OF the various characteristic features of the Freewoman doubtless the most prominent is that which insists upon the necessity for women engaging in money-producing work, and it is not the least important side of the characteristic that this necessity is based not merely upon women's need to live, but upon their equally important need to live upon the value and sale of their labour in the open market, and not in that special incalculable market where all sales are questionable—i.e., that of sentiment and passion. In this market, all values are personal, and in sentiment and passion personal values should not be for sale.

To borrow a much-used term, in the women's world there is great unrest, an unrest of which there is an almost humorous misunderstanding of the cause. It is, however, amusing merely for the moment. Unless more light breaks in on the situation, women will land themselves into a position by comparison with which their former condition was the embodiment of freedom. The truth is, some men (not all!) have allowed their women a latitude so extended that they have wandered abroad and picked up a conception of freedom which they have carried back to their regions of captivity. Now they are busying themselves with plans to make freedom settle down comfortably in captivity. They would like to retain the essence of both freedom and captivity—the comforts of the one and the exhilarations of the other. The bitter pill of experience which the women yet have to swallow is made of this, that the essence of the one destroys the essence of the other. We are fast approaching the moment when women will be compelled to make a clean choice between the comforts of protection and the harsh responsibilities of freedom. Many and ominous are the signs among leaders of women that their emancipatory faith will falter when they are face to face with the leaving behind of fostering care, the soft cheek, the smooth brow, the unworn face of the sheltered women, with all that these imply. Tens of thousands will turn back. Only in the few dare we steadily believe that the passion for freedom will in itself be a goad sufficient to urge them forward. No more than men are women devotees of the austerities of freedom. Already they seek to dress up their old slavery with the merest flummeries of freedom. The old parasitism is scouted for, far ahead, to forestall freedom. Already schemes such as the State endowment of motherhood, the compulsory payment of wives, are discussed, schemes which are so absolute in their repudiation of the human responsibilities of women that it appears some women are prepared not only to slam the door in the face of freedom, but they would lock it and throw away the key. However, women have much to do before such dread plans round to their completion. Those emancipated women whose humorous sense still remains intact have much merriment in store for them when such schemes are mooted in real earnest.
numerous that we decided to leave the solution of them to their promoters. It is enough for us and, which we do. We venture to present the backers we believe, for our readers merely to state them—

To our mind regarding the State endowment of mothers may possibly be considered part of the scheme.

To our mind, the following questions await an answer:

1. Does State endowment of mothers mean an adequate subsistence grant to mothers—say, £100 a year for five years? or is it a dole to mothers—perhaps £5 a week?

2. Endowing the mother, does the State propose to make her subsistence grant sufficient for the child also, and, if not, on whom does the cost of maintenance of the child fall?

3. For what period before birth is the grant to be in operation—nine months, six months, three months, or one?

4. If the child lives, how long is the grant to continue—one year, three years, or seven years, or what?

5. If the child dies, is the mother to continue to be endowed, or, being deprived of her child, is she to lose her endowment as well?

6. If the period during which endowment is fixed extends through a number of years, will not women be able to earn their livelihood by continuously giving birth to a small number of children?

7. After spending the best years of their lives in bearing children, are women to be thrown aside when their bearing period is over? If not, will not a State pension be necessary at the close of the period?

8. If this be so, does not this amount to a permanent State maintenance of all adult fertile females?

9. If to the number of these females maintained by the State, were added on the number of children they bear (perhaps also State endowed; certainly not self-supporting), can such a State avoid bankruptcy?

10. Of whom, for financial purposes, is this State which is to provide such maintenance composed other than money-earning men and a few sterile women?

11. On whom is the motherhood tax to be levied?

12. Is it to be a poll-tax on adult men and women, including bachelors and spinsters?

13. Is it worth while taxing mothers in order to refund them their money?

14. Will the protected position of mothers lead to a rush into motherhood?

15. If so, is this increase in the population wanted?

16. Is there to be any limit to the number of a woman's family?

17. If so, on what grounds is limitation to be made?

18. Will endowment increase with size of family?

19. Are all women to be eligible for motherhood?

20. If not, what is to be the standard of eligibility?

21. Who is to set the standard?

22. Will the standard be a physical or mental one, or both?

23. Will the State require to exercise restricting rights over the selection of fathers?

24. If so, by what standard will fathers be judged?
for payment, and instances domestic service, how is her service to be defined in respect of quantity and quality adequate for payment received?

5. In the event that a wife is paid, what proportion of the husband's earnings is she to be entitled to, for instance, (a) in the case of the man "earning" £ 50 a year, (b) the man "earning" £ 10,000 a year?

6. What will be the penalty for non-compliance on the part of the husband?

7. If her domestic service is unsatisfactory to the husband, what form of redress is there open to him?

8. As in other organisations, such as the Army, where masters and subordinates work together, each unable to dismiss the other, what forms of punishment for ill-service can be meted out other than those of the detention-room and corporal chastisement?

9. On the other hand, should the wife (the employee) be dissatisfied with her employer (the husband), by what means could she obtain better terms?

10. Would not the fact that the women, not being free agents in regard to their employers, but bound to them by law, prevent them from entering into free organisations such as trade unions of wives, and thus make mutiny their only form of rebellion as in the Army and Navy?

11. Would not even mutiny prove abortive, in view of the fact that there would be exactly the same number of employers as employees; and, as the employers would hold all the funds, would not

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

Miss Mary Gawthorpe.

Last week, just at the moment when our comments upon the criminal inhumanity of the Pentonville Prison authorities in regard to Mr. William Ball were issuing from the press, totally without our knowledge, and with her intention unknown to anyone save herself, Miss Mary Gawthorpe, to whose notice the Ball case had been vividly brought by accidental circumstances which we are not at liberty to specify, left her sick-room, determined to do what lay in her power to quicken public imagination to a keener realisation of this almost unbelievable crime.

Miss Gawthorpe, as many of our readers know, has been seriously ill during the last twenty months, and has not, save upon one occasion, we regret to say, yet been able to contribute to the pages of THE FREEWOMAN. It was, therefore, with very keen pleasure that we learnt she was considered well enough by her doctor, a fortnight ago, to come to London to undergo special treatment connected with her long illness. It was while undergoing this treatment that the accidental circumstances to which we have referred so increased her indignation against the Pentonville crime that she decided to make a personal and public stand against the lethargic spirit in which the story of this ghastly outrage has been received by the public, and the intolerable frivolousness with which it has been treated by the Home Office.

Having, by breaking the Home Office windows, repeated exactly the offence committed by Mr. Ball on December 21st last, Miss Gawthorpe surrendered herself to the police, and handed to them a document which ran as follows:

A PROTEST.

"(1) Against the forcible feeding of all prisoners and captives, whether Suffragist or not, the employees—i.e., the wives—be forced into submission by starvation?

12. Are the women prepared to occupy a permanently inferior position in regard to men with whom they must perforce live on intimate terms?

13. If husbands demand certain qualifications from the wives they pay, are women to regard wifehood as a trade, and undergo a course of training such as is arranged by the University of London, for instance, for those who are proposing to adopt wifehood as a profession?

14. Seeing that the attractions which have led to the selection of wives have, in the past, but rarely been those of domesticity, are women to understand that the principle of selection with men is going to be transformed side by side with women's increasingly domestic outlook?

15. When every man pays his wife for housekeeping, must not then every wife in England become a paid domestic servant? and is the position of paid domestic servant the ideal of the women in the emancipation movement?

16. Finally, in view of such questions, have the wives who are smiling in the knowledge that the affectionate regard of their husbands will lead the latter to wink at the non-return of the equivalents in service for money and maintenance given, examined to the fibrils of the foundations of the kind of bargain they are secretly expecting to effect?

When these questions have been answered, we shall be able to state the case of Endowed Women versus Freewomen. We hope the enthusiasts for endowment will not shirk their preliminary catechism.

who have sustained the heroism of a hunger strike when deprived of privileges to which they are justly entitled.

"(2) Against the barbaric treatment meted out to Mr. William Ball, Suffragist prisoner, whereby, as testified by prison officials, he was rendered insane after five and a half weeks of forcible feeding, following on a hunger strike.

"(3) Against the cruel manner in which this intimation was made to Mrs. Ball, who, like her husband, is a self-supporting member of the working class.

"(4) Against the degradation of prison officials, who, for the sake of their respective livelihoods, have hitherto felt themselves compelled to share in Governmental blunder."

On Thursday last, Miss Gawthorpe came up for trial before Sir Albert de Rutzen at Bow Street. Miss Gawthorpe’s statement of her case followed these lines: She committed an offence with the deliberate intent of being placed in the dock and making it clear that, when sentenced, she would begin the hunger strike, and, with public attention drawn to the situation, she would challenge the authorities to meet her resistance with forcible feeding. If forcible feeding was the fit and proper method for dealing with such resistance, the authorities would not shrink from applying it in her case when public attention was roused and fixed upon the circumstances. If, on the other hand, the authorities did not consider forcible feeding a fit and proper procedure, but merely a hole-and-corner device for crushing the life and spirit out of poor and unknown men and women, of whose circumstances the public had largely lost sight, it was high time the public learned what could be done in its name under the aegis of the State. At the trial, Miss Gawthorpe defended her own case, though
Mr. Blanco White, at the instigation of her friends, attended to watch the case in Miss Gawthorpe’s interest. Miss Murray, a woman doctor, having given evidence that change of diet would probably result in serious consequences, Miss Gawthorpe, Sir Albert de Rutzen, who was very obviously embarrassed with the situation, remanded the case for a week. Miss Gawthorpe, feeling that nothing serving Mr. Ball’s interest was to be gained by waiting a week, refused to provide sureties for her bail, and was therefore transferred to Holloway Gaol. She began a hunger strike which lasted until Friday evening, when, acting on information based upon the prison doctor’s report, Sir Albert de Rutzen had Miss Gawthorpe again brought before him for trial. He thereupon dismissed the case.

Miss Gawthorpe’s challenge in respect of the practice of forcible feeding in English prisons, therefore, gallant, daring, and public-spirited as it was, has not proved itself the test case which she hoped it would be. The state of her health gave the authorities full excuse for shirking the issue. The question to which the country is entitled to a plain, unequivocal answer is this: A person, in ordinary practice of forcible feeding in English prisons, is a hunger strike, does the prison system sanction, an application of the principle of forcible feeding? Without any apology, that is the sole question we ask the authorities, and we are entitled to a straightforward answer from the Home Office. Given an answer, we shall know where we are. If the answer should be in the negative, we shall know what is to be done to those screened persons who put enforced feeding into effect against poor or unknown prisoners. If it is in the affirmative, we shall have had the last necessary evidence for the binding together of all humane people into a common unity to effect the overhauling of our present dangerous and inhuman prison system.

In any case, we require to know who is going to be the scapegoat in this Ball affair. We want to know whether Mr. McKenna is screening the governor and doctor of Pentonville. If so, his protection is inefficient to cover their offences. They should be dismissed. The public is only so fearful, knowing that the most pitiable portion of our society lies wholly at such men’s mercy. If, on the other hand, the governor and doctor of Pentonville are merely the tools of the Home Secretary, for the latter, as an inadequate, unimaginative, and incompetent paid servant of the State, a responsible Government could find no uses for his services.

The Suffrage Barometer.

