position as regards the employment of females in April, 1917, is summed up in the following table, which shows: (a) the expansion in the employment of women and girls since July, 1914; (b) the extent to which they are directly replacing males according to the returns made by the employers.

Occupation.	Estimated Number of Females employed in July, 1914.	Increase (+) or Decrease (-) in the Employment of Females since July, 1914.		Direct Replacement of Men by Women.	
		Numbers	Percentage of those employed in July, 1914	Numbers.	Percentage of those employed in July, 1914.
Industries*	2,184,000	+ 453,000	+ 20.7	485,000	20.1
Government establishments† ...	2,000	+ 198,000	+ 9,404.9	187,000	8,926.0
Agriculture in Great Britain ...	80,000	...	- 0.2	32,000	40.3
(Permanent Labour)					
Transport‡	19,000	+ 62,000	+ 325.4	64,000	338.7
Finance and Banking	9,500	+ 50,000	+ 526.2	48,000	505.5
Commerce	496,000	+ 307,000	+ 61.9	308,000	61.0
Professions	67,500	+ 21,000	+ 31.2	20,000	29.4
Hotels, Public Houses, Cinemas, Theatres, &c.	176,000	+ 13,000	+ 7.4	35,000	19.8
Civil Service	66,000	+ 89,000	+ 134.9	83,000	126.5
Local Government	198,000	+ 47,000	+ 23.9	41,000	20.7
TOTALS	3,298,000	+ 1,240,000	+ 37.6	1,258,000	38.1

Since the war about 1,240,000 additional females, of 37.6 per cent. of the numbers employed in July, 1914, have been drawn into the various occupations included in the table above. This figure does not, however, represent the net increase in the number of women employed in all occupations, since casual agricultural labourers, domestic servants, and women employed in very small workshops and workrooms in the dressmaking trade are excluded, as well as women at work in military, naval, and Red Cross hospitals. Under the last head there has been an increase in the numbers of women employed equal to 36,000 full-time workers. On the other hand, the number of female casual labourers in agriculture has fallen by 13,000 since July, 1914, owing to seasonal variations; whilst from small workshops and domestic service it is estimated that there has been a displacement of 300,000 women. Taking these figures together, the net result gives an increase of 963,000 women employed in occupations outside their own homes.

In the occupations enumerated in the table there has been an expansion since January in the number of women employed of no less than 182,000, which is nearly double the increase that took place in the preceding quarter. This acceleration in the growth of women's employment has been felt in all the main groups.—*The Labour Gazette*.

* Including Controlled Firms, but excluding all kinds of Government Establishments.

† Including Arsenals, Dockyards, and National Shell, Filling, and Projectile Factories.

‡ Estimated figures.