DAUGHTERS OF ISHMAEL.

I HAVE just read the American book of Reginald W. Kauffman, “The Daughters of Ishmael.” It is said that a quarter of a million copies of this book have been sold in America. If this is true, it means a vast modification in the social structure of America.

This book is not “La Dame aux Camélias.” It is another story. It is not a book. It is rather a vertical section cut through a stratum of life which has become suddenly germane and similar to the life which is our own. So the review must wait, for the concentrated passion of sheer truthfulness of this book leaves, at the moment, nothing to be said. It has established its own tale—clear-cut, self-defined, self-supporting. I suppose this is the reason why, the horrific tale told, one is not haunted with the story, but rather with the infinitely more horrible story, of which no word is uttered, but upon whose existence the naturalness of the told tale testifies at each syllable. It is now part of our living experience to know how starvation and misery can drive women from trench to trench, until at length they are willing goods for sale in the petroleum-reeking hell of a cut-throats’ den. This we now understand, and we can imagine, at least, that the moment is fast approaching when a State will as readily harbour in its limits polluting hordes of plague-stricken rats as tolerate the presence of poverty so dire as this which enforcing and then blinks at such sales. It is to be noted that of all the women Kauffman places in his gallery there is not one that, at the outset, money would not have saved. He shows no Marguerite Gautier. Is hers another story? or do we not remember a time, far back, when a little girl, Marguerite, was taken into the streets—by her mother—to beg, and ...? Perhaps it is the same. As far as women are concerned, therefore, the problem of the Daughters of Ishmael is comparatively easy. It appears to have to deal with environment largely. Whether exclusively or not, only the alteration of environment can tell. They, because of their dire need, are willing to supply a demand which seems always to be there. And this is the matter we are left speculating upon, though Kauffman says not a word regarding it—this question of the permanent demand. Cut off the supply, and the demand remains, we suppose. So, a new supply and a fresh social sore? However that may be, it is now becoming clear that thousands of years of inculcated practice have been adequate to the production of male and female of the human species with impulses, in this respect so different, that it is only with difficulty that they can conceive of the mental condition one of the other. Of the women who read “The Daughters of Ishmael” the comment will be that they understand those who sell, but they do not understand those who buy—not under such grossness, such brutish conditions. And of the men who read “The Daughters of Ishmael” what of their comments? We do not know. Mere statistics make it fairly certain to say that the majority of men, at one time or another, have had some share in this traffic. If the statement that seventy-five per cent. of men have at one time or another suffered from a certain kind of disease can be made—a statement which we noticed passed wholly without challenge a few weeks ago—if such is the case, the inference which women may draw is obvious. Men, it appears, while demanding a monandrous womankind, are largely impulsive, promiscuous, and polygynous. Women, having mean-
while become essentially monandrous, are awaking to a realisation of the different nature of men. How are these two going to make terms on such differing bases? Can they make peace on such fundamental differences? It is a fixed certainty that women never will. There is only one thing that mental differences? It is a fixed certainty that acceptance of polygyny. Love is jealous. All love is. We all expect love to return, like a boomerang, back to the source from which it springs. Men do. Indeed, it is not conceivable that a man would condone promiscuity in the woman he loved and who professed to love in return, and this for far less material reasons than those which suggest the possibility of his becoming chargeable with responsibilities which he had not himself undertaken. It is due to his grasp of the exclusive nature of love, of which jealousy is nothing more than a sign. Jealousy is combined anger and fear, at and for the threatened loss of something which is not only valued, but whose value finds itself, in large part, in the fact that it is one's own. Hence, there is the spirit of an Angel Clare in every man, and in every woman this germ has its counterpart. It is the handicap which is twin to every virtue. The real bitterness between the sexes finds its grounds in jealousy. A man, on however slight grounds, is free to procure an outlet for it. A woman, on no matter what grounds, is bidden by discretion to smother it. So fundamental a characteristic of love is jealousy that, were women sure of a livelihood, discretion might whistle for all the effect it would have when jealousy was afoot. Still, all has not been as well in love for men as has appeared. They have, indeed, been spared the immediate injury; it has been of the immediate incentive and consequences in the sphere of passion, with the result that passion has remained with the majority of them mainly an impulsive physical affair, capable of being caused by next to nothing, and of being satisfied with about as much. This alone explains the possibility of that promiscuity among men which is so foreign to women (the scapegoats—the Ishmaelites—excepting). In youth there was put before him no incentive to restrain; whatever his record, numberless women, all "pure," would be there from whom to pick and choose whenever he so decided. He was asked no questions. In marriage it was quite accepted that his love would cool, because, forsooth! the primitive physical impulse had been satisfied. Proceeding, therefore, from satiety to boredom, he might then go on to any number of impulsive affairs, always provided that such affairs were contracted with persons of a lower station in society than his own. No voice was raised against him, either by Church, Society, or State. His was a recognised mode of living; and such a man would have been acceptable to almost any woman, so far as character was concerned. With the woman, the order has been reversed. She has known it a financial necessity to marry, and in order to marry her "purity" must be strictly maintained—no matter at what physical and mental cost. So, "pure" she remains before marriage, and "faithful" she becomes after marriage—otherwise the law will expel her from Marriage. Consequently, were not women "restrained" and "pure," it would be a proof that the human species did not lend itself to this kind of virtue, for it has been inculcated in them by every natural and artificial incentive, and reinforced by every natural and artificial kind of deterrent against nonconformity. Men, on the other hand, have been encouraged to let impulses run riot, and it is now men's untrained passions which threaten the life of the race, it is not easy to say whether it is men's fault or women's. Women's restrained qualities are certainly due to the fact that men's demands were high. Had women's demands on men been equally high, there would not be prostitution of the kind we know to-day. It becomes clear that women will have to do for men that harsh service which men have done for women, that is, to provide them with incentives and social reward for monogyny. The first will be partially effected when women have established the custom of demanding, as well as themselves providing, a certificate of health from any man with whom they intend to "marry." It will make an enormous difference to mere impulsive conduct in youth to know that a man's health and the kind of life he has led will have a direct bearing on his plans and chances of success in the future. In the second place, in marriage, legal or otherwise, it is time women expected from men the same "faithfulness" that men demand from their "wives." No man would tolerate in his wife the "little indiscretions" that a woman tolerates in a husband—not so much in their unfaithfulness as in their method of dealing with unfaithfulness—a vast change for good will have been effected.

---

**THE SENESCHAL.**

This place is hallowed with the scent of her,
And I know she has passed this way,—
Long time ago, maybe—perhaps a year—
I ought know of a yesterday,
For Time flies fast, they say,
With Remorse at the heels of him.

But what does it matter, now that I may not rise
To the place where she is to-day;
That I have gone from gazing in her eyes
To lie—where that other lay?
What does it reck, I say,
That the scent of her yet lingers?

*Selwyn Weston.*

---

**THE WHITE SEA.**

O that magnific sea,
Whose waves, like flame of snow,
Roll through eternity!
The waters leap and glow;
The moored ships eager strain,
Each at her iron chain;
The captains wait the Day—
Till all be shipped, no bark must weigh
(If one remained, what joy could be?).
But it is Paradise, I wis,
To gaze on such a sea as this,
Dreaming of discovery!

*E. H. Visiak.*
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

On the eve of the King's Speech, which will be declared before this issue appears in print, it is useless to speculate as to the exact terms in which the references to the New Reform Bill will be made. It is undoubted that recent events have raised women's expectations in regard to female enfranchisement to the point of certainty. The rumour, to which we referred last week, that Sir Edward Grey is to be Mr. Asquith's successor, has been strengthened by the signal honour which has been conferred upon him by the King during the last few days, and such a development of affairs would make a wide measure of Woman Suffrage inevitable. As one of the strongest and sincerest supporters of Woman Suffrage, Sir Edward Grey, whether he should lead the Liberal party in the House of Lords or in the House of Commons, would make his views and those of Mr. Lloyd George paramount on Woman Suffrage. Also, there is no member of the existing Liberal Cabinet, with the exception of Sir Edward Grey, who could give the impression of "safeness" to the Government which is Mr. Asquith's chief recommendation in the eyes of his party, and the only one, therefore, who could reduce to a minimum the falling away of support which naturally goes with a change in the leadership of a government, nominal or otherwise. What is quite clear is that the Lloyd-Georgian influence with which Sir Edward Grey is associated has become infinitely stronger during the last few weeks. This has been largely on account of his straightforward and unambiguous declarations in regard to Woman Suffrage, and that his influence should have increased so rapidly as to alter the tone and attitude of his followers appears a welcome proof that party support will be available for the Suffrage measure. The general question of Woman Suffrage being, therefore, in so hopeful a position, we can very fittingly examine the possible conditions under which a Radical Government can confer the measure. During the last three years the demands of Women Suffragists themselves have altered from a demand for votes for women on the terms granted to men under the existing franchise—a demand enfranchising about one and a quarter million women—to a demand under the so-called Conciliation Bill seeking votes on the municipal basis—a demand which would have enfranchised about a quarter of a million less; then the demand shrank under a still further restriction in the prospective new Conciliation Bill, to a demand for a householder franchise merely. In view of the proposed introduction of the Reform Bill, Suffragists are now for the first time, in anything like seriousness, demanding Adult Suffrage, and from the tones of many of them, they are afrighted at their own daring. It is an enormous undertaking; but, fairly looked at, Adult Suffrage is the only form of Woman Suffrage under which women workers would get any look in at all. The municipal, or householder, franchises would enfranchise only the tenders of the home, who, though undoubtedly belonging to the poorer classes in an overwhelming proportion, belong chiefly to the class of women whose outlook is limited by the narrow confines of the home. Even should there be added to the practice of complete chastity (a quaint enough proposal), it would still leave out the main body of women workers, an arrangement which is unsatisfactory in the first degree. We believe that both Mr. Lloyd George and Sir Edward Grey could be convinced very easily of this view regarding women workers. Such being the case, Suffragists very naturally are at a loss to know where to "draw the line," if line is to be drawn short of Adult Suffrage. There are, indeed, signs that the interests of household Suffrage and Adult Suffrage, save arbitrary ones erected round distinctions of class and sex, and irritating anomalies of registration—all distinctions of the precise kind which it is the raison d'être of the new Reform Bill to destroy. Let us, then, have a clean sweep. We look to Mr. George and Sir Edward Grey to safeguard the interests of the women workers in the coming session, and, in view of their enthusiastic beliefs and determination, expressed only a few weeks ago, we believe we look to those who are not only able, but willing, to undertake this serious responsibility.