Although during the last week so essentially new developments have taken place in respect of female enfranchisement, the atmosphere with which it is surrounded has been charged with currents which will materially affect the nature and manner of its enactment. Mr. Lloyd George’s statements regarding the Government’s relations towards it represent nothing more nor less than those formally enunciated by the Prime Minister and Mr. George in November last; but the lid has been lifted for the period off the pot of the personal opinions of those members of the Cabinet whom we have been accustomed to regard as the Ministerial Suffrage section, and we have been allowed to see the seething effect coming among this supposedly united group. Mr. Birrell, aforetime friend of Suffrage, scholar, humanitarian, and, we hoped, man more than politician, is now, we learn, “neither excited nor enthusiastic” about Woman’s Suffrage, though he is prepared to go the wild lengths of the Con-
the onus of responsibility for failure to pass the Suffrage Amendment will lie at the doors of the Conservative suffragist members. If the latter are sincere suffragists, they can make the situation simple. It is in no way necessary for them to vote for the Reform Bill, or to proclaim their principle of Manhood Suffrage. The women's amendment, at the stage when their votes are necessary to it, will be distinct and separate from Manhood Suffrage, and, once passed as an amendment, the safety of its remaining stages will be assured without further claims upon their assistance. We are, therefore, in agreement with the views expressed by each and all the speakers in the Albert Hall on Friday last—Mrs. Fawcett, Mrs. Snowden, Lord Lytton, and Mr. George—in thinking that the present situation is rich with promise for Woman Suffrage. To us who have not been within their range for some time, it came as a little shock of surprise to encounter again the Rip Van Winkles of the W.S.P.U., who haunted the Albert Hall meeting, evidently under the delusion that they were back living in the old times when Cabinet Ministers spoke only in sealed halls, brooked no questions, and answered none. They compelled us to reflect how the weaknesses of society are sometimes turned into transactions where members who receive their opinions from authority and learn their texts by rote are found chanting the opinions and chattering the formulae when the circumstances which rendered these apposite have long since fled into the past. We regret that the meaningless hubbub interfered with the answers of Mr. Lloyd-George to their own quite sensible questions. To us it seemed odd to ask questions and then gag the reply; but perhaps it was the human instinct to prevent statements being made which would show too much falsity of policy on the part of those which must be made good at any cost. It had to us, however, its cheerful side. It seemed to justify afresh that difficult and cantankerous Democracy which, with all its faults, does not produce the rapid disintegration of intelligence which is the fruit of delivering up one's intelligence bound to the easy worship of a blind autocracy.

Mind the Paint.

Mr. Pinero is quite certain that his reputation is invulnerable, but one cannot help fearing that even the widespread fame of a able playwright would fail to win through more than two exhibitions of the kind of ineptitude shown in his new play, "The Mind-the-Paint Girl." In our opinion, it is one of the worst plays we have ever seen. It is too uncertain of purpose for satire, too cheap for romance, too false for realism, too maudlin for comedy, too antiquated for problem, too immoral for propaganda. Of what mongrel species of the world of drama is this play? No doubt it was because the audience was turning over this knotty problem in its minds that it omitted to show any signs of interest in the performance, hostile or friendly. Some idea of the ungritness of the plot may be gathered from the following incident. At the end of the third act we were only prevented from leaving the theatre under the impression that the play was over by a realisation that the mass of the audience were still remaining the programme, found there still remained another act of the play. So much for the plot. This is an outline of the play. A "Pandora girl, pretty, poor, and good, in her struggling days is "helped" by the "poor" and fascinating Army captain. Like a star, she rises to wealth and musical comedy fame. Her captain's love increases (quite nicely) even as her wealth. At one time unprepared to marry, his life now becomes a torture of fear lest she abandon him and marry another. His profession given up years ago, that he became a nightly occupant of the stalls at the Pandora, he is now acutely aware of his blighted and slighted existence. He spies upon her, and finds she is "encouraging" a noble young lord. A storm bursts thereupon, and a great scene follows. Noble lord has just told the heroine of his love (meaning marriage, no less) with the delicate, haggard voice of another Raleigh to another Elizabeth. She has just refused him with the nobleness of a Cromwell refusing a crown, "because of his mother." The air is heavy with nobility and renunciation, when, at four o'clock in the morning, in stalks the blighted captain. She tells him what she thinks of him. He retorts by telling the noble lord how she has shattered him. Compunctious, she offers to marry the captain, making the noble lord swear friendship to the same, not failing to insinuate, however, that if she marries the one she loves the other, to such a degree that she must never be tempted by any other. They depart hand in hand, blighted lord and betrothed captain. They return hand in hand at twelve noon, having agreed to an exchange. Exchanged she is, to become my lady, and the blighted captain consoles himself with inviting the pair to visit him in exile, in Buluwayo. So much for the skeleton. One would be fearful to back the gods faced with the task of breathing life into these dry bones. Mr. Pinero has made the dialogue to match the nature of the structure. Miss Marie Lohr impersonated the Pandora heroine, and showed a young lady so refined, so noble, and with such remunerative qualities as would have made the typical Christian martyr stiff with boredom at their fatuity. She handed round blank cheques to graceless young gamblers, with a touching little catch in her voice, asking them to make them out for a sum no bigger than they could help; also with a sobbing catch she tells how she maintains the far-sighted ward-cum-corelli-cum-ouida qualities of the Pandora girl. Still, Mr. Pinero has a gospel to preach, and preach it he must, even should he be compelled to quarrel with the nature of things. Miss Pandora is destined to become a perfect lady, and therefore she must be made to possess all the ward-cum-corelli-cum-ouida qualities of the ideal refined and aristocratic female. He fails to see that the fundamental shifting which are taking place in female society which unconsciously led Mr. Pinero to write this play are due to this fact: that the pure, proud, sweet, chaste aristocrat, beloved of Ouida, has become violently nauseated with herself, and that when Miss Pandora metamorphosed into a real lady appears after the six months' probation which she considered as the onus of responsibility for failure to pass the Ward-cum-Corelli-cum-Ouida qualities of the ideal refined and aristocratic female. He fails to see that the fundamental shifting which are taking place in female society which unconsciously led Mr. Pinero to write this play are due to this fact: that the pure, proud, sweet, chaste aristocrat, beloved of Ouida, has become violently nauseated with herself, and that when Miss Pandora metamorphosed into a real lady appears after the six months' probation which she considered as the onus of responsibility for failure to pass the Ward-cum-Corelli-cum-Ouida qualities of the ideal refined and aristocratic female. He fails to see that the fundamental shifting which are taking place in female society which unconsciously led Mr. Pinero to write this play are due to this fact: that the pure, proud, sweet, chaste aristocrat, beloved of Ouida, has become violently nauseated with herself, and that when Miss Pandora metamorphosed into a real lady appears after the six months' probation which she considered as the onus of responsibility for failure to pass the Ward-cum-Corelli-cum-Ouida qualities of the ideal refined and aristocratic female. He fails to see that the fundamental shifting which are taking place in female society which unconsciously led Mr. Pinero to write this play are due to this fact: that the pure, proud, sweet, chaste aristocrat, beloved of Ouida, has become violently nauseated with herself, and that when Miss Pandora metamorphosed into a real lady appears after the six months' probation which she considered as the onus of responsibility for failure to pass the Ward-cum-Corelli-cum-Ouida qualities of the ideal refined and aristocratic female. He fails to see that the fundamental shifting which are taking place in female society which unconsciously led Mr. Pinero to write this play are due to this fact: that the pure, proud, sweet, chaste aristocrat, beloved of Ouida, has become violently nauseated with herself, and that when Miss Pandora metamorphosed into a real lady appears after the six months' probation which she considered as the onus of responsibility for failure to pass the Ward-cum-Corelli-cum-Ouida qualities of the ideal refined and aristocratic female. He fails to see that the fundamental shifting which are taking place in female society which unconsciously led Mr. Pinero to write this play are due to this fact: that the pure, proud, sweet, chaste aristocrat, beloved of Ouida, has become violently nauseated with herself, and that when Miss Pandora metamorphosed into a real lady appears after the six months' probation which she considered as the onus of responsibility for failure to pass the Ward-cum-Corelli-cum-Ouida qualities of the ideal refined and aristocratic female. He fails to see that the fundamental shifting which are taking place in female society which unconsciously led Mr. Pinero to write this play are due to this fact: that the pure, proud, sweet, chaste aristocrat, beloved of Ouida, has become violently nauseated with herself, and that when Miss Pandora metamorphosed into a real lady appears after the six months' probation which she considered as the onus of responsibility for failure to pass the Ward-cum-Corelli-cum-Ouida qualities of the ideal refined and aristocratic female. He fails to see that the fundamental shifting which are taking place in female society which unconsciously led Mr. Pinero to write this play are due to this fact: that the pure, proud, sweet, chaste aristocrat, beloved of Ouida, has become violently nauseated with herself, and that when Miss Pandora metamorphosed into a real lady appears after the six months' probation which she considered as the onus of responsibility for failure to pass the Ward-cum-Corelli-cum-Ouida qualities of the ideal refined and aristocratic female. He fails to see that the fundamental shifting which are taking place in female society which unconsciously led Mr. Pinero to write this play are due to this fact: that the pure, proud, sweet, chaste aristocrat, beloved of Ouida, has become violently nauseated with herself, and that when Miss Pandora metamorphosed into a real lady appears after the six months' probation which she considered as the onus of responsibility for failure to pass the Ward-cum-Corelli-cum-Ouida qualities of the ideal refined and aristocratic female. He fails to see that the fundamental shifting which are taking place in female society which unconsciously led Mr. Pinero to write this play are due to this fact: that the pure, proud, sweet, chaste aristocrat, beloved of Ouida, has become violently nauseated with herself, and that when Miss Pandora metamorphosed into a real lady appears after the six months' probation which she considered as the onus of responsibility for failure to pass the Ward-cum-Corelli-cum-Ouida qualities of the ideal refined and aristocratic female. He fails to see that the fundamental shifting which are taking place in female society which unconsciously led Mr. Pinero to write this play are due to this fact: that the pure, proud, sweet, chaste aristocrat, beloved of Ouida, has become violently nauseated with herself, and that when Miss Pandora metamorphosed into a real lady appears after the six months' probation which she considered as the onus of responsibility for failure to pass the Ward-cum-Corelli-cum-Ouida qualities of the ideal refined and aristocratic female. He fails to see that the fundamental shifting which are taking place in female society which unconsciously led Mr. Pinero to write this play are due to this fact: that the pure, proud, sweet, chaste aristocrat, beloved of Ouida, has become violently nauseated with herself, and that when Miss Pandora metamorphosed into a real lady appears after the six months' probation which she considered as the onus of responsibility for failure to pass the Ward-cum-Corelli-cum-Ouida qualities of the ideal refined and aristocratic female. He fails to see that the fundamental shifting which are taking place in female society which unconsciously led Mr. Pinero to write this play are due to this fact: that the pure, proud, sweet, chaste aristocrat, beloved of Ouida, has become violently nauseated with herself, and that when Miss Pandora metamorphosed into a real lady appears after the six months' probation which she considered as the onus of responsibility for failure to pass the Ward-cum-Corelli-cum-Ouida qualities of the ideal refined and aristocratic female. He fails to see that the fundamental shifting which are taking place in female society which unconsciously led Mr. Pinero to write this play are due to this fact: that the pure, proud, sweet, chaste aristocrat, beloved of Ouida, has become violently nauseated with herself, and that when Miss Pandora metamorphosed into a real lady appears after the six months' probation which she considered as
Pinero has tried to paint, and failed to comprehend. He also has not understood that Miss Pandora to welcome the prospect of lounging in drawing-rooms with idle ladies of perfect manner. Regarding the social value of refinement, Mr. Pinero seems to be floundering in an utter quagmire of incomprehension. When the heroine proceeds to describe the captain, very naturally, if somewhat inadequately, as a spy, a lout, and a cad, Mr. Pinero makes her grovel in an apology for her vulgarity, and allows her to figure, the nebulous type as parasitic loafer Mr. Pinero further does not appear to be aware of the "passing," to forgive her in a noble and soothing phrase. Mr. Pinero may sometime learn that women of every class are finding out the satisfying pleasure of occasionally telling people the truth about themselves, and that once tasted, it is a joy but rarely abandoned. This "vulgarity" is a sign that women are beginning to act as they feel instead of living up to their accredited pose. It is much more likely, and certainly to be desired, that the manners of the class of the noble lord's mother will gravitate in the direction of the Pandora girl—and not the reverse. Some day, under much more stabilizing situations Miss Pandora will be able to tell her aristocratic mother-in-law, whom Mr. Pinero believes she respects so profoundly, a few home-truths about the relative value of aristocrats and hard-worked, underpaid chorus girls which will make the aristocrat realize that in the scheme of things far from being the last note of perfection, she is a mere hang-on, living by the toil of others, and very far from having attained the level of usefulness of the chorus-girl, who at least has provided cheer for the gallery which seeks it after a day of monotonous toil. It is perhaps not as surprising as it at first appears that Mr. Pinero should fail to understand the contradictory currents of a social transition period, and the types such periods produce. Mr. Pinero is unerring when he depicts stock types. Mrs. Upjohn, the heroine's mother, is exquisite, so is the genuine Pandora girl, who "on the stage is "the spirit of elfish gaiety and fun," but off the stage feels that only the gift of a motor car from one of the "boys," will raise her drooping spirits. The "boys" themselves are convincing. They at least convince the audience that they exist. Naturally enough, the two lovers of a heroine who is noble beyond her station must inevitably be lay figures who rave and adore by turn, according to formula. The faked heroine of necessity destroys the play, because she is incomprehensible, both to herself and to her creator. We believe the play will have a run, however, as most women, even the good ones, have a healthy curiosity to look upon the ways of life of the people who sup with the "boys" in the foyer of the theatre. Things certainly appear folly enough, and invite an abandon which seems foreign to the kind of men whom their "own" women know only in the rôle which they adopt towards perfect ladies. In the setting of the play as it stands, with the complete recasting of the heroine, and a consequent recasting of her two lovers, and the further and consequent recasting of the main scenes, something might be made of it. In short, the same subject would lend itself to masterly treatment with a wholly different interpretation. Miss Lohr, who was pretty and refined as the Pandora heroine, contributed on that account to make matters worse.

EXCEPT for a few volumes, mostly out of print and forgotten, and an occasional reference to the question in the writings of reformers, such as Mr. Charles Booth, Mr. Arthur Sherwell, and Mr. Stead, no serious and honest attempt has been made in this country to determine the causes and explain the conditions of prostitution. A large number of religious and moral crusaders against "the social evil" are prone to regard the matter as easily remedied by "self-control"; while several sociologists of a somewhat more scientific order assert that no woman would sell herself if economic causes were removed. Among this second order of meliorists there are at least some signs of a desire to reach the root of the problem.

But the economic factor is by no means the only factor. It is quite true that poverty drives thousands of women into the profession; but want is not the incentive in the case of the ambitious chorus girl in regular employment, or of the forewoman in a factory who earns steady wages. The causes are, in fact, manifold, and until we understand them it is rash to speak dogmatically of one or even two primary sources.

Having devoted some years of close study to the question of hetairism, as it exists to-day in the United Kingdom and on the Continent, by the acquisition of first-hand information, by a comparison of treatises in various languages, I may be able to contribute a word or two of worth to this very complex social phenomenon. There was a time in my youth when I glibly repeated the moralisms that my elders advanced as "remedies" for an institution as well-nigh as old in its origin as man. Experience, travel, social intercourse, reflection, and reading have taught me that it is useless to speak of a cure until a case has been rightly examined and diagnosed.

My doubts as to the efficiency of the reformers of the study were deepened when I learned from the lips of some of them that they were unacquainted with any of the members of a calling which they sought to suppress by legal means, or by other measures, such as early marriage, better wages for women, moral education, the censorship of literature, and so forth. One well-known and painstaking collater of facts about prostitution admitted to me that he had never conversed with one of the sisterhood. This remarkable admission seems to me representative of the attitude of a vast number of "students" of social questions in this country. Hence arises that habit of reiterating eternally postulates and platitudes that passed for wisdom somewhere and at some time under conditions that have vanished. Axioms of the study, statistics, scientific theories, and moral presuppositions become curiously unimportant in the light of practical research. Bishops are beginning to loom in the social mist as unreal, almost mythical, beings, because bishops never go into four-ale bars, and hobnob on equal terms with the populace, nor sit down, as Whitman did, among those who drink, and joke coarsely, and are not afraid of the fundamental instincts. How can the theologians, or anyone else, "save" people whose real lives, and thoughts, and actions are unknown to them?

Essentially this is a woman's question. What do women know about it? The few women who know a little are those engaged in "rescue work." The great mass of working women, like others, do not, or will not, inquire concerning the status, outlook on life, commercial position, moral, mental, and physical traits of the fallen as they are concerning the extinct fauna. And yet every woman...
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who dares to speak at all on this great burked subject has a "remedy" to hand, and a copious de­
nunciation of the men who are responsible." Such is "social reform," as we know it in scores of cir­cles professing advanced and progressive views and a zeal for sound amelioration. Women can­not continue to shirk this part of their civic duties. The mothers of the community, "the straight women," the shielded wives of the respect­able and accountable, in a degree that they do not imagine, for a traffic whose very name is spoken in hushed tones.

My effort to reach bedrock facts about the demi­monde has taught me that seduction, as practised by men, is another of the putative causes requiring careful examination. Certainly a large proportion of the half-world have been tempted by men, be­trayed, and deserted. Personal inquiry has proved that the confession, "I have a child to keep," is not always a fiction used to touch the emotion and to loosen the purse-strings.

But very little stress has been laid on the fact that the number of men—some observers say the majority—receive their initiation into sexual gratification by the teaching of erotic women. I do not make this statement without ample proof. Thousands of youths are incited by girl com­panions, or by women older than themselves. This seduction is often brought about by the starting point of a young man's association with courtesans. The stimulus has been given, the desire awakened. "It is always the woman's fault," cries Esther Waters. I do not go quite so far; but it is time to assert that if there are a number of men always lying in wait for women, there are a number of women always lying in wait for men from before adolescence until advanced middle-age.

If a boy escapes the allurements spread for him by domestic servants, governesses, and girl play­mates during his tutelage, he encounters further tem­ptation when, in the vigour of early manhood, he begins a city career in a profession or business. The streets, restaurants, and places of amusement abound with seductive lights o' love, many of them pretty, amiable, and well-versed in all the arts of feminine fascination.

When we reflect that in every big city there are thousands of lonely men who rarely converse with women, through sheer lack of opportunity, and thousands who know no woman well enough to address her by her Christian name, should we be greatly surprised when we learn that many young men, in utter desperation, with the women whose business it is to attract and please the lonely bachelor?

Poverty, seduction, expulsion from home, follow­ing upon a breach of conventional chastity, the inci­dence of example, the yearning for finery and luxury, inherent sensuality in some cases, are among the causes of mercenary commerce between the sexes. Another powerful factor is the exist­ence of a large number of virile men in the army and navy, who are debauched by regulations from a licit outlet for their desires. In all civilised nations the celibate army and navy provide a demand that rarely fails to produce a supply.

But one of the most potent causes must be sought in that strong craving for adventure and excite­ment arising, not unnaturally, among girls of the wage-earning class, debauched, by circumstance and the conditions of labour for a wretched pittance, from the closer, closer, height of scene, beauty of scene, length of scene, height of scene, length of scene, the gratification of aesthetic instincts, and the variety which gives a zest to life. The education of "the masses" tends to heighten this craving for some­thing brighter, gayer, less poignantly monotonous than the common round of drudgery and sleep.

Hence we find an increasing augmentation of the army of the frail sisterhood by young women who labour by day for pence, remaining ostensibly "straight," and who roam out of the "long, unlovely streets" by night to the wide West End thorough­fares, bedecked for the market.

This class of courtesan becomes more numerous yearly. It is one result of the almost complete disappearance of classes whose occupations are formally conducted by the procurers, and the increase of the number of householders, in almost every district of London, who offer facilities to women of the pave­ment and their patrons.

The movement of independence among women has undoubtedly penetrated into the half-world. The London courtesan is probably as commonly found among the "gay crusts" as an ice-cream vendor and a greengrocer. A host of women employed in domestic service on the same plea, and gone "on the streets." A courtesan interrogated by Tolstoy, a cook by original profession, said that she could not endure the heat of the kitchen and the inadequate wages. I have met more than one skilled cook who has left service on the same plea, and gone "on the streets." It must be recognised that "want" is not the in­centive to the demure. She yearns passionately for comforts, luxuries, and dissipations that respect­able industry will never secure for her. She is usu­ally a high-spirited girl, and often romantic and emotional in a sentimental way. Frequently, too, she is cynically philosophical, and will express the opinion that, as things are, no woman can have a good time without the pecuniary assistance of men, who are readily found. She is not so much bent on marriage.

The "typical prostitute," so elaborately analysed and labelled by Lombroso and his school, is cer­tainly not common. It has been often stated that the congenital courtesan may be recognised by certain manifest physiological and psychological traits. The signs and temperamental tendencies are, however, far from obvious in an enormous number of courtesans.

Among the thousands of women in this vast trade there are many abnormal types; but the great majority are, apart from the matter of free choice in their business, practically undistinguishable from the women of any other class. They have, as a class, varied temperaments, and are, in fact, like millions of ordinary women in aspiration, point of view, tastes, and general habits. Some are gentle, amiable, naturally affectionate, and, strange as it may seem, an immense number are innately con­jugal and sentimentally. Very many of the sisterhood marry, and a proportion prove good wives and housekeepers.

From the Magdalen to De Quincey's kindly, compassionate Ann of Oxford Street, men of re­efined feeling, whether lax or strict in their obser-
vance of chastity, have testified to that quality of sympathy which is often deeply expressed by, and rarely quite lacking in, those women whom society sympathize with, and at large condemns and despises.

Even men of extremely dissolute life, and a tendency to cynicism in speaking of women as a sex, have frequently confessed to me that the demimondaine is not without certain conspicuous virtues. Certainly pity may seem wasted when lent to the flaunting, painted, hard-drinking, gross-minded courtesan who has not the least pity for herself, and exults in her professional success. But many gentle and affectionate girls are driven into prostitution through the insensate moral harshness of the community, and most of these victims are ready for any way of escape, provided that escape does not spell starvation.

WALTER M. GALLICHAN.

(The to be continued.)

The Home Office Blunderer.