On Affirmations.

A well-wisher and helper of our paper has sent us a communication, in which he makes the following criticism of THE FREEWOMAN: "I have had a good look into each number, and would like to make some suggestion. It seems to me that the general tone of it is not constructive enough. It is very easy to throw mud at a stature. Anyone can do that. But the point is, whether such production can claim to be more than just flings at the women workers. I do not mean to suggest that I am satisfied with present social conditions, but I wish to say that I think it would be wise for you to encourage more constructive work, and to decline to publish the correspondence that is chiefly mud-throwing. Unless the paper adopts a more affirmative tone, Exactly so—Affirmative tone! Affirmative of what? There's the rub. Our dogma or yours? Neither, yet a while, an it please you. THE FREEWOMAN makes one great Affirmation just here and now, and it is this: There is more to be said, of bad and good, of shade and light, than the pure and good and lofty-living seem to have dreamt of; and Neither, yet a while, an it please you. THE FREEWOMAN are endeavouring to live to say. For what other is our existence than to take the tangled skein of life and, where the knot is closest, carefully to untie the strands apart? This is our interest in life. The sudden jerk which is Affirmation, and the drastic cut which is Denial, at this moment is the work for other hands than ours. Affirmation and Denial made absolute have no interest for us, as we hoped would have been clear from our own limited measure of affirmation. What could we have meant by "A Plea for Psychology" save an appeal for toleration of individual affirmation? What could we have meant by our remarks on Joy, except that where many see only a sink of hideousness and final death, we see the groppings after joy and a more abundant power of life? To show what we mean: Another of our correspondents of this week, a woman, unmarried and under thirty, writes to say that the practice of complete chastity has had no untoward influence on her physical and mental health. If it has had an influence at all, it has been influence for good. This is an affirmation, simple, direct, and bearing the cachet of truth. We publish it with pleasure; and at the same time we publish this, that we, women, unmarried and under thirty, from half a life's experience, affirm that the practice of complete chastity has had an incontrovertibly untoward influence on marriage and physical health. Which is another affirmation. Again, to show our meaning: One man this week, writing concerning an "Ethnic Society," states that he belongs to a union which seeks totally to
eliminate all sex considerations from among its members, because it suits their temperament so to do. Another man writes to say that by means of adopting a diet which he detests, and by occasional blood-letting, he can maintain chastity, but only with a consequent loss of energy which affects his remaining energies. Hence our slowness to put forward pious and generalised affirmations. THE FREEWOMAN stands for the variety, the joy, and the individualness of life. It is connected only with the cause of women, because we believe women lack many of the opportunities for securing variedness, individuality, and joy. Our work at present appears to them as much in the sphere of staying general affirmations until such time as we are more aware of the nature of the thing of which we affirm, as it is to advance a few obvious economic and political truths. The purest and truest individual affirmations, generalised, rapidly become festering lies. When we understand more what is in the minds of one another, we can affirm more. Till then, affirmations are a snare. Browning has it in one of his poems: "Ten men love what I hate." What will they do with the eleventh man? Suppress him? Or suppose the eleventh man possesses power, what will he do with the ten? Coerce them? There, in a line's space, we have the complete problem of a various and differing community, struggling for and against a uniform government. This is the problem of all government, if it be not government in a community of sheep. It is odd that it should be so, but so it is. Nature, which has born us all, is varied enough, whimsical enough, averse sufficiently from producing replicas, and yet our whole theory of living together is based upon our highly questionable sameness, instead of upon an acceptance of our infinite differences. It is strange. It is quite different from the straight line of Up and Down and we hold to be wrong, perverted, and unnatural.

If ever we are to know more of the nature of the human heart, we shall have to muster the courage to listen to any tale sincerely told, and be prepared to grant during the listening that the tale told has the naturalness, therefore, that THE FREEWOMAN club has it in one form or another. Nothing will become direct subscribers from the publishing office. Those to whom it is not possible to become subscribers, we ask to become more persistent in their demands upon the bookstall and newsagents.

We ask for this individual effort because it is not possible, even were the means to hand, to adopt conventional methods of advertisement, as THE FREEWOMAN cannot entirely find its readers among the general public. We feel that the only feasible method is to rely upon individual recommendation of the merit of the paper. We ask daily from readers regarding the difficulty of getting the paper regularly and promptly, we beseech those who have difficulty in securing the paper will become direct subscribers or informal gatherings of men and women, expressing opposing points of view. It has been suggested, coming from several sources, that "FREEWOMAN" clubs, or informal gatherings of men and women, should be started for discussions, of which the weekly FREEWOMAN would form the basis. Of this suggestion, coming from several readers, we highly approve, and pass it on to other readers for their consideration.

Editorial address : 9, John Street, Adelphi, London, W.C.
HAVING set forth at some length the reverse side of the story of elementary teaching from the one usually told under our heading, we next proceed to discuss the outlook of what is usually called the secondary teacher. The terms are not always happy ones, since the latter body of teachers quite often would appear to suppose the word "secondary" to apply to some mental or moral condition of a superior kind. An elementary teacher to them is an "elementary person"—a person, one would gather, of a primitive stage of development—while in the mouth of the elementary teacher the "secondary person" is one who comes second in importance, a by-product, in fact. This lack of understanding and attitude of intolerance is productive of untold harm to the cause of education, and to the specific cause of the teacher. The remedy lies in the teachers' own hands. They must resolutely live down this mutual contempt and realise that all education is one—that the distinction between the primary and the secondary schools is simply the difference caused by the different stage of development of the pupils, and that an intimate correlation of studies and a full knowledge of and sympathy with one another's methods would lighten the work of both sections of the profession. Moreover, the secondary teacher stands to lose most by this division. United with the teachers in the primary schools, they might hope to achieve greater educational reforms, and, incidentally, to procure better terms of service for themselves. Education will never be carried on on intelligent lines until there are great meetings of teachers of all grades and positions, earnestly seeking to discover—personal prejudice being entirely put on one side—the best methods of education of the race and the best means of using the teacher to the limit of her capacity, as well by storing as by expending her energies.

Secondary teachers, however, suffer from lack of organisation. The societies and unions that are at their disposal do not touch the interest and command the attention of the people they profess to unite as does the National Union of Teachers, the organ of the elementary teachers. It is true that the N.U.T. has recently invited the formation of a secondary branch, but we do not at present anticipate any great results from this. The secondary teacher of to-day would consider such a membership entirely infra dig., and would lose caste with her own kind by joining the Union.

The secondary teacher, therefore, faces the world alone for all practical purposes. Perhaps it is owing to this that their average rate of salary is even lower than that of the members of the elementary profession. Yet the expense of preparation has been greater, the education wider, and the desires created more difficult to satisfy. The salaries, in fact, are quite incommensurate with the cost of the education necessary.

The woman who becomes a secondary teacher generally drifts into her profession in a somewhat casual way. She is either a graduate, a scholar perhaps, or her parents think it worth their while to spend further money on her, and so she proceeds to the university or college affiliated to the university, or she goes abroad to acquire a language or two. She throws herself with feminine whole-heartedness into her work. She becomes immersed in it, and lives for the present. Then she discovers that she must "be" something. Unpleasant discovery! She had hitherto resolutely refused to think of life as being anything but college. Now, therefore, she crams in work for a teaching diploma at the end of her course, and leaves college with various qualifications. But she has never yet taught in any responsible manner, and therefore does not yet know if she is suited for the profession.

We all remember the story of Gissing's early days, which runs on these lines. People without the talents of a Gissing may spend their college days in an equally unproductive manner from the point of view of obtaining qualifications, and may find that that very youthful ardour which spent itself on the pursuit of knowledge in fields which really allured has been rewarded thus harshly.

The teacher who is most successful, from the professional point of view, in the secondary world (including all branches) is she who at college discovered no preferences except those which ran in the groove of "examination work," and who never allowed the fires of youth to rise higher than the practical, calculating, look-to-the-future sagacity of the student deemed safe.

A good "all-round" student has an assured future compared with that of the erratic young adventurer, who remained the exact opposite of her. She went on realising her own possibilities. This because of the slavish respect paid to mere academic successes by most head teachers and by all Education Committees. The fact that at eighteen—the usual age of entering college—the girl does not know her own bent, and when requested to select her course of studies does not hit upon those which she afterwards finds so engaging, is a difficulty which might be met by greater pliancy in university schemes. Moreover, in no profession, we imagine, is the paying power of the parent more highly regarded. To have struggled for a footing is ever a crime. A prosperous parent paying for a training in a well-known school, and afterwards, with equal ease, for a prolonged university career, is an asset compared with which determination to rise, triumph over the obstacles of a bad start, poverty, and the like can only hide their diminished heads in despair.

Secondary posts may be obtained by women in private schools, in schools run by the Education Committees of County or Borough Councils, or in high schools. The men are preferred in the first, as we have already stated, because the remuneration is low compared with the amount of intellectual attainment required and the length and expensive nature of the training. It is by no means unusual for private schools to advertise for a graduate knowing one or more foreign languages, having a university education and a teaching diploma, and to offer her £80 if non-resident, or £40 to £50 if resident. The fees paid by the pupils may be anything from £50 to £200 per annum. It is unthinkable that any man with these qualifications should have his services rated at so low a value—nor would he endure it, which fact is a lesson to women.

The schools managed by local bodies pay better, though not well, except the secondary schools of the L.C.C., where the salary of an assistant ranges from a minimum of £120 to a maximum of £220—not a vast sum, truly, but one which compares well with most other scales. The average salary of the secondary schools under other Education Committees of Great Britain is about £100 to £110 per annum.

Lastly, the high schools are to be considered. Some are private high schools, and some have been taken over by the local Councils. Others, however,
are the property of limited companies! The idea of an educational institution which is also a profit-making machine for those not engaged in the work is truly an amazing one, nor can one be surprised that the Girls' Public Day School Company, Ltd., is truly an amazing one, nor can one be surprised that teaching is the sole means of livelihood of the cultured woman may be dispelled, and that, there­fore, only those who really have a "vocation" may be considered 

profit comes before any good of pupil or of teacher. The maximum salary for a university woman would appear to be about £120. Most teachers earn considerably less. There is no "scale," no regular increase, and often no increase at all. The grievances of the teachers, either as educationists or as women earning their livings, can only be laid before a body of men, to whom the consideration of profit comes before any good of pupil or of teacher. In these limited company schools, and in the privately owned schools, there is no security of tenure. Personal reasons merely may cut a teacher adrift from a private school, while considerations of cheapness or economy may throw the whole staff of a school, or their profit-making lines into the ranks of the unemployed. From these ranks it is ever increasingly difficult to rise. The paucity in the number of professions open to educated women makes the supply of secondary teachers vastly greater than the demand. It is no unusual thing for two hundred applications to be sent in for a post valued at about £120 per annum! After forty it is increasingly difficult to obtain employment. Capable young women are "out of a post" for months at a time. What, then, of the woman over forty? Even if the post for which she has applied is not already filled before the advertise­ment was published, by someone with "in­fluence," any weary committee will be only too glad to find a reason for eliminating her from among the aspirants to a post for which they have such an overwhelming number of applicants. From this number of applicants arises the searching and innumerable questions to be answered by the can­didates for these posts. No man in any of the other professions would submit to be thus cate­chised. Men and women are paid very unequal salaries, and the men are often doubling that of the women. This is the case, too, in mixed and girls' schools, where, though men and women work side by side and fulfil exactly the same duties, the salaries are never equivalent. These schools also are dangerous to women professionally, since there is almost always (we believe there are one or two exceptions) a man as the head teacher, and thus the chance of women's obtaining headships is considerably lessened, and with it the one hope of obtaining a really respect­able salary of, say, £250 to £600. Thus the Council secondary schools are seen to pay salaries which per week instead of their customary salaries.

Under the Insurance Bill she will, moreover, be worse off as regards absence for illness, for most employing bodies pay their teachers for any reasonable period during which they may be away for ill­health; but the vast majority of this body of women will come under the administration of the Act, and will probably, unless their employers are extraordi­narily generous, in future receive as sick pay 7s. 6d. per week instead of their customary salaries. It is more than improbable, moreover, that they will wish to avail themselves of the Act, for they will probably, unless their employers are extraordi­narily generous, in future receive as sick pay 7s. 6d. per week instead of their customary salaries.

And what is to be done for all these grievances, for we do not wish to end our criticism? We would say to all teachers, elemen­tary and secondary, Organise! organise! See to it that you yourselves, who know what is necessary, lay down precepts for directing the energies of the teaching into an independent profession, control­ling the methods of admission, regulating the supply and demand of teachers, deciding on and working for suitable hours, schemes of work, salaries, and pensions. Do away with all distinc­tions of "primary" and "secondary." Treat edu­cation, in short, as a whole. Further, we advise women of education to agitate for the throwing open of all professions to women, so that the idea that teaching is the sole means of livelihood of the cultured woman may be dispelled, and that, there­fore, only those who really have a "vocation" may become teachers. Lastly, let women take courage and show confidence in themselves, and let them demand, among other things, a good and reason­able wage, and one equal with the man's for the same work. Let them remember that "the labourer is worthy of his hire."
Sex and Civilisation.

In all recent discussion about artificial limitation of the family the radical problem of all sex questions has never been directly discussed—I mean the sexual difference between savage men and wild animals on the one hand and the one-handed and civilised men and domestic animals on the other. In the one case we are dealing with creatures whose supply of food is as scanty and precarious as their own existence from day to day, and in the other with creatures whose staple means of existence and nutrition are regular and, up to a certain minimum, even guaranteed, by the State or the owner of the animal. In the one case sexual activity is naturally much less pronounced and merely seasonal; in the other case it becomes a chronic activity, and creates quite a different type of character and organism. What, then, is the ordinary active and well-nourished under examination to be? There are, of course, many different types, and among less vital human beings there is often an atrophy of sex, sometimes congenital, sometimes perhaps the result of unnatural abstinence. There is also a distinctively neurotic type of person, who suffers a kind of nervous disorder as the result of long indulgence, and this collapse often finds theological expression. The normal healthy human being, however, living under civilised conditions, may possibly abstain for certain definite purposes—e.g., for athletic contests, or a particularly strenuous run of brainwork—but such abstinence is probably not beneficial as a normal practice, although it need not in most cases be really injurious. The limitation of the family by abstinence is clearly equivalent to complete abstinence, for all practical purposes, and should therefore only be advocated by those who maintain the ideal of complete abstinence.

Mr. Havelock Ellis, in his last volume of the Sex Series, has exhaustively balanced the medical evidence on the question without being able to arrive at any very definite medical result. The phenomena under examination are, of course, too subtle for medical analysis, but in some cases abstinence certainly seems to promote perversion. On the other hand, the sociological results are plain enough to any student of ecclesiastical history. Nearly every system of compulsory celibacy imposed on any body of men and women—regardless of any individual vocation—produces sexual irregularities on an enormous scale, to say nothing of numerous perversions. In mediaeval Europe, when the duty of complete abstinence was enjoined by the Church, and not even disputed or questioned by laity or clergy, we find the priest requested in certain parishes to keep a concubine. In almost every state, ancient or modern, prostitution has avowedly been permitted or encouraged, in order to keep up the admittedly artificial condition of chastity demanded by Christian morals.

The origin of the whole problem is not, however, entirely Christian; it is rooted in the traditions of barbaric society. In the majority of barbaric societies sexual activity is regarded as a dangerous indulgence which impairs other activities. It appears to the observant much as indulgence in drink or drugs appears to the civilised man, except that it has a mystic sanction because the community has to go on somehow by this means. Hence we have a number of minute and fanciful regulations in regard to sex, not unlike those of the Early Fathers, described by Gibbon as "whimsical," and "forcing a smile from the young and a blush from the fair." The barbaric tradition on this important question certainly does not influence the practice of normal men and women. If they do
not limit their families artificially, they merely have huge families, which are often destructive to the health of the wife, the finances of the husband, and the prosperity of the children. But the tradition is not usually challenged in theory, because it has a certain religious or Christian sanction behind it, and because it also has a certain amount of common sense behind it. The difficulty almost exactly resembles the question of drinking wine, beer, and spirits. Here, again, the normal healthy human being is clearly no worse, and probably all the better, for a moderate consumption of (say) wine or beer, although a number of persons who openly or secretly drink wine, beer, and spirits, spend their lives trying to impose restrictions on the consumption of it by others. On the other hand, we all feel that the consumption need not be stimulated by any vehement exhortation.

It cannot be doubted that immediately any man is off his guard, either as to the amount of alcohol he takes, or, to take another example, the amount of money he spends, he is cycling down a steep hill with no brakes on. He cannot safely relax vigilance, although he may strongly resent and regret the compulsion to abstinence, especially if it is imposed by persons who can only judge others by themselves.

The exact limits to be observed in all these matters by the individual cannot be regulated by rule of thumb, and certainly not by the State. Theoretically speaking, the problem cannot be solved except by each individual for himself or herself. The practical result, however, is that ordinary human adults are not going to practise an unnatural life, especially when married, and the only alternative to the artificial limitation of the family is the irresponsible propagation of large families which cannot, in the poorer ranks of life, be properly reared by the parents, and which, even in the richer ranks of life, transform the wife into nothing but a child-bearing machine, even if her physical health is not damaged. Freedom and toleration are the first conditions of any useful discussion. The attacks on Dr. Drysdale originate either in mental confusion or else in the anxiety of an anaemic, teetotal, nut-eating type of human being to "damning" (what he calls) "sins he has no mind to."

No one wants to compel these people to give up their nuts, or unfermented drinks, or odd habits. All that the rest of us want is to be left alone. We may live to see ourselves degraded by such restrictions on drink as exist in half-civilised places like the United States and Australasia, but if we submit to this we shall only have ourselves to thank when a State inspector calls on married couples at regular intervals.

E. S. P. HAYNES.

Three Plays by BRIEUX

With a Preface of 45 Pages by BERNARD SHAW and an Autographed Photogravure Portrait of BRIEUX.