M R. McKENNA'S appointment to the Home Office was a matter of political expediency. His predecessor, Mr. Winston Churchill, foresaw the Dundee strike, and, fearing the consequences of having to send troops down to his own constituency, was inclined to go to the Admiralty. After McKenna's record of failure as First Lord, and his undignified squabble with Lord Charles Beresford, Churchill's breeziness and energy came as a welcome sign of life. There is a certainty of success about the latter's opportunism—a sense of individuality, which lends him an air of statesmanship even in his demagogy. At the Home Office he was a success, and attained a great measure of popularity, notwithstanding the rôle his department played as the agent of capital in the great labour troubles of last year. The contrast between him and Herbert Gladstone was so great that one would have thought McKenna would have learnt a lesson from it. But the Home Secretary as First Lord was one of absolute failure was foredoomed to failure at the Home Office. There is a fatalism about his incompetency. It is no use changing him from this office to that in the hope that, by ringing the changes of statesmanship, he will come to his senses. The Home Secretary as First Lord was one of absolute failure was foredoomed to failure at the Home Office. There is a fatalism about his incompetency. It is no use changing him from this office to that in the hope that, by ringing the changes of statesmanship, he will come to his senses. The Home Secretary as First Lord was one of absolute failure was foredoomed to failure at the Home Office. There is a fatalism about his incompetency. It is no use changing him from this office to that in the hope that, by ringing the changes of statesmanship, he will come to his senses.

A letter notifying this decision to Mrs. Ball was written from a love of order and method, a sense of precision and detail, and if that were done, I suppose the prison rule made by my predecessor would then apply in such a case."

As a matter of fact, however, this apology on the part of the Home Office is but an evasion, as will be seen from the answer McKenna gave to a question put by Mr. Lansbury on the 19th inst. Mr. Lansbury asked whether it was not in the power of the Home Secretary to challenge the interpretation in Mr. Ball's sentence by placing him in the second division instead of the third, thus relieving him of the sentence of hard labour. To this McKenna said:

"No doubt the Home Secretary could remit that part of Mr. Ball's sentence which gives hard labour; and, if that were done, I suppose the prison rule made by my predecessor would then apply in such a case."

Challenged by the same questioner to state whether Mr. Ball was other than a political offender, the Home Office hero declined to come up to the scratch. Describing the effects of forcible feeding on Mr. Ball's sanity, in the answer to Mr. Lynch from which I have quoted already, Mr. McKenna said:

"He was fed twice daily by mouth tube. ... No force whatever was used towards him. ... His weight and physical health were fairly well maintained, and on January 21st his wife, in answer to an inquiry by her, was informed that he was in his usual health. ..."

The Ministerial screening could not appease. If only from a love of order and method, a sense of placing like things in the same category, we should insist on McKenna being relegated to the oblivion Gladstone now enjoys. Like failures must produce like returns.

Let us and McKenna's Home Office career, and then compare it with that of his predecessor, Gladstone. The crowning infamy in the former's record is, of course, the Ball case. I dealt with the horrors of Mr. Ball's treatment in my recent article in these columns on "Our Prison System." I would now turn to McKenna's apologies and attitude. Answering a question put by Mr. Lynch, on February 19th last, McKenna said:

"William Ball was convicted at Bow Street on December 22nd last of doing wilful damage, and sentenced to two months' imprisonment with hard labour. He was, therefore, not eligible for the special treatment which may be accorded to certain classes of prisoners under the prison rule recently made by my predecessor, as that rule applies only to persons placed by the Court in the second or third division, and does not apply to those sentenced to hard labour. This was explained to Ball, but from his reception into prison he refused all food, and on December 25th it became necessary to feed him artificially."

This statement contains a deliberate lie, for Mr. Churchill's regulations contain no reference to their being inapplicable when hard labour is imposed; and, as has been pointed out, the Home Secretary implies in the above statement that there is a fourth division in prison, although, of course, there is nothing of the kind. The text of the Churchill regulations are:—

"The Home Secretary may, in the case of any offender of the second or third division, on previous character being good, and who has been convicted of, or committed to prison for, an offence not involving dishonesty, cruelty, indecency, or serious violence, the Prison Commissioners may allow such amelioration of punishment as may be agreed to in the discretion of the Commissioners."

As a matter of fact, however, this apology on the part of the Home Office is but an evasion, as will be seen from the answer McKenna gave to a question put by Mr. Lansbury on the 19th inst. Mr. Lansbury asked whether it was not in the power of the Home Secretary to challenge the interpretation in Mr. Ball's sentence by placing him in the second division instead of the third, thus relieving him of the sentence of hard labour. To this McKenna said:

"No doubt the Home Secretary could remit that part of Mr. Ball's sentence which gives hard labour; and, if that were done, I suppose the prison rule made by my predecessor would then apply in such a case."

Challenged by the same questioner to state whether Mr. Ball was other than a political offender, the Home Office hero declined to come up to the scratch. Describing the effects of forcible feeding on Mr. Ball's sanity, in the answer to Mr. Lynch from which I have quoted already, Mr. McKenna said:

"He was fed twice daily by mouth tube. ... No force whatever was used towards him. ... His weight and physical health were fairly well maintained, and on January 21st his wife, in answer to an inquiry by her, was informed that he was in his usual health. ..."
prisoner himself made no protest. He was removed from Pentonville to the asylum at 3 a.m. Monday. The prisoner's treatment while in Pentonville was strictly in accordance with the law as laid down by the Lord Chief Justice in the case of Leigh v. Gladstone, and I am satis­
fied that he received every care and attention from the medical officers of the prison."

It must not be forgotten that the Churchill regulations rendered the Leigh v. Gladstone decision obsolete; and McKenna's appeal, therefore, is to the letter of a judge-made decision as opposed to more recent constitutional law. The conclud­ing that he cannot be expected to receive this answer will be appreciated by all who have seen the inside of a gaol as one of his Majesty's guests. In view of McKenna's admission above as to when the first disturbing "mental symptoms" were observed in Ball, the following answers, given immediately afterwards in reply to further questions from Mr. Lynch, are interesting reading:

1. "My memory is that there was nothing in the prisoner's conduct at the time of his admission which led the medical officer to think he was not of sound mind."

2. "I think it would be so unlikely [for the treatment he received in prison to have driven him insane] as to be impossible."

Another stage in McKenna's evolution and pro­gressive official impertinence was witnessed on Wednesday, February 21st, when, having had further opportunities of consulting his colleagues, our consistent Minister stated that the prison doctor had reported that, in his opinion, the man Ball's mind, never a very strong one, was not affected by his treatment in prison. His insanity, in the doctor's opinion, was caused by continually dwelling on votes for women and political prisoners. This puts us in mind of the discovery of Lady Constance Lytton's weak heart. And, by the way, if Mr. Ball's mind was never very strong, was not this a reason for reducing the sentence to second division? What impertinence, too, for official hirelings, whose knowledge is a sort of jelly production, to talk of the weak mind of a man who has shown the dauntless resolution Mr. Ball has evinced!

As I have said, the Ball case is but the crowning infamy of McKenna's career. We will now con­sider some of his other "errors of judgment." On December 21st, 1911, George Baker was wrongly convicted by the Uckfield magistrates for trespass­ing in pursuit of game, and sentenced to six weeks' hard labour. Two days later, two other men, named Hall and Pagden, confessed to the offence for which Baker was convicted, and their confes­sions were sent on the following day to the Home Office by train. A day or two later, the Chairman of the Uckfield Bench and a colleague came to London, and had an interview with one of the Home Office officials. After this, a request was sent to the magistrates' clerk for his notes of the proceedings, and there the matter dropped for the time being. On January 18th Hall and Pagden were sentenced by the Uckfield magistrates for the very offence of which they had found Baker guilty, and for which he was still in gaol. Two days later, McKenna woke up, and signed an order for Baker's release. Baker has received, and is likely to receive, no compensation. Such an injustice deserves no treatment in a concise form. viz.:—

Dec. 21st, 1911.—Baker released on Home Office order, having served over four weeks of his sentence.

In the Stewart-Gott case of last year, McKenna refused to verify the sentences imposed by poor knavery for the wholly impossible offence of "blasphemy." At the best the sentences were imposed purely and simply for "bad taste," and nothing more. After considering the various cogent arguments urged in favour of the prisoners' release, many of them based on the grounds of public policy, McKenna declined to interfere. My friend, Mr. Gott, went down with pluck, and deter­mined to make no appeal against the sentence upheld by the man who is to introduce a Govern­ment Bill for Welsh Disestablishment in justice to Nonconformity! But here is the sequel. Gott and his wife were devoted to each other, and she in­wardly fretted over his incarceration. I have not communicated with him yet on the subject of his imprisonment; but I believe that, notwithstanding the Churchill regulations that would apply to "blasphemy" convictions, Gott received the normal treatment of an ordinary prisoner. If so, this would add to Mrs. Gott's grief. However, she grieved to death, McKenna refusing to release Mr. Gott up to the last moment possible. When it was known she had died, fearful of public indignation, he signed the order for Mr. Gott's release, so that the latter could attend his wife's funeral. Mr. Gott was released on Friday, the 16th inst., and his wife received a secularist burial at Scholemoor Cemetery, near Bradford, on Monday, the 19th. Let this fact be added to our indictment of Mr. Reginald McKenna.

The stage censorship has proven itself an impor­tant folly. Mr. McKenna has accordingly defended it. He has also interviewed a dozen persons con­nected with cinematograph manufacture and exhibi­tion, with a view to securing the more effective supervision of subjects for public entertainment, and the appointment of a censorship of films. We all know what this means. He also intends to introduce a Bill "to prevent the publication and dissemination of demoralising literature" during the coming session. On the same day as he made this announcement, he stated that he could not find time to deal with the Poor Law Commission's re­port. This problem would have been more properly altered if he had been able to; but the sense of propor­tion possessed by the man shows how his mind runs to policemanism and terrorism. He has also upheld outrageous police assaults on the rights of free speech at Streatham, and, still more recently, at Hull; and placed a premium on hooliganism and the incarceration of upholders of public rights. In
the matter of censorship he would do well to recall the following passage from Shaftesbury's "Characteristics": "Fan would they confound licentiousness in morals with liberty in thought, and make the libertine resemble his directhurst; and from the manner in which he announced 1867. or the [overthrow of] Hyde Park railings in 1832, he has made no mention of the speech made on the same evening as Mrs. Pankhurst's outburst at Bristol, by his fellow-member of the Cabinet, Mr. Hobhouse. Speaking at an anti-suffrage meeting, Mr. Hobhouse said:—

"In the case of the suffrage demand, there had not been the kind of popular sentimental uprising which accounted for the destruction of Nottingham Castle in 1832, or the [overthrow of] Hyde Park railings in 1867. There had been no great ebullition of popular feeling." What is this but an incitement to violence—an inflammatory speech made by a so-called responsible Minister of the Crown? There is no need to labour further details of McKenna's inglorious career at the Home Office. It is a sustained record of iniquity, pettiness, time-serving, officialism, and incompetency. He has not the name "Gladstone" to excuse him; and his relegation to obscurity is essential to the partial correction of many public scandals. To emphasise the necessity for his immediate passing, let me call attention to a few incidents of Gladstone's Home Office régime, and the Government's failure to save him. Gladstone's stock defence of every public abuse was: "I take full responsibility." Some of the things he took "full responsibility" for are thus summarised in a paragraph I wrote in the Indian Sociologist for August, 1909:—

"Mr. Gladstone assumes full 'responsibility' for giving his adherence to the police to confiscate whatever papers they consider may lead to a breach of the peace. He is also 'responsible' for blasphemy prosecutions, which are afterwards justified on the ground of the 'defendants' licentiousness' in such cases. This 'responsibility' enabled Russian spies to photograph and mark down Revolutionary members of the Duma during their recent visit to London. For the legal murder of Dhingra on the 17th, Gladstone's 'responsibility' was the final 'responsible' cause. Whether Dhingra's body is to be cremated or buried in the usual way, Gladstone will decide. For all these things does Mr. Gladstone assume 'responsibility.' The Speaker thinks the public control over Mr. Gladstone's actions of no importance, and agrees that it is a sufficient reason for police coercion if Mr. Gladstone is 'responsible.' But who, or what, in the wide world, is 'responsible' for Mr. Gladstone? That it should be necessary to put this question proves how un-constitutional is the rôle played by the present Government in the matter of repression. Its existence is a conspiracy against the liberty of the people.

The Government made every effort to defend Gladstone in his assumption of this rôle. On my trial for sedition this paragraph was quoted as tending to bring contempt on the Government and one of its Ministers. The prosecuting attorney was almost fanatical when quoting it. Still Gladstone went. And I doubt whether he was as dangerous a reactionary as McKenna, then, must be made to go. Public decency requires so much, and public opinion will be content with no less. It is time he was packing.

"Gone from us, but not forgotten,
Never shall thy infamy fade;
Bitter thoughts shall ever linger
Round the record thou hast made."
February 29, 1912
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stand at present, there is an undue secrecy about these important facts which form the moral and economic basis of life. The most important thing which governs life is left to chance to disclose and explain, and thereby is often done its work so disastrously that fine characters are wrecked. I feel convinced that a greater emphasis in our daily nursery, pre-school, and infantile education, and unhealthiness is caused by ignorance, the neglect of parents carefully enlightening their young children, and training them in the care and reverence for their bodies. Uncivilised persons are frightened of sex because they often find themselves incapable of thinking out such problems scientifically, and are frightened of sex because they often find themselves in danger of degrading themselves to a level beneath their parents. There would be a very useful thing. The International Suffrage Shop, I may mention, has a room which would do quite well for that purpose, and all of us who send in names will be willing, I am sure, to postpone the 60th birthday of The Free Woman, by all those who have a vested interest in preserving the body in this direction as is given to the spiritual, and for healthy-minded children, in whom no such fear occurs, is dangerous for them to mix with those of weakened wills and morals, caused either by inheritance or chance, unless they are armed with a parent's careful, thoughtful, warning education in this direction. "Instruct thy son, lest his heedless behaviour be an offence unto thee." I think all Freewomen will agree that to tell the children truthfully is more noble and far better than to let them grope in darkness, and be ignorant of their own undoing. Train them up in the idea that "the noblest monument a man can have is the record of a pure, and we should do away at least with one of the causes of prostitution,

With every good wish, from

A Mother.

PRURIENCY AND SEX DISCUSSIONS.

To the Editors of THE FREEWOMAN.

The writer of the letter signed "Scothron" deserves the castigation meted out to a small boy who from a hiding-place hurls filth at the passer-by.

Beginning by alluding to me—I presume ironically—as "that gentleman," he (or she?) accuses me (1) of "disguising generalisations"; (2) of implying that every woman "is a potential prostitute"; (3) of "denying to the whole luckless Uranian class, where the male is only apparently dominant, the virtues of chastity and modesty." These outrages and libellous accusations I repudiate with scorn, and nail them to the counter as the base coin that they are.

I shall not condescend to argue with "Scothron," of what use would it be to handy words with a person who imagines that a wild guess at his own or anybody's sex-formula has the slightest evidential value? But there is not one syllable in my articles which implies a lack of sympathy with or an imputation upon the conduct of "Uranians" in general. On the contrary, I was careful to indicate on what your libellous assertions I repudiate with scorn, and nail them to the counter as the base coin that they are.

P.S.—I take this opportunity of correcting a misprint in your issue of February 16th. The seventeenth of my " Aphorisms" should read: "Progress implies decivilisation: that is to say, the slow and painful reconquest by the individual of the powers usurped by the community." "Recivilisation" (as printed) is obviously meaningless.

GROUP-HOUSES.

To the Editors of THE FREEWOMAN.

As a regular and appreciative reader of THE FREEWOMAN, I make a suggestion to you, or, rather, a request? Could you, I wonder, get someone to write an account for THE FREEWOMAN of any actual scheme of group-life in working, of which he or she may have any knowledge? I mean any system of group-houses with a common kitchen, for example. I do not know if any such exist; if not, it is quite time, in my opinion, that they did, for I consider this housing and housework problem at the bottom of the whole question of "Free­women," and it struck me that an account of any actual scheme, if such exists, especially as regards financial arrangements, might be of interest to your readers—it would be to me.

With apologies for troubling you.

(Miss) DOROTHY CHAPMAN.

We expect to publish very shortly an article containing the information asked for.—Ed.
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A GROUP OF THE "FOURTH PARTY."

To the Editors of THE FREEWOMAN.

We most ardently hope that THE FREEWOMAN, instead of being discontinued, will acquire the extended circula­tion it asks for, and so richly deserves.

It holds in our estimation, the higher place in sociological journalism, in that it is the day of THE FREEWOMAN, and this generally means fresh fields for thought and discussion.

If personal recommendation and influence can procure subscribers, be assured that ours will be exercised to the utmost. Yours faithfully,

LILIAN ANDERSON, B.Sc.

CHAPMAN, HUNTER.

JANE CRAIG, LL.A.

ELIZABETH P. CUMMING.
to the editors of THE FREEWOMAN.

May I be allowed to remove the misapprehension with regard to the Insurance Act, from which the writers of the article on "Teaching" must be suffering? It is quite incorrect to speak of "the doctor indicated as the one with whom the insured person of selecting . . . from the appropriate list the practitioner by whom he wishes to be attended and treated, and, subject to the consent of the practitioner so selected, of being attended and treated by him." It is only when the insured person neglects to make any choice, or has been refused by those she has chosen, that any doctor will be "indicated" as the one she may consult.

As far as this provision, at least, is concerned, I should think the panels of doctors working under the Act would be very useful to the woman doctor. They give her an opportunity of becoming known, not only to the insured person whom she treats, but also to her or his dependents and friends. In the case of a sick person, they remove the services of a woman doctor neither she nor I would know where to find one. When this part of the Act comes into operation we shall at once know whether one is available.

With regard to sickness benefit, it is possible, but not inestimable, that the woman teacher will have to depend solely on her 7s. 6d. a week. If the Insurance Commissioners declare that it is the custom in the teaching profession for the women generally or in a particular locality—and they may do so either on their own initiative or on the application of an employer in the profession—for emplees to be debarred from receiving sickness, if the employers guarantee to pay full wages during the first six weeks of any illness to all the teachers they employ. The employer then pays a premium of 2s. 6d. per week, and the teacher (woman) receives her 7s. 6d. per week. It is difficult to see what advantage there is to the teacher (woman) for a business calculation on the part of the employer, and it may not be worth his while to guarantee the payment of wages during sickness, but the possibility ought not to be overlooked. After the six weeks, of course, the teacher would be entitled to twenty weeks of the ordinary sickness benefit, followed by another twenty-six weeks' disablement benefit.

r. J. P. Mortished.

February 19th, 1912.

a a a

A MOUTH FOR SUFFRAGISM.

to the editors of THE FREEWOMAN.

In reference to the many questions raised by your article, "The Drudge," and in correspondence, may I suggest that your readers obtain a book by Edward Carpenter, "Love's Coming of Age." Evidently many do not know it. I should also like to express appreciation of the letter of your contributor, R. W. Carey, in the last issue of THE FREEWOMAN. Let us not in clearing away the mounds of rubbish now covering marriage, and obstructing all sane, pleasing, and necessary intercourse between men and women—which is the thing above all else that will "cut pathways east and west" for us out of our present perplexities—let us not raise other mounds of rubbish now covering marriage, and ob­structing all sane, pleasing, and necessary intercourse between men and women—which is the thing above all else that will "cut pathways east and west" for us out of our present perplexities—let us not raise other mounds of rubbish now covering marriage, and obstructing all sane, pleasing, and necessary intercourse between men and women—which is the thing above all else that will "cut pathways east and west" for us out of our present perplexities.

One correspondent writes: "Some day a woman will be able to choose whether she will bear her children to the State (or to a husband)." What is this thing called a "natural" greatest bond?—State protection! A very good one. The worst of mother darkness! Then we may look back at the mother cow and pig of to-day, breeding for slaughter, as a being superior to ourselves. She is, but doing as she must, without knowledge of ought else.

But surely in those neat and tidy days to come, when "the multitudes of things" will have been sorted out, and our women will determine their places by scientific minds for the State—we could go "one better," and obtain our babies, if we still desire to have them, nicely put up in hygienic jars, with nothing but their names to suggest origin. We will be refined, and devote ourselves to the things that really matter. But as those days draw near, we of warmer blood must needs draw close our shawl of love, or hasten on. Cold, cold it will be!

May I give a quotation—not in its entirety—from an account of an interview given by Bernard Shaw to some young men at Cambridge? "They who exist at present, is an extremely rotten lot . . . Honestly, I see no hope for the species, unless there is a very considerable improvement in human material . . . There is this mysterious, this wonderful human happening—there is no getting away from it—a peculiar physiological attraction does exist between certain people. And isn't it a fairly reasonable deduction, that if it means that a superior instinct, it must be to some purpose? I suggest that it is upon that purpose that we have got to depend for the improvement of the race. It is the method by which Nature would be of help to improve us—believe in a force that is working for a higher purpose. I see no reason to doubt that in the course of the infinity of the future some such man and superwoman, who will be above us, as we are above the pieces of slime in the ditch. And the selective impulse of which I speak is the power behind evolution, working with the purpose of producing something better."

The Despised Suffragist.

February 29th, 1912.

FOOD AND POPULATION.

To the Editors of THE FREEWOMAN.

May I have a little space in which to criticise some of Mr. Drysdale's arguments?

Take first the alleged "connection between the birth and death rates." Mr. Drysdale says "if the birth-rate rises or falls, the death-rate will rise or fall with it," and interprets this to mean that in different countries the death-rate is proportional to the birth-rate. The figures in the "Statistical abstract for . . . [the years] 1801 to 1908-09" (Cd. 5,440) give for 1909 the United Kingdom with 24,5 births per 1,000, and 14,8 deaths; while France has 19,6 births per 1,000, and 19,3 deaths; and Denmark, with 28,3 births per 1,000, has 13,3 deaths. This is quite contrary to Mr. Drysdale's theory. Again, if the birth-rate were 10 per 1,000, would the death-rate be 0 per 1,000.

The evolutionary doctrine of Darwin. Mr. Drysdale's argument is obviously not at all applicable to fruit which does not suddenly appear ripe in a day. If it is destroyed, it will not be in the days of grinding Industry. Surely this desire explains in large part the vast agitation over the getting of that small thing—the Vote!

The Despised Suffragist.

February 29th, 1912.

The actual deficiency of the food supply. I do not think that Mr. Drysdale intends to deny that the deficiency in the world's supply of food is accompanied by such a deficiency in the purchasing power of large classes as to make it clear that an alteration in our ideas of property is necessary, in addition to any decrease of the birth-rate that may be required; and surely in the distribution of wealth will necessarily promote an improved weekly demand for, and therefore an improved weekly supply of, food, by transferring purchasing power from those who are at present over-fed to those who are at present under-fed.