The Volume contains: MATERNIY, THE THREE DAUGHTERS OF M. DUPONT, DAMAGED GOODS, and a new version of MATERIY.

8vo. net. Inland postage 4d.

Mr. P. A. SCOTT JAMES (in the Daily News) says: "To shirk Briieux is to shirk vitally important facts in modern life."

Mr. W. L. COURTNEY (in the Daily Telegraph) says: "They are certainly not meat for babies, but then there is no reason why they should be."

The English Review says: "Every young man should be made to read 'Damaged Goods,' and every mother 'Maternity.'"

London: A. C. KIFIELD, 13, Clifford's Inn, E.C.

Labour Notes.

AN ANNUS MIRABILIS.

WERE not the mood of the public one of keenest apprehension as regards the desperate course which seems to be shaped for the labour world in 1912, a retrospect over the annus mirabilis we have just passed through would stand out much more saliently as highly suggestive matter for speculation. One chapter of that miraculous year does stand out, and a summary of the results would appear much more profitable than any forecast. That is, of course, the extraordinary growth of industrial unrest among women.

It is a remarkable fact, for instance, that by its next annual meeting the National Federation of Women Workers will have practically doubled its membership. Starting with an enrolment of about 9,000 organised working women at the beginning of the last year, Cradley Heath, Nottingham, Bermondsey, and a dozen or so smaller battles in this sweating workers' rising have brought in well over 6,000 new recruits within the year, while the skirmishes that are going on at this very moment in the Vale of Leven, a dozen, among the women tailors of the East-End of London, to mention one or two at random, are filling the ranks of organised women's labour with the strength of a rising tide. But it is not the celerity with which this organisation is going on that is remarkable; it is the results in actual wages and bettered conditions which bring its justification and its index of actual progress. And I think it may be safely said that never in recent years did working women win fruits of agitation so secure and so substantial as during 1911. For the tens of thousands of women who struck or were locked out all over these islands, I find there was an average increase in wages of between 30 and 40 per cent. Many, of course, returned with empty hands and empty hearts, many others with concessions on paper which they and their friends know perfectly well cannot be enforced. But the course of events was so thick with increases of 50 and even 75 per cent. that a general average, reckoned only from those rises which are permanent and practically guaranteed, swings about midway between 30 and 40 per cent. cash increase. And to those who know anything of current working conditions among women in Great Britain, this subsidy, while not exactly the purchase price of a heaven on earth, lifts thousands of women, at any rate, out of the sordid depths of unrelied hell.

Still, this is only the light side of the picture. The real encouragement of the year comes not nearly so much from the net results gained, as all these fine increases of wages are swallowed up and overwhelmed among the great mass of workers whose conditions are stagnant or even retrograding. It is the new spirit that is valuable, the veritable epidemic of revolt which sent its impulse into trades and localities where there had never been the threat of a strike before. The general condition of the women workers stands just as vividly in need of reform as before, but the women have come a great deal nearer to taking the matter into their own hands. The economic value of this will never be realised by people who do not know how hard it is to rebel on 9s. a week. Let me offer in illustration the detailed budget of a factory girl who manages to be independent on exactly this sum; and let it be borne in mind what time or vitality she has left to reflect on her lot in life or to muse on the economic disparity between what she and her mates...
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earn and what they get. Here is the list of her expenditures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Rent of Unfurnished Room</em></td>
<td>3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soap, Soda, Blue (for washing clothes, etc., on</td>
<td>0 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday afternoon)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>0 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light</td>
<td>0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>0 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes (two clubs at 6d. each)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boots (one club at 6d.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Death Benefit Insurance</em></td>
<td>0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Total</em></td>
<td>9 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This leaves 3s. 3d. for food, which she spends in this way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bread (six loaves)</td>
<td>1 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea (1 lb)</td>
<td>0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar (1 lb.)</td>
<td>0 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Tin Cheapest Milk</td>
<td>0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dripping</td>
<td>0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacon (for Sunday dinner)</td>
<td>0 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Dinners (bread and cheese, 1/2d.; fish and</td>
<td>0 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potatoes, 1/2d.; German sausage and bread, 1/2d.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relish for Sunday Tea</td>
<td>0 1 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Total</em></td>
<td>3 3 5 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BARRICADED from the fastidious craftsman behind the solid Tottenham-Court-Road workmanship of her mental furniture, Mrs. Humphry Ward has been able to preach her gospel unappreciated by revolutionaries. This is a pity. Because Mrs. Ward reveals to us the psychology of the clergyman-class, Ormonde says which throughout the Victoria era peopled the Church and the Universities to the exclusion of any other. With the single exception of the scientist group, they have sent no message of inspiration to this generation. Yet the excellent economic position which they enjoyed which enabled them to monopolise the Higher Education, made it inevitable that they should leave their mark on England. To take only one instance of their activities, they were responsible for the beginnings of modern journalism—God forgive them! But, on the whole, they mean very little to us—Matthew Arnold, Kingsley, Coventry Patmore, Anthony Trollope. But it helps us to understand the House of Commons if we can grasp their point of view: and that is most lucidly and naively shown in the works of Mrs. Humphry Ward.

Even her deficiencies are of value to the student. For instance, at first sight it seems merely a very damning proof of the worthlessness of Mrs. Ward's writing that she should have written her two most pretentious works—"Robert Elsmere" and "The Case of Richard Meynell"—about a national movement which could not exist, but a movement which she describes as sweeping over the country and turning the hearts of Englishmen to flame. This Modernist Movement, which aimed at regulating the Church of England's doctrine and ritual according to the conclusions of historical research upon the life of Christ, is alien from, not only the Englishman, but from the human mind. Jesus of Nazareth sits in a chamber of every man's brain, immovable, immutable, however credited or discredited. The idea of Christ is the only inheritance that the rich have not stolen from the poor. It is now a great national interest (not a faith), and as such is treated with respect, and as securely protected from "modernising" as the tragedy of "Hamlet." And although Mrs. Ward has been "turning her trained intellect" (to quote her publisher) on the universe for nigh on sixty years, that has not struck her. She regards the Englishman as going to church with the same watchful eye of possible improvements as when he attends the sanitary committee of the borough council. She does not understand
that the Englishman, having discovered something that, whether true or not, is glorious to the human soul, is not going to tamper with it. This misunderstanding is so typical of her class. For, see how in the House of Commons the respectable always прибями the acting mean thrift, to rob the poor of their imprudence, which uncomfortable as it is in its results, is nevertheless their one means of protest against their conditions.

A defect which Mrs. Ward shares not only with her own class, but with the modern world, is her lack of Honour. Honour, in the time of Elizabeth, was, happily, an ideal and not a reality. Mrs. Ward, in her jolly sort of code, such as holds good between skippers on the high seas, a fine, cheerful recognition of mutual responsibilities. It bound together those bands of pioneers as they trampled down dangers on the virgin shores of the New World in loneliness and thirst. It made literature beautiful with discussion of the debts of the soul. The difference between our outlook and theirs is very well illustrated by Thomas Middleton's imperial tragedy, "The Changeling." Beatrice, a noble lady, is betrothed to a man she hates. She hires de Flores, a poor gentleman, to kill this man. That service done, de Flores demands that she should become his mistress. On her refusal, he holds the secret of their conspiracy over her head. Now, what struck the Elizabethan about this ghostly story was not the blood-guilt of Beatrice, nor the brutal lustfulness of de Flores, but the treachery of de Flores in blackmailing the lady, and the nice point as to exactly how far Beatrice had contracted these base obligations. We have travelled far from that now. For the Englishman became spoilt by too much prosperity, and began to worry about his soul, and, as a Puritan, reverted to savagery. For he knew his base natural temperament to be his moral conduct according to Honour, but according to his various tabus. So Honour left us, to shine only in broken reflections from the work of our great artists.

Mrs. Ward is not one of these. For an example of her complete lack of this sense, let us turn to "Daphne." There you see, set down without disgust, the wooing of an underbred American heiress, Daphne, by an able-bodied young Englishman, Roger Barnes, who is frankly in love with her money. Mrs. Ward seems to think it quite a wholesome arrangement, even setting down in cold fact that he "enlarged his wit and his savagery." They live an uneventful and, one might say, animal life in England for some years, and then Daphne gets bored with Roger. She moves over to America, and divorces him according to the kindly laws of that country, taking custody of their only child. With a fine sense of what is fitting, the child dies. Hence the father takes to drink, and lives with a shopgirl. Had he been a workman who had lost his job, how disguised and contemptuous Mrs. Ward would have been! So, overcome by remorse, Daphne returns to England and offers to live with him again. Then comes the one gleam of horse-sense discernible in Mrs. Ward's books. Roger prefers to die without the companionship of a woman he dislikes. Mrs. Ward does not see it like that, however. It seems to her the most tragic note of all.

But what lesson does Mrs. Ward learn from this rather trivial story? The chief lesson would be, one would think, that it is a bad thing that a man should eat if he does not work; and that it is a very vile thing that a man should earn his living by entering into a sexual relationship. But actually the only thing it suggests to Mrs. Ward's trained intellect is that divorce is too easily granted. Unmoved and undismayed, she suggests that the rich woman and her parasite should have continued to live together until death corrupted their mean bodies. And why? Mrs. Ward never answers that question. She never hears it, because she does not consider that personal relationships need the sanction of Honour. To her, all things try to the name of the tabu seem beautiful.