Wages in France and England. Mr. Drysdale asks me to look at the Board of Trade Labour Gazette for November, in order to find French wages and their alterations between 1900 and 1910. I find that in Paris, where wages
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are highest, "the current hourly rates of wages in 1911" are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters</td>
<td>6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joiners</td>
<td>7½d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbers</td>
<td>8½d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painters</td>
<td>9d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turners (Metal)</td>
<td>6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiths</td>
<td>7½d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upholsterers</td>
<td>8½d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compositors</td>
<td>9d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Labourers</td>
<td>4½d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have added the London rates, obtained from the various Trade Unions concerned, for ten out of the thirteen trades mentioned above. The figures seem to me quite favourable to Mr. Drysdale's theory. Even if wages have risen in France, they are still lower than in England.

I may say that the index figures used by Mr. Drysdale for the cost of living in France, showing an increase from 100 to 104 between 1900 and 1910, are probably quite misleading towards the cost of living for a "normal" workman's family. The figures given by the Ministère du Travail show this normal expenditure as 105 in 1910 and 106 in 1911, the base year being the average of 1895 to 1911. If, however, sugar and wine are omitted from the articles, the prices of which are included in the index number, the index number becomes 87 for 1910 and 114 for 1911. This shows how difficult it is to arrive by statistical study at any conclusion as to the changes in the cost of living in a country, and it is still more difficult to compare the actual wage of people in different countries with different ways of living.

The ignorance of the working classes and their rate of increase, I doubt, is exaggerated (probably it is unscientific) against answering an opponent by merely saying his statements are "quite untrue," and I will, if I may, defer reply to the fallacies of Henry George, in the paragraphs which have been regarded as further inquiries, but meantime I may point out that its meaning is ambiguous, as it may mean (1) that the working classes do not know how artificially to limit their families, or (2) that they ignorantly consider the use of such means immoral, or in some way injurious. The first statement seems fairly incredible.

The problem, I do not think there is a separate way of reasoning called scientific reasoning. Reasoning is of various degrees of accuracy. Great scientists, being men whose imaginations play with special ease with some parts of the phenomena of life, are usually peculiarly inaccurate when talking about any subject except the one in which the necessaries of their trade have trained them to be accurate.

As for the text-book logic which Mr. Drysdale estems so highly, it is only of use for checking the results, obtained first by a quite different kind of mental process.

Arthur D. Lewis

POPULATION AND THE FOOD SUPPLY.

To the Editors of The FreeWoman.

The neo-Malthusian position, as stated by Dr. Drysdale in his issue of 22nd inst., ought to be met in your columns by a clear exposition of the fallacies which underlie it.

Superficially, it may sound convincing that the population is increasing, or may increase, faster than the food supply, but one need only go a little deeper into the problem, and from a somewhat broader outlook, to discover the absurdities.

Dr. Drysdale evidently belongs to the chemical school of diet—he is even here not logical from his own standpoint, for he has not reckoned with the vital school at all. I have taken considerable pains to adjust the standard ration for an average man to the exact area of land needed to produce this amount of food. Taking the average production of the United Kingdom for ten years as my basis—that is, without going into the possibilities of intensive culture—I find that, no matter what foods are chosen as the necessaries of life, the area of land required can hardly be made to fit in any one food. I have calculated the area required for the standard ration of an adult man, varying the area for boys and girls, and for children of different ages, and found that the area varies with the size of the family. I am, however, able to show that if any foods are chosen as the necessaries of the average man, the area which can produce the standard ration of the average man is about 8 acres. This is more than half the area actually used in the cultivation of one crop, and is quite unfavourable to Mr. Drysdale's theory. Even if we could not grow the food ourselves, the cost of transport would be enormous, due to the fact that cultivation, in the long run, lowers the vitality of the plant, making it less productive.

From this consideration it follows that the population of the United Kingdom could be increased more than threefold without importing any food, provided that the food supply be drawn from the vegetable kingdom, which would postpone the scarcity question to the far distant future. Instead, of interfering with the natural productivity of the human being himself, why not change the bias of his diet? This would surely be a less drastic and more humane method of solving the problem. If Dr. Drysdale rejects this solution, he will be kindly tell the readers of THE FREEWOMAN who ought to be eliminated as the more unfit, the man who consumes the one-third of an acre, or the man who needs the twenty or thirty acres for his support.

It is the present money system which stands between the man and his food supply—also this fact Dr. Drysdale ignores—so that he, as well as his school, brings forward a difficult and natural solution with the hope of disdaining to consider the simpler, more practical, and more natural factors of the problem. Yours truly,

February 26th, 1912.

W. A. Macdonald.

POTENTIAL FOOD SUPPLIES AND AN UNLIMITED POPULATION.

To the Editors of The FreeWoman.

As we proceed in our research in the beautiful theory of starvation of infants, let us not neglect Dr. Drysdale's laudation of "the advantages of race suicide." If we are to deny the patent fact that all food products may actually increase manyfold faster than man can possibly increase, we must come to the conclusion that suicide and race suicide should be encouraged, for it is only fair to the man who has the needs of others to consider the simpler, more practical, and more natural factors of the problem. Yours truly,

February 29th, 1912.

C. F. Hunt.
rates) can only be connected (in the manner supposed by Mr. Drysdale) if their superior and inferior limits are similarly connected. Now the superior limits of both rates is obviously the same (being the theoretical maximum), but the inferior limits differ radically, and it is here that the theoretical justification for Mr. Drysdale's arguments disappears. The birth-rate may fall to 0 per 1,000 (this may be a practical impossibility, but it is conceivable theoretically, and I am now concerned with the theoretical point of view only), as an inferior limit, and may rise to the superior limit of the theoretical maximum. But the death-rate can never fall to 0 per 1,000, for people must die—even assuming no deaths from disease, accidents, etc., people die from old age. Consequently our inferior limits in the two rates differ greatly.

This is the theoretical criticism of Mr. Drysdale's argument. Now for the practical point of view. He seems to point out that no natural increase can possibly exceed the rate of 10 per 1,000—otherwise we must be running short of short of food. A mere glance at the statistical abstract will show the utter fallaciousness of this idea. The following are a few figures I have selected at random:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rates Per 1,000 of the Population</th>
<th>Births</th>
<th>Deaths</th>
<th>Natural Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England and Wales</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In no case will the natural increase be found to be less than 10 per 1,000 (except in the case of Ireland, where there are special circumstances).

In conclusion, I am inclined to think the supposed connection between the two rates finds its origin in the marked correlation between infantile mortality and the birth-rate, but there are absolutely no indications whatever of any such connection between the birth and death rates—Yours, etc.,

[Signature]

February 29, 1912.

[Notice about the number of letters received and their response]

[Letter from ISRAEL HORWITZ]

INSTRUCTIONS.

Rest the Sharpener, so that the edge of the table, place Knife alternatively in each end slot, and draw towards you, using slight downwards pressure.

For Scissors use the central slot. Scissors require slightly more pressure. Sharpen each blade in turn.

THE SHARPENING WHEEL IS MADE OF THE FINEST HARDENED SHEFFIELD STEEL.

The "Lady" Sharpener soon saves its cost. ASK YOUR IRONMONGER FOR IT.

THE NATIONAL VENDORS' SYNDICATE, 55, CHANCERY LANE LONDON W.C.
lege of the laws of health and for improvement in the conditions of houses and housekeeping. So we are not surprised to find in the British Medical Journal for this month an article headed "Home Science," commenting upon the deplorable waste of infant life, owing to the ignorance of mothers, not all, by any means, belonging to the poorer classes. All will be in entire agreement with the writer to the extent of deploring the ignorance of those who form the subject of the article, however, a little thought will be sufficient for anyone who possesses a knowledge of science and of the King's College scheme to mete out to it very short shriving. The article states that, conspicuous among the signs of the awakening of the national conscience is the recent movement for the education in Home Science as carried out at King's College for Women.

This is the flamboyant enthusiasm of a person who talks of something he knows nothing about. The writer evidently has been deluded by the fact that the promoters of the scheme point out that "our object is to foster a sounder knowledge of the laws which govern health, sanitation, and household economy. The moral and physical welfare of our country depends primarily on the training and healthy upbringing of its children. This is the special work which Nature and custom have assigned to women, and it is in directing attention to the type of education provided for the education in Home Science as carried out at King's College for Women."

We presume that the writer of the eulogistic article in the Medical Journal is a trained medical man. When did he begin training for his life's work? About the age of eighteen, we suppose. Did he spend his youth in such work? How would his future career have suffered had he been compelled to spend his childhood learning to wash, scrub, cook, clean, and mind babies? So to specialise in the education of girls in their schooltime, and leave to them the problem of the broad educational advantages secured to boys. We shall have a law to make it compulsory for girls to become domestic servants, if we do not nip this kind of scheme in the bud. Until men who have had the good fortune to be well educated stop this malevolent tilting at the bottle. Even with their pupils, they are often unable to sustain arguments, and when the argument has wound up they are seldom able to give space to such sentimental babble and countenance such a travesty of science. To allow matter of this kind to appear in its columns is to cause grave misunderstanding and to delude the public not only as to what ranks as education of a University standard but also, even more, to give false hopes as to the solution of a national difficulty. It is impossible to take the article seriously. One can only believe that it is a little more of the valueless approval and applause which men give to schemes for women before they have taken the trouble to give the matter thought.

How did the scheme arise? To begin with, there was the need I have already mentioned, and an earnest desire to get a short cut out of the difficulty. The inefficiencies of the house and home were to be turned into efficiency. But how? No one knew. So they decided upon a University scheme. There were among the promoters of the scheme a few men and women conspicuous for powers of initiative. These recognised that, whatever the scheme, it would require financial backing if it was to have power. For what kind of scheme would financial backing be obtained? Certainly not for a progressive scheme. Only for a tentative scheme of the ancient order of things would money be readily forthcoming. Hence the first thoughts were given, not to the intrinsic merits of the scheme, but to considerations for loosening the purse-strings of financiers. So business zeal outstripped all else, and whatever progressive ideas were in the minds of the few were rapidly swamped.

The actual course became nothing more nor less than that required to turn out the "womanly woman and perfect housewife"; but by masquerading as pure science it lured into its toils women who otherwise would have shunned it, and, by seductive offers of post-graduate posts, attracted students who were sincere scientists.

I give it here and now, as personal testimony, that even the members of the staff at King's College for Women are in no way sure of the rightness of the scheme which they have undertaken to carry out. Even the chairman of the committee to whom so many of the experiments of the King's College scheme were due never gave it the slightest encouragement. He was from the first opposed to sustaining the experiment, that the post-graduate student is not ideal, but so vague is the ideal itself that the one he has assigned to women, and it is in directing attention to the type of education provided for girls that the true remedy lies. By ensuring that in future every girl's education shall include some knowledge of the science which affects her home problems, and some practice of the domestic arts, the whole standard of home life would be raised, and trained experience substituted for instinct and tradition, which have hitherto been the chief guides for mothers."

Most people will agree that women do need more knowledge in Biology and sex matters (Hygiene and Sanitation, you may less pretentiously call it), if they are to avoid the pitfalls of marriage and motherhood. It is, however, a training which the King's College scheme is not ideal, but so vague is the ideal itself that the one he has assigned to women, and it is in directing attention to the type of education provided for girls that the true remedy lies. By ensuring that in future every girl's education shall include some knowledge of the science which affects her home problems, and some practice of the domestic arts, the whole standard of home life would be raised, and trained experience substituted for instinct and tradition, which have hitherto been the chief guides for mothers."