It may strike one in reading "Daphne" that it shows a strange habit of mind to consider whiskey and shopgirls as the only alternative to a happy married life. But Mrs. Ward has a poor opinion of men, and of worse one of women, whom, with Zarahustra, she considers "still cats and birds: or, at the best, cows." Of course, Mrs. Ward is largely in agreement with Nietzsche—not only in this, but in her firm belief in the Superman, whom she considers to be realised in the aristocratic classes of this country, her contempt for democratic art, and her valuable prejudice against Socialism. But Nietzsche's Superman is to have quite a good time, exulting in his eternal Bank Holiday, with the wide world for Hampstead Heath. But Mrs. Ward's characters, judging from her ideal figure, Catherine Leyburn, would at their highest fail to enjoy the spiritual exhilaration of a meeting of the Poor Law Guardians.

Catherine Leyburn is revealed to us in her youth and in her late middle-age in the pages of "Robert Elsmere" and "The Case of Richard Meynell." The distinguishing characteristic which differentiates her from, for instance, Isabel, in "The New Machiavelli," is her physical abandonment. On every page her face works with emotion and is illuminated by a burning flush; once she has slowly succumbed to the turged wooing of Robert Elsmere, she matches him with tears and kisses. A spiritual upheaval is a picnic to her; whenever she approaches a death-bed, one has an uneasy suspicion that she is glad to "be in at the death." After many years of widowhood, whiled away by the perusal of the lives of bishops, she dies as easily as she has lived. What a life! Never once had she earned the bread she ate. She had spent her life in thinking beautiful thoughts, in being a benign and beautiful influence... Never will Woman be saved until she realises that it is a far, far better thing to keep a jolly public-house really well than to produce a cathedral-full of beautiful thoughts. "Here they talk of nothing else than love—its beauty, its holiness, its spiritualty, its Devil knows what!... They think they have achieved the perfection of love because they have no bodies!—shame imaginative debauchery!" It was of Hell that that was said. When people plead that "Woman should stand aside from the ugly mêlée" of things as they are, and "hold high the banner of the Ideal," which is the usual way of alluding to Catherine's life of loaferdom, they are instructing her in her damnation.

Mrs. Ward's novel is an easy one. If she was Mrs. Mary A. Ward, of Port Matilda, Pa., U.S.A., it would be expressed something like this—!

GIRLS! MAKE LIFE A JOY-RIDE!

BUT DON'T TALK BACK TO THE POLICE!

This easy gospel will give its disciples the heritage one may see in the faces of so many "sheltered women"—the disdainful brow, that has never known the sweat of labor; the lazy look, that has never shown a want of discipline; eyes that blink because they have never seen anything worth looking at; the fat body of the unexercised waster. And within, the petulance of those who practise Idealism on the easiest methods; a pastime that develops the conceit of the artist, with none of the wisdom and chastening of art.

REBECCA WEST.
Correspondence.

CONCERNING "THE DRUDGE."

To the Editors of THE FREEWOMAN.

Your article on "The Drudge" is of great interest, and contains suggestions of much value; but I wish to dissent from your general conclusion that the modern household management is a burden to the modern woman. The woman of to-day must share the earnings of the man and she must give way entirely to the "professional mother."

In the first place, you are inconsistent in appportioning the relative values of the home mother and the "professional mother." The former is worth nothing, though single-handedly she gives more help of a permanent kind than the efficient nurse, she brings up a family of two, or a dozen, citizens; the latter you would give a minimum of £200 a year for caring for ten infants, with the help of half a dozen grown probationer assistants. (Who, by the way, is to pay or maintain these assistants in their training?) In the latter case I think you are no more than fair. It is a truism among mothers and nurses that "one baby is one person's work." But perhaps a course of psychology and ancient history will alter all that.

In the second place, while your scheme reads most attractively as a fact and is appreciably on putting to a personal and practical test. Any mother or nurse will tell you that a child in its first years must sleep and be pushed and be pram during most of the hours (say, from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.) and must be fed and be otherwise looked after. And the work which is being done during the month is, must give up child-delights to another person (if I could help it). I cannot see where it is that, and millions like me, "come in" in your scheme. In fact, we do wish to deprecate home life until all women are forced to take up outside occupations, and no mother can care for her own children unless she fosters half a dozen others in a miniature "institution." (Shades of the Anti-Socialists who have tried to make my blood run cold with similar pictures, and have been met—hitherto—with my amused smile!)

Next, I want to point out (my history is shabby, but I do not fear much correction) that in the days when necessities were produced at home, the "necessities" of the mass of the population were practically nil compared with those of the rich and aristocratic. There was the domestic-class. The wives of the wealthy and the farmers carried on the interesting occupations you describe (or a selection of them) with the aid of a small army of hired female hands. The mass of the people satisfied primitive cottages wants much as our own poor do now, with the addition, perhaps, of a spinning wheel and a baking-oven. Again, you call the women of those days "producers," and of these, "non-producers." How many men are nowadays, in a civilised country, "producers" in the real sense of the word? And what is the first "product" necessary to a "non-producer.?" And what is the first "product" necessary to a nation, if not healthy children? The bearing of children is no doubt instinctive and mechanical in itself, but it entails much self-sacrifice (even though more or less compulsory), and if we are to progress from the animal it must entail more and more preparation and pre-natal training of mind and body. In fact, maternity always has and always will be a heavy burden on womanhood, because what we give up in quantity must be made up in quality, and child-bearing must lose its present casualness. In looking at the problem of the mothers' independence "from all sides," how is it that you ignore State endowment? Only because, I suppose, you have to remember the attitude that the bearing and rearing of children is not worth "independence." From your point of view, I suppose State maintenance would be charity. For the working poor and working practically. We need a number of things before a woman's economic independence, in my opinion, becomes possible. Economies are coming. Efficiency in training for mothers, with State endowment; efficient training for other workers, and an open field; a half-time system for working mothers; your crèche system; and, if still necessary—the legal right of a mother to a proportion of the father's earnings. It is not fair to call this last "employment of the wife by the husband." You forget that the man is paid on the supposition that he has a wife and children to share his wages, and that the work of the wife and mother in the home sets free the faculties and energies of the husband (and children later on) for what is called the "higher work." I contend that if she fulfils her nature by creating a minimum standard of health and happiness, she is entitled to economic independence as a return. Leave the "home" to peaceably withdraw from a thousand activities and giving communal amusements for the family; and leave your crèche to be run by the childless woman who loves children, for the benefit of the motherless or unwilling mother.

HOME-WORKER.

The following comments may elucidate a number of points upon which our correspondent holds opinions differing from ours:

1. The "professional mother" must be an efficiently trained person educated for her profession. She is a public servant, willing to sell her services to people who are willing to pay. The "domestic" mother need have no further qualification than that of being a female. Many have little more; some very few may be the compères of the professional mother; but if these last are unwilling to take up duties for which there is remuneration offered, naturally they cannot expect a salary.

2. It appears that our correspondent does not realise that the association with qualifications of a certain level have to be maintained by their parents or guardians while they are in "training," usually to the age of twenty-one or over, in order to retain this feature of this scheme will enable our correspondent to understand the difference between the haphazard entrance into marriage and domesticity, is a serious one. The careful training necessary for entering one of the skilled professions.

3. Regarding the statement as to "double work," we understand that all things have their compensations. If not, this statement suggests a picture of the very long sufferings of the father.

4. We fail to understand the restricted mother-love which has no tendency to flow over in love for all children. We believe, and hope, that with a more strongly developed civic consciousness this restricted love will wholly disappear.

5. The vast army of workers-to-day are mainly producers. There is, of course, a class of idle rich who produce nothing.

6. We do not believe State endowment of motherhood a workable proposition. A State insurance, contributory or otherwise, would meet the needs of the situation.

7. We have heard it said that a man is paid fancy wages, on the supposition that he is, or may be, a father. We do not believe in its truth, however, and we detest the idea that a man is paid a very extraordinary amount of wages, on the supposition that his earnings are really not good for the mothers. Ladies who can eat as much as they need, and lie on sofas whenever they feel tired, can manage very well without nursing their children. We believe, in fact, that a man would be much less cordially, as its acceptance tends to the permanent depression of women's wages.

8. We believe that the domestic mother may be felt to regard her economic independence is not the point. It is sufficient for the argument to state that she is unable to get along.

It will be very obvious to our correspondent that a separate article might be written on each one of the above points.—E.D.]
life by 85 per cent. Nor, when money is so badly needed for something else, does it seem worth while to spend it in enabling infants to be fed or the cow's milk when it is healthier for them to be fed by their mothers. I suggest, therefore, that instead of weaning them when they are two or three months old, we welcome them as long as they prefer to nurse. This has been already tried in Paris and Vienna, and insist that businesses which employ women should provide a crèche where the children could be taken care of during working hours, and where the mothers could visit them at proper intervals. The work of washing and preparing bottles for even a couple of babies seems endless, but one woman could look after a good number, and would be responsible for the health of the babies. Also, if the crèches were placed under suitable regulations and properly inspected, they could be made fit places for infants to be raised. The work of infant care more than can be done with most poor people's homes.

All the same, in the long run, I do not think that any institution should do more than supplement the work of the mother. The editors seem to have overlooked the fact that women are fond of their children, and find intense pleasure in personal contact with them. The great experience of motherhood does not end when the baby is born.

If the mother's work must be lightened, as it must, let it be the cooking, and washing, and housework that are taken off her hands. These are mechanical tasks, on a level with factory work, and best performed by organisations that can properly inspect them. Poor mothers have not time and strength to enjoy their children, the community is working them too hard, and getting more out of them than it has any right to get.

The remedy for this lies in shorter hours and less work, not in taking the children away from the mother, who finds a pleasure in their company, which certainly will not be found by anyone else.

[We agree with our correspondent almost entirely, especially in regard to shorter hours of work, not only for mothers, but for everyone. But as the work of the pioneer working mothers is to force their way, not along a path specially prepared for them, but through existent conditions which are directly opposed to them and their ideal, mothers must have to be content to do what can be done to meet present needs. In the future, doubtless, a State insurance for motherhood, and crèches attached to workshops, will be the lot of the working mother much easier than it is to-day.—Ed.]

TWO PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS.

To the Editors of THE FREEWOMAN.

May I beg a little of your space to speak of two matters which have some interest to your readers? One is brought to my mind by the articles in your paper on "Biscuits." Is it possible for you, and for us who are your readers, to do anything towards securing a list of trading firms which pay respectable wages and treat their employees in a decent manner? I am convinced that many of the girls who go into such firms have to be content with what they can get, and deal with them. If such a list could not be obtained, perhaps a list could be compiled of those firms which are notorious in this respect. It is a work which I think we can and ought to do.

I write this in answer to a letter by E. M. Watson in this week's FREEWOMAN, which says, "All that is asked is the freedom of the sexes demands the sacrifice of these men in the instance of the women. Is the cure for all their troubles not the practice of sterilisation, but the subjection of their sexual inclinations, which will lead to their true freedom?"

Marriage is the great school of continence, and continence alone produces the highest joy.

The writer of the letter suggests that the neo-Malthusian can choose the time and regulate the quantity and quality of offspring is a delusion. The children of Malthusians are accidents. The children of Freewomen have always been welcome to the "love children," and like Walt Whitman, "well begotten and the son of a perfect mother." I would like to know how many Freewomen are content to sterilise their sex on account of the disease of their husbands? The cleanliness of the sexes demands the sacrifice of these men in the place of the millions of women already said.

It is noteworthy how anxious men are to safeguard their incontinence in the coming age of the Freewomen. They are expecting trouble, as your columns show, and by paying less to them Freewomen will be leaving the frying-pan for the fire.

The way to joy in love and marriage is for Freewomen to educate their husbands to be as least as free and content as tom-cats.

It is a mistake for Coralee M. Boord to suggest that a man can be neither happy apart from the happiness of his wife.—Yours,

THE WIFE OF THE MAN MARRIED AND HAPPY.

®  ®  ®

UTILITY TO WHAT END?

To the Editors of THE FREEWOMAN.

"Your own generation," says A. B. Criticises my letter in January 25th issue, and says, "All our arguments (the italics are mine) require exercise, even when not employed on purely utilitarian purposes." I am afraid we differ hopelessly, but I wish to ask the meaning of the word "utility.

Nowhere in Nature do we find an instinct implanted, or a law without a reason or purely utilitarian purpose, and
we can never go against those laws with impunity. The instinct implanted was for the purposes of reproduction. Man has sought to use this instinct for pleasure and to avoid reproduction, and he functions and exercises his instinct unnaturally, and so goes against Nature. This is largely due to his artificial and unnatural way of living. Nature has planted a living seed in man, and he must bear the effects.

To the Editors of THE FREEWOMAN.

Mr. David Graham Phillips was born at Madison, Indiana, in 1869, and graduated from Princeton University in 1887, when he began his career as an author. He is widely recognised, both in the United States, in England, and in English colonies as a novelist of power, of breadth of purpose, and of striking individuality. Mr. Phillips was undoubtedly the most characteristic writer of American fiction of the day, and took his work very seriously. He was a man who caused his death. He wrote his books between 10 and 4 on the hours of the day, except when he was engaged in night editorial work. Mr. Phillips was a rapid worker, and sometimes accomplished as much as 1,400 words of the first draft of a novel in an evening.
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Population and the Food Supply.

The discussion upon the birth-rate question, after touching upon a large number of questions relating to marriage, prostitution, and hygiene, shows signs of concentrating upon the basic principle of Malthus itself—that uncontrolled population, if not checked by war or disease, must always lead, in a comparatively short time, to insufficiency of food, and that in most civilized countries the over-production of life results in a continual shortage of subsistence. I had hoped to have spared your readers and myself the demonstration of this, the most supremely important principle in the whole of sociology, and to have contented myself with pointing out the obvious advantages to women of moderate families; but, as half the correspondence in your last number is devoted to this subject, I suppose that your readers desire the matter to be thoroughly threshed out; we can never go against those laws with impunity. The great problem was how to avoid the natural consequences. But I loved Nature, and studied her, and she taught me quite differently.

February 7th, 1912.

P. SHERWEN.
before renewed pregnancy. This is most certainly not harmful.

Mrs. Boord is concerned lest the possibility of limitation should lead women to desire no children whatever. Well! this has not happened. The bulk of the middle classes have limited their children to two or three, and could just as well have avoided having any at all. But what limitation is going to mean eventually is not the break-up of the family, but the co-operative home, in which the woman who has few children shall live, and Mr. Rowntree will be able to obtain effective care of her children by competent motherly women when she needs to be free. I freely admit that the present transition state is in many ways most unsatisfactory for cultured women, in that it is more satisfying to be a fully occupied hausfrau than to be half emancipated and to spread one's wings for a flight, only to be dragged back by the chains of maternal responsibility, which are quite as strong, or stronger, for a single child as for a dozen. Emancipation from excessive maternity opens the door to feminine specialisation, and when homes are arranged on the large scale, with due provision for individual privacy, women will be able to give their best to themselves, their husbands, and their children, while securing adequate care for the latter. At the same time, the undoubtedly advantages of large families as regards the children would be secured with small families in the co-operative home, and a social rather than a purely family spirit would be cultivated. If Mr. Esson and others, who wonder whether restriction will bring about moral decadence, would only realise its possibilities and spend their talents devising improvements in social life to meet it, I fancy their fears would rapidly change to enthusiasm.

Now for the law of Malthus itself, and my contention that the food supply is and must be insufficient for an uncontrolled population. Mr. A. D. Lewis fails to see any law of population, and considers that poverty causes large families. Both he and Mr. Hunt state that much greater quantities of food could be produced by scientific improvements, and the latter adheres to his theme that, if the land were freed, food could easily outstrip population. "H. B." asks me how a destruction of food can be expected if the land is a real going concern, and Mr. Esson puts his trust in Herbert Spencer's "individuation and genesis doctrine." All these points, and many others, I am quite prepared to answer, but in doing so I must protest against two of your correspondents' remarks. Mr. Lewis objects to the care with which I have stated the population doctrine, and Mr. Hunt accuses me, as editor of The Freewoman, of revelling in logic and delighting in the doom of the little ones. It should be unnecessary to repel the last charge after my expression of sympathy with all humanitarian reforms which do not conflict with parental responsibility, and as to the charge of cold logic and scientific precision, I hope that readers of The Freewoman will appreciate that so momentous a conclusion as the population doctrine should only be come to with the utmost care and certainty. It is precisely the absence of scientific methods of investigation and reasoning which have led to the current notions surrounding this subject, and at the risk of being tedious I propose to prove my case by the most rigorous methods known to science.

How do we prove any natural law or generalisation? In a few cases by simple observation. But practically all the great laws, such as the law of gravitation, cannot be proved in this way. Until the time of Cavendish there was no experimental verification it utterly fails. In fact, it may be given as an almost invariable rule that poverty and famine are more severe, the more highly and completely cultivated a country is. There are no such horrible famines in the world as in China and India, where cultivation is carried on to the extent of encroaching on the roads, of terracing the mountain slopes, and of working in the swamps.* Belgium, whose agricultural output has called forth the admiration of Prince Kropotkine, is probably the poorest country of Western Europe, and Mr. Rowntree has told us that it was necessary for him to go a stage lower in his scale of poverty when dealing with it. The only case of prosperity, combined with good distribution of land and cultivation, is France, where the birth-rate is low. Next let us apply the same method to the question of population. Observation, poverty, famine, and other evils in all countries at practically all times, and with great differences of laws and customs; also that in times of plenty population increases more than the food; Induction, that population naturally tends to increase faster than the supply of food can be increased, and that there must always be starvation, war, disease, or other cause of premature death, unless some means are taken to

* Those interested may be recommended to read a most striking article by Prof. E. A. Ross on "The Struggle for Existence in China," in the Century Magazine for August last.
limit births. This is the fundamental law of Malthus, which he further developed by stating that unchecked population would increase in a geometrical progression, doubling in every twenty-five years or less.

Before coming to the deductions, the latter statement is capable of direct verification by itself. Not only have we the fact that the population of the United States in the early part of last century, apart from emigration, doubled in twenty-five years, but the vital statistics of various countries now available give us an unmistakable proof. In Russia a birth-rate of close on 50 per 1,000, has been maintained for the three years past, and this is evidently less than it might be if there were absolutely no checks to marriage and production of children. The same figure appears to be obtained in India. On the other hand, in New Zealand a death-rate of only 10 per 1,000 has been maintained for a long period but there is no reason to suppose that there will be any increase. Moreover Mr. Hunt is obviously wrong in stating that the death-rate is not more than 10 per 1,000.