The actual course became nothing more nor less than that required to turn out the "womanly woman and perfect housewife"; but by masquerading as pure science it lured into its toils women who otherwise would have shunned it, and, by seductive offers of post-graduate posts, attracted students who were sincere scientists.

I give it here and now, as personal testimony, that even the members of the staff at King's College for Women are in no way sure of the rightness of the scheme which they have undertaken to carry out. Even the chairman of the committee to whom so many of the experiments of the King's College scheme were due never gave it the slightest encouragement. He was from the first opposed to sustaining the experiment, that the post-graduate student is not ideal, but so vague is the ideal itself that the one he has assigned to women, and it is in directing attention to the type of education provided for girls that the true remedy lies. By ensuring that in future every girl's education shall include some knowledge of the science which affects her home problems, and some practice of the domestic arts, the whole standard of home life would be raised, and trained experience substituted for instinct and tradition, which have hitherto been the chief guides for mothers."

This, surely, is not the way to start a University scheme. Should not authorities have at least some cogent reason for their action before applying for a degree for that scheme? One can understand people groping their way into a subject, but one cannot understand such groppers asking for a degree for such vague processes. Women are to get knowledge of a quality inferior to any supplied in crafts or applied sciences, and then for the sum total of over-numerous but undervalued smatterings they are to receive a degree!!

Cannot the authorities see that an ordinary college course simply will not supply the time to do all these subjects even decently well? Can they not grasp the fact that the home is a little cosmos in itself, each one of its sections lending itself on the one hand to practical learning, and, on the other, to great manipulative skill? In attempting
to run a course in "Home Science," they are attempting something as wild as those who should offer a degree in the science and art of living.

In considering the future treatment of Housecraft, it must be realised that at certain periods of history, as the need arrived for improvement through specialization, Housecraft was left by one, left the house. The time has now arrived for further specialisation, and to imagine that things can be directed back to the old position merely by granting women a "B.Sc." degree in "Drudgery," is as absurd as to imagine that mankind can be induced to return to a primitive stage of civilisation by the reward of a University degree in "Devolution."

The inefficiency in Housecraft is due to the complexity of it; yet the promoters of the Home Science scheme saw fit to increase this complexity by adding a study of Economics, Biology, Chemistry, Bacteriology, and Psychology, and what not. To old dabbling they added new dabbling, and have yet to realise that, so long as women dabble in the many trades and professions found in a house, and refuse to lose their grasp on them, so long will these remain undeveloped so far as the house is concerned.

When the various sections of Housecraft are brought out of the house, then, and then only, will they be recognised as skilled trades requiring the same thorough training such as skilled work requires. Considerable advance has already been made in these crafts, yet the house has not received the full benefit, for the incompetent housewife separates her little piece of the craft from the specialised trade. Cookery, laundry work, and cleansing processes have advanced considerably outside the house, but surely such crafts are the same whether found in the house or outside it. The cleaning of paint, for instance, requires the same processes whether that paint is found on the walls of a house or on those of a tube station. The care of woodwork is the same, whether in a house or in a hospital ward. With regard to the application of science to household matters, all must acknowledge that wherever science is applied in the household such application has been brought about by agencies from outside the house and not from within. The great advances in the application of gas and electricity to cookery, heating, and cleaning have come into the house from scientists through commercial enterprises, and not from the "domestic" brain might well swoon at the thought of such a revolutionary household appliance as this last.

Future generations may see such detailed developments of household concerns that science degrees may be possible in the applied sciences of cookery and laundry work, perhaps even of cleaning processes; but these, so far as my imagination can conceive, will be worked out as branches of applied Chemistry and Physics, in exactly the same way as, for example, Chemistry applied to colours and dyeing and to leather manufacture, have been carried out in subjects for the science degree of one of the Northern Universities.

Should such changes take place, however (and they will), in regard to house development, it will not be possible to conceive of a degree in "Domestic Science." Such application of pure science will be no more "domestic" than the science of brewing is to-day. Brewing, at one period, was a domestic. At that period it was amateurish. History (King's College calls it Economics) has shown that so long as occupations remain in the house, so long do they remain amateurish. Before domestic anything becomes science, it must lose its domesticity

—it must leave the home. For the present women must realise that knowledge of pure science, and the power to apply it, are chiefly in the hands of men, and to men they must appeal for application of science to the household, unless they themselves are prepared to become serious scientists. If women in the future are to have a place in household development work they must go through the science mill in the Universities and in the workshops, and not rely upon a butterfly course in Home Science and Economics for women.

The King's College scheme can never succeed except financially, and then only through the exercising of an intellectual bluff and the distortion which has always been considered beneath the academic, not to mention the intellectual, mind. Efforts have ever been made in the Universities to preserve the respect for scholarship, to the honour of academicians be it said; and it is an insult to women and a degradation of University standards that in offering their first specific University scheme for women they should depart so far from the age-long traditions of the Universites.

Why should they insult women by this scurrilous slur upon their intellects, by this presumption that women will work at, even here, science, and in that quality of work accepted to qualify women as compared with that demanded for men?

I, at any rate, as a very humble but very sincere science student indignantly repudiate both the insult and presumption, and regret that for one term, by holding the Gilchrist Scholarship, I should seem to have acquiesced in this humiliation. I herewith express my thanks for this opportunity to make public my position, and to state that I abandoned the Gilchrist Scholarship on account of my unspeakable detestation of the principle that women should receive— for dabbling—honours which men receive only for honest workmanship. At present the King's College scheme in Home Science and Economics is a piece of the purest charlatanry.

RONA ROBINSON, M.Sc.

"What Diantha Did."*

*By Charlotte Perkins Gilman. 4s. 6d. net. (Fisher Unwin.)

February 29, 1912

"WHAT Diantha Did" is a book which women will find worth reading, in spite of its irritating sentimentality. Mrs. Perkins Gilman, like many other reformers who fear the adjective "revolutionary," has chosen to make her appeal, not to the enterprising people who might possibly be roused to take action, but to those prejudiced opponents whose enmity is based on their habits of mind. She asks us to solve the servant problem by clearing our houses of cooks and kitchens, hiring maids by the hour, and having our meals delivered, ready cooked, in silver-plated aluminium food containers; but she gives us a heroine who, in moments of irritation, must work from 6 a.m. till 10 p.m. for her husband, and regards with "positive jealousy" the hirering whom she sees waiting on the adored young man. Diantha, in fact, besides her excellent head for business, has a real, womanly, pulsing, American heart, and though she does not seem to think that Deity can manufacturer, has been carried out in subjects for the science degree of one of the Northern Universities.
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"What Diantha Did."*
held fast. It was an odd prayer, if any human ear
had heard it. 'Thank you!' was all she said, with
long, deep, sobbing sighs between. 'Thank you!
—Oh—thank you!'

However, we do not see very much of these
esthetic feelings; they serve merely to lift
Diantha's business enterprises to that higher plane
where the American mind feels most at home.

The real heroine of Mrs. Gilman's book is the
modern household. She asks us to think of a
million or so of our homes. Each of these contains
her immediate dependents. There is no guarantee
Diantha's business enterprises to that higher plane
where the American mind feels most at home.

Each group struggles along as best it can, and
makes its own mistakes, an incompetent mistress
or servant brings misery on her household, and the
greatest genius for domestic work can benefit only
their immediate dependents. There is no guarantee
of competency, no certainty that the women en-
gaged in this industry are suited for it, no recog-
nised standard of proficiency. The whole thing is
a muddle. What is bought is bought in small
quantities, expensively, often unintelligently, and
much of it is wasted. Moreover, the conditions of
work are bad. The mistress of the house, placating
her husband on one hand and directing dependent
servants on the other, busied with innumerable
small duties which are important only when
neglected, tends to develop a narrow mind, a mean
outlook, and the defects of temper natural to those
whose work is performed not under the criticism of
equals, but among their inferiors and for the benefit
of a more powerful being. The evils of the ser-
vants' position need hardly be enumerated here.

This state of things the author proposes to reform
by abolishing. She wishes to relieve educated
women both of the task of training and super-
intending servants, and of the serious moral
responsibility which is incurred by having young
and inexperienced women living in the house. Ser-
vants, like the charwoman and the man who cleans
the windows, will come in, do their business, and
vanish. The work will be more quickly done be-
cause several of them can do in an hour what one
takes a day to accomplish; it will be better done
because each servant will be a specialist carefully
trained. Cooking and marketing are arts too
complex for the average brain, and the ordinary
dallas will be a great dead weight on the house-
kitchen. One first-rate cook can control a dozen
subordinates and prepare the meals for twice as
many families. The families, meanwhile, enjoy the
privacy of their homes. Mrs. Gilman does not
mean to involve her mistresses in any of the difficul-
ties of co-operative housekeeping. There is, she
says, no reason why "the inefficiency of a dozen
tottering households should be removed by com-
bining them." The mistress is to be in the position
of a simple customer, giving orders for so much
service and so many meals, and she will be supplied
as she is now supplied with her band and her supper
when she gives a dance. We admit at once that for
the mistress the solution seems complete.

There may be women who prefer the company of
servants, who like to direct the lives of other people,
and who never go without a thing they want be-
cause they are ashamed to bring a maid upstairs
to get it, and afraid of losing the maid's feelings
by setting it themselves. There may be women
who endure bad dinners for the pleasure of bully-
ing the cook, and enjoy good ones for the pleasure
of outshining their neighbours. We hope and be-
lieve that they are the result of their environment,
and that their numbers would soon decrease.

The difficulties of the scheme come in, not here,
nor in the matter of supplying meals, but when we
begin to think of organising the servants. Mrs.
Gilman is very anxious to show that there is money
in it, that as great careers may be carved out by
supplying maids as by supplying soap. That is, we
think, the principal danger. Many servants in
private houses are disgracefully treated now, but
we doubt whether the majority endure conditions
half as unhealthy as those of a waitress, a servant
in a great hotel, or a girl in a shop. Flocks of
ignorant women have before now been organised to
their own undoing; and an extension of Mr.
Whitley's admirable activities would be a high
price to pay for the extinction of the kitchen fire.

The small voluntary servants' societies Mrs. Gilman
seems to suggest do not sound convincing when one
tries to imagine one of them set down in a modern
city. To succeed, it would have to be either a
great exploitation of labour or a great trade union.

And it is the first, not the second, which an able
man could form out of servants as we have them
now. Perhaps the Insurance Act will pave the way
with its servants' societies. Here, at any rate, is
a fresh field for enthusiasm.

A. F.

Luang Sawat, B.A.

II

In a large room in a Siamese house in Bangkok,
a house of palatial size, and of unkempt rooms
all open to the air on at least one side, Mom Sabai,
the owner of the house, and the mother of Sawat,
sat on a rickety chair, chewing betel. She sat on
a chair because it was easy from that height to
superintend the embroidery class, as she could see
if anyone looked up or dawdled. The workers
were all seated on the floor before a long low frame,
on which were stretched yards of white satin.