For every 1,000 persons in such a community, there would therefore be 50 births, and 10 deaths from natural old age, leaving an increase of 40, or 4 per cent., in the year. This does not appear very much, but a sum of money put out at 4 per cent. compound interest would double in seventeen and a half years, or increases fifty-fold in a single century. Take our own country, say, England and Wales, which started last century with a population of nearly 9,000,000. This would have meant a doubling to 18,000,000 in 1818, to 36,000,000 in 1835, more than 72,000,000 in 1853, to 144,000,000 in 1870, to 288,000,000 in 1889, and to 576,000,000 in 1905. There is absolutely no escape from this conclusion. Unless opponents of the population doctrine can show a day when the birth-rate could actually be below 50 per 1,000 without any restraint on marriage or births,* or why the death-rate in a perfectly healthy community should rise above 10 per 1,000, the conclusion as to the rate of increase is a mathematical certainty which no one can dispute. Mr. Hunt and those who believe that improved agriculture and land distribution will do away with the necessity for restraint of births have got to show us that they can get a fifty-fold increase of food in a single century, or that they will be able to support an increase of the present population from 35,000,000 to 175,000,000 (more than the present population of the globe) in a hundred years from now. And in the next century! I have been engaged for fourteen years in training thousands of youths in the most progressive of all industries, that of electrical engineering, and I find myself alive to the wonderful possibilities of electrical production of nitrates and stimulation of crops, of radio-active substances, and the utilisation of solar energy; but they do not in the least alter the above-mentioned course. The same figure appears to be obtained in India. On the other hand, in New Zealand a death-rate of only 10 per 1,000 has been maintained for the three years past, and this is evidently less than it might be if there were absolutely no checks to marriage and production of children.

King's College for Women. A

S the recent holder of the Gilchrist Post-Graduate Scholarship, in the course of Home Science and Economics at King's College for Women, I have frequently felt during the last few weeks that it was my duty publicly to state my entire agreement with the contributor, "Educationalist," in her remarkably able criticism of the above-mentioned course.

The fact that the scheme received provisional recognition by the University of London a few days ago, and the announcement that the £100,000 required for the scheme had been contributed, made it clear to me that the College scheme had now every opportunity to establish itself upon existing lines, and that no second criticism could compel its promoters to submit it to revision.

In the interests of the integrity of science teaching, and with a firm belief in the necessity for the development of household crafts by trained intellects, I feel that no effort should be spared to check the easy acceptance of the present scheme, and to delay it until something more sound and better thought out is prepared in its place.

It was under such convictions that I gladly accepted the Editors' invitation to write upon the subject in The Freewoman, made upon my resignation of the scholarship owing to increasing hostility to the aims and methods of those responsible for the scheme, and the conviction that nothing but a complete revolution in the course could make it what the promoters, in the latest circular, claim it to be, namely:—"Education in Science and Economics of a University Standard," "adapted to the needs of women wishing to prepare themselves for the efficient management of their own homes," "fitting for teaching on the lines of the Course and for other spheres, both professional and voluntary," "preparation for openings connected with the interests of Public Health," and "a training for Social Workers."

The general objections to the course have been so ably dealt with by your contributor, "Educationalist," in your issues of November 23rd and December 14th, 1911, that it is unnecessary for me to restate them. As "Educationalist" well says, the subjects dealt with will be built upon a University standard of treatment. This becomes clear when one notes that for a degree in science at the London or any other University four subjects are taken up to the intermediate standard, and three of these to a final standard. In the same period of time, three years, a student at King's College for Women studies biology, chemistry, physics, hygiene, physiology, household work (cooking, laundry work,
and housewifery, economics, including a short course in book-keeping and business affairs, and may take as an optional subject one of the three following:—Psychology with practical psychology, psychology with ethics, or bacteriology.

I can illustrate my contention that the King's College course in home science and economics is worthless from an educational point of view in each of its details, and consequently worthless in its sum total, by examining their treatment of the subject in which I specialised at the Manchester University, i.e., chemistry. A bright student at King's might, by the end of the first year, have reached the intermediate standard of the University in this subject. This covers but the rudiments of general chemistry. Straightway, in the second year, the student takes, along with simple organic chemistry, so-called "applied chemistry," to be plunged into more "applied chemistry" in the third year. To what does this "applied chemistry" refer? It relates to such diverse and difficult matters as "the chemical changes caused by organised and unorganised ferment applied to the preparation, preservation, and deterioration of foods and to digestion," "the constituents of foods, adulterants and preservatives; the chemistry of soaps for laundry processes, including removal of stains and of cleansing processes in general," etc., etc., processes involving pure science of such an advanced nature that specialists, only after many years of experience, e.g., public analysts of very high standing, and research chemists in workshops, are capable of understanding and dealing with them. The student even, accustomed only to simple routine analysis, is incapable of understanding and dealing with such matters.

Very far indeed is such "applied chemistry" from the realm of young dabblers in science, and it is nothing short of impudence on the part of the authorities to presume to state that they teach anything of this nature. Such chemistry is and must remain caviare to the general public, and to talk of students applying the knowledge of such matters in the third year is to ask them to apply knowledge which they have not got. Take any one of these possible "subjects" of "chemistry of fermentation," etc., and it is not a subject that even the most advanced students of "applied chemistry" can deal with. Such "chemistry" has been worked out by highly skilled scientific chemists and by fully trained research chemists in chemical works. Advanced knowledge of this kind can only be dealt with by men and women in specialized experimental work, aiming at the elucidation of existing empirical methods. No doubt! The privilege of attending this class is extended to those students holding first-class diplomas in cookery and laundry work who take the special one-year certificate at King's College for Women. Just before I left the College, I was informed by a number of such students that they were expected to do "research" work which they had already done more thoroughly in the schools for Domestic Arts, and that their disgust for the work was so great that they intended to make a special request to be allowed to omit such.

Before leaving this section, I must say that I protest most strongly against young women going to the University to learn to clean. It is a despicable prostitution of educational opportunities. There are places where cleaning can be learned, and such places are not in the Universities. An anonymous donor has given £20,000 for a hostel for students, and it is in this hostel that the future students are to learn to clean pan lids.

In spite of the patronage of her Majesty Queen Mary, in spite of the fact that it is a university scheme, and in spite of our love for cleanliness, I protest that a more impudent piece of charlatanry has never been perpetrated before in the history of education.

I must find space for a word on King's College Biology. In this subject the student, after reaching a standard rather below the Intermediate by the end of the first year, is plunged, in the second

---

**£500 FUND.**

Owing to the action of the Censor, the "Benefit Performance," which was to have started the above Fund to ensure the continued life of the International Suffrage Shop, at 15, Adam Street, Strand, had to be given at dead loss. All, therefore, who consider the shop worthy of existence, are asked to contribute as generously as possible.
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year, into economic biology, and such matters as
the Lamarckian theory, theories of Darwin, Weis¬
mann and Hering, the Mendelian theory, and the
law of Galton, leading up to "general conclusions
as to the nature of Heredity." Forsooth!

I have intentionally left Economics to the last.
This subject, if time were provided to digest the
material, would be one of the most satisfac-
tory, so far as I was able to judge. Economics is
a new science, and a study, from the woman's point
of view, newer still—in fact, as yet only in the
process of discovery by trained economists in the
Schools of Economics. Here, however, the farcical
nature of the whole course becomes apparent.
After studying Economics in general, attention is
directed to the conditions in the home, and it is
discovered that the home, once the centre of in-
dustry, ceased to remain so after the second indus-
trial revolution. One by one the household employ-
ments became specialised and left the home, a pro-
cess which has continued till now, and will
continue still further, resulting in the final removal
of laundry work, cooking, and cleaning from the
house, and in the establishment of co-operative
schemes of housing, necessitating the development
of housecraft as a combination of a number of
special trades. Along with this specialisation
comes the need for women's economic indepen-
dence to be able to take a position in any of the
skilled trades or professions. Therefore three years of University time have
been given, only to end in the discovery in the last
lecture in Economics that the odd-jobbing once
necessary for the housewife is a thing of the past.
The student feels that her training has fitted her
for nothing. She is neither fish, flesh, fowl, nor
good red herring. She is, indeed, an anachronism,
and there is nothing left for her to do except to
take the advice of those who trained her, and teach
the young "on the lines of the course"!

This is the "special contribution made by women
to the general recognition of the necessity for specialisation, in order to maintain a high standard
of national efficiency." And a twentieth-century contribution, too!! On similar lines—perhaps a
couple of centuries hence—we shall find their suc-
cessors introducing a complete course on the science
of sound transmission in order efficiently to manipu-
late the telephone.

If the public imagines that the purposes of the course are to apply science to the development of
the household it is simply being deluded.

Rona Robinson, M.Sc.

(Tobe continued.)

Luang Sawat, B.A.

[NOTE.—One of the first laws made by Chulalongkorn,
the late King of Siam, was aimed at the abolition of
slavery. It lingered on in practice, however, until quite
recent years, along with many other abuses abhorrent
to the heart and mind of that kind-hearted and far-seeing
monarch. The good seed sown by him, and by his father
(King Mongkut), is sprouting freely. Yet it is not in actual flower even to-day all over the kingdom;
and the conditions here sketched were still quite possible,
not to say prevalent, when this story was written, fifteen
years ago. With acknowledgments to the Independent
Review.] I.

"It is knowledge I want, not degree," said
Luang Sawat, with a sob in his voice. How
should he make this talkative tutor-gentleman
understand the needs of far-off Siam?

Teacher and pupil were sitting in the tutor's
room in Old College, Oxford. The Siamese youth
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again would he meet so kind an Englishman. He would try to speak to him. He cleared his throat noisily; the tutor did not wince.

"What Siam needs is to know real things," he began. "Make railway, build bridge, store rainwater long time; teach people learn fighting, and keep country from French (and English, Sawat added, mentally), teach the woman be good wife, good mother; and man to be good judge."

The tutor uncrossed his legs, ceased playing with his watch, and listened attentively.

"What good is degree for that?" went on Sawat. "When I come to Oxford, I think I come to great school where all things I can learn—and Englishman teach me to be good judge. Then you make me go to lectures on French Revolution."

"But how—how could he, for refusing to run off with her?"