Mom Sabai would have been more comfortable
on the floor, too. She longed for sunset, when the
work would stop, as lamp-light was expensive.
Meantime, she rested one leg at a time by lifting it
on the chair and holding the knee up to her chin.
Occasionally she put them both up, and so got
a really good rest, claspimg them together with
skinny fingers heavily bejewelled. A shrivelled
brown woman, with an inscrutable, wary expres-
sion, she looked, in spite of her elegant silk
and pahom, panung and
and
panung
and
pahom, rings on her fingers, and bangles at
wrist.s and ankles, like an able anthropoid ape.
Her hair, hardly grizzled, and still thick, stood up
in a bristle all round her head; and her lower lip,
full of tobacco, bulged far out beyond her small
nose. Every now and then, as she talked, she
paused to eject a mouthful of red saliva, betel-nut,
and tobacco. For this purpose a kneeling slave-
woman held out to her a small gold spittoon.

The embroiderers were women and girls, all, if
not actually slaves, subservient and obedient to
Mom Sabai. From a drawing fixed near her, each
worker copied some detail of a large Japanese pic-
ture hanging on a screen behind her. They stitched in
dead silence, hardly breathing or lifting their eyes.
All were dressed in panung and pahom, the brown
neck and arms bare. All but one wore the hair cut
short and bristling erect.

The room was dingy, hardly furnished at all,
except in the far corner, where two or three mat-
tresses were prepared as beds, with mosquito-net-
ting bundled up over them during the daytime.
Direct light entered the room only from one side,
and even that side was shaded by a deep verandah.
The verandah itself was darkened by heavy clumps
of rustling bamboo growing in the compound
below. Through the bamboos a glimpse of flowing
river, of boats and houses, was possible here and there.

As they bent over the low frame in the dark room, all the workers strained their eyes. One of these, though not old, had an actively careworn expression, very different from the dumb animal-like patience on the other faces. The curves of her mouth were beautiful still, though the habit of betel-chewing showed in the black glistening teeth.

This was Ying, Sawat's wife. She wore her hair differently from the others. Instead of being cut in a dense upstanding bristle, it was long, and wound in a large coil on the top of her head, Lao fashion. She wore the Siamese pahom, and an accordion-pleated apple-green silk pahom covered a beautifully curving bosom. The brown skin of her neck and arms was delicate in colour, and fine as satin; and the hands that plied the needle in and out were exquisite in shape. She sat on one haunch, her legs tucked away on the opposite side. She pottered about, finding fault, and creeping in with downcast head beside Ying.

"Will Sawat come to-morrow; to-day?" Ying turned to her little girl. "Are you tired, Dockmye?"

"Tired. Mother, I'm top in Standard III. And Kru says I may get the scholarship next year."

"What's this, Mom Jeean?"

"A present for Mom Sabai."

"A present for Mom Sabai."

"You must give it to herself," said Ying, hastily.

"A present for Mom Sabai."

"I know it," said Ying, smiling and hopeful. "He will be here soon."

"I'II, very Il. She never comes out of prison now."

"Why?"

"Her ankles are so swollen, they can't get the chains on."

"Why don't you ask the governor to let her out sometimes without chains? She wouldn't run away?"

"Run away! She can hardly crawl, or eat, or speak. And she has not touched betel. Sawat will soon come, and he will put all chains on."

The woman crouching near the bundles ejected a mouthful of betel on the verandah floor. She then shook out of one of the bundles a remarkable featherly and flowery hat. Of commonest millinery, coarsely ribberoned and belaced, it was such a hat as a Walworth Road shop-girl might think she had bargained well for at 5½d.

"Kru (teacher) does not like the hat," said Raut. "She said I must not wear it at school."

"Not wear it! A hat that cost sixty ticals (nearly four pounds) at the English shop!"

"Now?"

"Now. He's waiting."

The old lady went off, followed by half a dozen women.

When the cat's away, etc. They all stopped work suddenly, and began to chatter.

"Watch, Jeean, and tell us if you see her coming back."

"Mè! I forgot. Where is it, Jeean?"

"Mè! I forgot. Where is it, Jeean?"

Mom Sabai, her mother-in-law, noting the happy smiles, pounced viciously. "Wasting time again, Ying. How do you suppose the embroidery's to get finished?"

"Ying dropped her needle, and, placing the palms of her hands together, she raised them high above her bent head. "Kaw todt" ('I beg forgiveness'). And she looked for her needle. I cannot find it," she murmured, and she searched in vain, the worker on her right having hid it while Ying was saluting. "Work, I say, Ying." Mom Sabai insisted.

"This is my needle, Mom."

"Mè!" And Mom Sabai got up and waddled across the floor. She pottered about, finding fault, betel-chewing, urging them all to greater diligence.

The heat was stifling. Voices were heard outside, and a questioning girl stalked in from the verandah. She was followed by several slave-women bearing sailor-like bundles, the contents bulging and falling out. Behind her came a younger girl, slim and sweet-faced. These were the two "childrens" of Luang Sawat, B.A. Both were dressed in silk jackets, and beribboned European-ised jackets with tight sleeves. They wore high-heeled shoes and openwork stockings. The elder, seeing her grandmother, dropped on her knees and saluted with both hands high. The younger looked round the room eagerly for her mother, Ying. The grandmother turned on her angrily. "Gom hua, gom hua" ('bend your head'). And the child dropped suddenly, walking on all fours, hitching up a ragged cloth that partially covered her breast.

"Why?"

"Her ankles are so swollen, they can't get the chains on."

"Why don't you ask the governor to let her out sometimes without chains? She wouldn't run away?"

"Run away! She can hardly crawl, or eat, or speak. And she has not touched betel. Sawat will soon come, and he will put all chains on."

"It's horrible," said Ying. "Take some more betel. Sawat will soon come, and he will put all chains on."

"The Kekh (Indian) is in his boat at the landing."

"Now?

"Now. He's waiting."

The woman crouching near the bundles ejected a mouthful of betel into a hole in the verandah floor. She crawled to Ying's feet, and, laying the tray on the ground, saluted profoundly.

"What is this, Mom Jeean?"

"A present for Mom Sabai."

"You must give it to herself," said Ying, hastily.

"Wait outside on the verandah until she comes back."

The old woman saluted again, but lingered.

"Has he come yet?" she whispered eagerly, hitching up a ragged cloth that partially covered her breast.

"Not yet.

"When will he come?"

"Bradëo, bradëo." ('Very soon.')

"You have said that for months and months. I am so weary waiting for justice. He has been in Europe eight years."

"I know it," said Ying, smiling and hopeful. "He will be here soon."

She offered her betel-box to the old woman, speaking low. "How is your daughter now?"

"Ill, very Ill. She never comes out of prison now."

"Why?"

"Her ankles are so swollen, they can't get the chains on."

"Why don't you ask the governor to let her out sometimes without chains? She wouldn't run away?"

"Run away! She can hardly crawl, or eat, or speak. And she has not touched betel for a whole week."

"It's horrible," said Ying. "Take some more betel. Sawat will soon come, and he will put all chains on."

The old woman filled her mouth with the national consolation for all woes, and crawled out to the verandah with her tray of fruit.

She would wait for Mom Sabai, and try to propitiate her.
"Mother, when will my father come?" asked Dockmye in her turn. "Bradéô, bradéô," assured Ying. "Will he live here with us?" "Not here," smiling, and in a whisper, with an eye on the squattting girls, gossiping loudly as they chewed and expectorated. "He will take us away alone with him, as farangs do." The child's face fell. "Will father be like a farang?"

"Like a farang. The Rajatut (ambassador) in London wrote about him to the noble grandmother, and said he was quite farang; had forgotten Siamese, and went to the English church." "Mother, will he take Mom Jeean's daughter out of prison?"

"Certainly." (A pause.) "Mother, if father is quite farang, will he be like the Nai farang Wentah?" ("the spectacled European"). This was the only European man that Dockmye knew. He came sometimes to talk business with Mom Sabai. The old lady was a capital trader, and she had no scruples in aiding the fulfilment of her desires. So to her the old European went, if in want of a new challet, male or female, alive or inanimate. Dockmye was horribly afraid of him; he was so fierce and fat and red and loud-voiced.

Ying smiled at the idea of comparison between her husband—good, kind, and young—with the brutal old European. "Mother, is Nai Wentah a farang?"

"Of course."

But he has more than one wife. He has! There's Beca, and Loon, and Maun, and Jeean, and . . . oh! I know there are some more. And, mother, I heard the noble grandmother promising him a new wife for fifteen pounds. I don't know who it was; but she isn't old enough yet, they said." Hush, child," whispered Ying, all her brightness clouding. You must never repeat what you hear.

"Only to you, mother. I'm very cautious . . . What's the matter, mother, darling?"

"What else did they say about the Nai's new wife?"

"I did not hear any more. The noble grandmother told me to run away. Why do you look so sad?"

A vague fear of months was taking shape in Ying's mind. Would her mother-in-law's ultimate cruelty be the selling of her darling to the old European? Dockmye clasped her mother's hand and raised it to her face, smelling it like a flower. Ying brightened. "Father will put all right when he comes," she repeated.

Suddenly, warning was given that Mom Sabai was coming back. All the women crouched lower on the ground, and shuffled back to the silent stitching.

The old lady was now quite in a good temper, having out-bargained even a Cingalese. She swaggered down the room and squatted among the women. She turned patronisingly to Dockmye. "How do you like school? Did you pass your examination well?"

"Yes, well," Dockmye said, proudly, but not omitting the deferential salutation.

"Where are you?"

"Top of Standard III."

"And where are you?" to Raut, the elder daughter. Raut hesitated, pouting, disinclining to tell the truth. The grandmother insisted.

When it was explained to her that Raut had not been able to pass at all, she was furious. Her pet below Dockmye! "I don't think that school is any good," she burst out. "They don't know anything."

"They don't know how to teach. When I asked the head Kru how long it would take to teach you all she knew, she laughed. Laughed! Showing her white dogs' teeth; and she said, 'One year!' She must be a lazy woman to want all that time."

The slave girls stitched on silently, while Mom helped herself to a fresh quid of betel and strutted about the room. The rolled-up part of her farang, tucked into the belt behind, being too stiffly starched to keep firm in its place, got loose and, falling down, trailed on the ground between her feet as she walked.

"What are you smiling about, Jeean? And you, Looa? And you, Dockmye?"

"But no one dared to tell her that her farang was trailing. There's to be no laughing here, Dockmye," she continued; "this is a real working school, not a place of amusement, like Arunapah." Then she added, with vicious decision: "I will send Dockmye to the school at Kong Beng next month."

Dockmye started, flushing in indignant protest. But she dared say nothing; so thoroughly had the lesson of submission been learnt. Ying forgot hers for a moment.

"Arunapah's a better school than Kong Beng," she said. "I don't want Dockmye to go to the school at Kong Beng. They will teach her to despise Siamese religion."

Mom Sabai glared, resenting all protest against her will.

"She shall go to Kong Beng. It's only five ticals a month there; and that's enough to pay for Dockmye. And she may learn good manners at Kong Beng."

"Is Raut to go too?"

"No. Raut is worth the expense of the Arunapah school."

"It isn't fair," burst out Ying, forgetting the price she would pay for relieving her mind. "I will tell Sawat when he comes; he will not allow it. Dockmye's his child, too; and he cared for her as much as for Raut."

There was an awed hush among the slaves. Ying must be mad to speak so plainly to Mom. The old lady's face was livid with anger as she said, slowly and distinctly, in her harshest tones: "You will not see my son unless I allow it. If you argue with me and contradict me, I will send you up the river to Pakret for a year; and Sawat shall not know where you are. He can get other wives."

"He will find me out," thought Ying, forcing back her tears of dumb misery. He is farang now; and farangs are always just, and have only friendship for one wife."
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