"Another woman—hated Mom Jeean's daughter and jealously of her—and stole diamonds from Phya Moosah and put them in Mom Jeean's daughter's box. And when the diamonds found in the box, not the real thief go to prison—oh, no!"

"Ah!" The tutor's eyes did not leave the youth's face.

"And then—that bad woman rise to be Phya Moosah's head wife. And Mom Jeean's daughter in prison now nearly three years. The judges got no time to try case; too much hair-cuttings and creations. And many more friends of mine all same thing—all innocent—and no one do nothing! And every Wan Pra old Mom Jeean come to pray to me to get her daughter out of prison."

"The woman had you?"

"Yes. I always hear that English judges are uncorruptive."

"H'm! . . . And you thought you would like to learn to be an uncorruptive—judge, too?"

"Yes: that is what I came to England for. And I want to be quick and not waste time learning things no use." Sawat stopped. He began to regret his burst of openness; also to feel the impossibility of really explaining how things were in Siam. And, now that the impulse to frankness was over, its danger recurred to him. No Englishman was really to be trusted. He had always heard that.

Meantime the tutor was silent. He felt himself densely ignorant. He determined to seek out Atkinson, who was always taking up black men, and get some information from him. Also, to read the strong feeling of the moment, held the tutor fascinated. His silence, far from being dull and unresponsive, was due to keen sympathy and interest; and this Sawat understood instinctively.

He went on. "In Bangkok Gaol two thousand prisoners—all wait trial, many, many years. Many friends of mine have son, daughter, father, wife, in prison."

"Guilty?"

"Not guilty, my friends," proudly. "Mom Jeean, a great friend of my father and mother. She have a daughter who was put in prison three years ago, but not guilty."

"Why was she put in prison?"

"Phya Moosah—one big man in Siam—want her leave her husband and live very grand in his house. But Mom Jeean's daughter hated Phya Moosah, and say 'No.' Phya Moosah very angry, and then put Mom Jeean's daughter in prison."
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up the Far East of the present day. Meantime, he must go. "Very sorry. Meeting at two-thirty sharp."

This was at the end of the Lent term, and Sawat never saw him again. During the Easter vacation on a health-seeking visit to Florence, the overworked tutor died suddenly of a chill caught between a stuffy "pension" and the freezing Lung' Arno. Sawat never again met an Englishman who moved him to a confession of genuine deep feeling. During the same Easter vac he stayed at the Siamese Legation in South Kennington, and the fierce Siamese nature that, after a few terms, was continued at Oxford, and learnt so thoroughly into matters relating to married women. Some may think him a fool by the code, for knowledge is power. He there learnt that he must not speak

The Eternal Amateur.

I N "What's Wrong with the World"—which our readers do not require to be told is a characteristic and admirable exposure of various conventional fallacies, Keith Baty, in his chapter on a very odd defence of the Anti-Suffragist cause.

Briefly, it amounts to the awful heresy—which our readers do not require to be told is a characteristic and admirable exposure of various conventional fallacies, Keith Baty, in his chapter on a very odd defence of the Anti-Suffragist cause.

A BOOK FOR MARRIED WOMEN.

By Dr. ALLISON.

The information contained in this book ought to be known by every married woman, and it will not hurt the unmarried to read. The book is conveniently divided into twelve chapters. The first chapter treats of the changes of puberty, or when a girl becomes a woman. The second chapter treats of marriage from a doctor's standpoint—pointing out the best ages for marriage, and who should have children and who not, and furnishing useful information that one can ordinarily get only from an intelligent doctor. The third chapter treats of the marriage of blood relations; and condemns such marriages as a rule. Chapter four treats of the signs of pregnancy. The fifth chapter tells how a woman should live during the pregnant state. The sixth chapter treats of mishaps that can be, in the matter of heredity, "sullenly attached to law." It is to propagate a specialised race, to fit its conditions, instead of altering grace. For when it cuts him off from graciousness and gracefulness, it definitely cuts him off from once a man is born "it is too late to damn or save him." Appropriately styled "the last lie in hell" : that if the Divine Amateur! Women must be forced to the masculine spirit the sphere of everything beyond domesticity. It is a pity, but you must! The savage separation between the two ideals of masculine and feminine character must be perpetuated—all in the interests of the Divine Amateur! Women must be forced into narrowness, men into roughness, in the delectable name of that dubious phantom. But that is what Mr. Chesterton has elsewhere appropriately styled "the last lie in hell": that if once a man is born it is too late to change him. For when it cuts him off from graciousness and gracefulness, it definitely cuts him off from grace.

It is "the huge modern heresy of altering the human soul to fit its conditions, instead of altering human conditions to fit the human soul." It is to be, in the name of Providence, "degrade" women. But it is different from that common plea, because it so candidly recognises their capabilities and powers. The ordinary Anti is content to say that women, though dear creatures, are somehow "different." They have not the necessary qualifications for politics. They would not only spoil themselves by going into politics—but they would not get there. But Mr. Chesterton admits that it is not so: that the qualities requisite are there all right. Still, he says, "Let us keep them aloof, or we shall lose the Divine Amateur!" In the stress of modern competition, which grinds men into ruthless, dull specialists, let us keep a corner for amateur lovable in consequence; let that corner be filled by one-half the human race! It is not difficult to reply. If specialization is indeed soul-deadening, in the name of Providence let it be abolished! And pending its abolition, let it be eradicated by feminine tenderness and beauty. But no! says Mr. Chesterton, agreeably yet inexorably! You must resign to the masculine spirit the sphere of everything beyond domesticity. It is a pity, but you must! The savage separation between the two ideals of masculine and feminine character must be perpetuated—all in the interests of the Divine Amateur! Women must be forced into narrowness, men into roughness, in the delectable name of that dubious phantom. But that is what Mr. Chesterton has elsewhere appropriately styled "the last lie in hell": that if once a man is born it is too late to change him. For when it cuts him off from graciousness and gracefulness, it definitely cuts him off from grace.

It is "the huge modern heresy of altering the human soul to fit its conditions, instead of altering human conditions to fit the human soul." It is to be, in the name of Providence, "degrade" women. But it is different from that common plea, because it so candidly recognises their capabilities and powers. The ordinary Anti is content to say that women, though dear creatures, are somehow "different." They have not the necessary qualifications for politics. They would not only spoil themselves by going into politics—but they would not get there. But Mr. Chesterton admits that it is not so: that the qualities requisite are there all right. Still, he says, "Let us keep them aloof, or we shall lose the Divine Amateur!" In the stress of modern competition, which grinds men into ruthless, dull specialists, let us keep a corner for amateur lovable in consequence; let that corner be filled by one-half the human race!

T. BATY.
The Compelling Books of our Generation

**The Roll of the Seasons**
By G. G. Desmond
Crown 8vo, 5s. net.

"A writer on Nature who can fill as many pages as are in Mr. G. G. Desmond's vastly packed book without ever repeating himself, and without saying anything unworthy of priest, is in himself almost a literary portent. Mr. Desmond is a most fascinating essayist, skilled alike in literary grace and in scientific knowledge."—Morning Leader.

"Well written and attractive. . . . Their appeal is wide, and they will sell many a wayfarer how to use his eyes."—Sheffield Daily Telegraph.

"That he is telling the truth, the simplicity and candid honesty of his telling forces us to believe. . . . An earnest and humanly balanced piece of truth-telling."—Manchester Guardian.

**The Mastery of Life**
By G. T. Wrench
Demy 8vo, cloth, 15s. net.

"Extremely clever and stimulating book."—Glasgow Herald.

"A book of unusual learning. . . . Dr. Wrench has vast learning; but he has something even better than learning. He has imagination, ideas, courage, and a large constructive mind. The book is an indictment of modern life, it is full of ideas, braving and masterful; the volume is invaluable, for it communicates something of its energy and vigour to the reader."—Publishers' Circular.

"The reader cannot but find much excellent food for thought in these well-informed dissertations and illuminating speculations."—Scotsman.

**Daughters of Ishmael**
By Reginald Wright Kauffman.
Price 6s.

With a Preface by John Masefield

"The kind of book that moves one to action, and may prove, like one or two famous novels before it, to be the inspiration of a great crusade."—Morning Post.

"A vivid, ruthless, and relentless account of the white slave traffic; . . . is not a nasty book. . . . There is much that is horrible—horrible because we know it to be only too true. . . . A book which, though in many ways ghastly, it nevertheless of such immense importance that every grown man and woman should read it. It is terrible from beginning to end, but above all the horror there is something which makes you feel cleaner, better, more pitiful for woman should read it. It is terrible from beginning to end, but above all the horror there is something which makes you feel cleaner, better, more pitiful for

"Appalling. . . . Mr. Kauffman faces the horrible facts with relentless candour. The work is inspired by a passion for moral and social cleanliness."—Liverpool Courier.

"A relentless and terrible exposure of what has been called 'the white slave traffic.' . . . It is both painful and powerful, and of its sincere purpose there can be no question. Mr. Kauffman's handling GIVES NO UNNECESSARY OFFENCE."—Times.

"The motive adopted by Stephen Swift & Co. is certainly being lived up to; their books really do 'compel,' and are obviously carefully chosen. Their list contains books which many publishers would not have had the courage to publish — unconventional, daring, outspoken and fearless. They are among books what the Little Theatre plays are among the dead books produced at popular theatres."—Academy.

"REMINDS THE READER OF 'ELIZABETH AND HER GERMAN GARDEN.'"—Spectator.

**In a German Pension**

By Katherine Mansfield.
Price 6s.

"Uncommonly bold and artistic."—Vanity Fair.

"Original and very forcible in style. . . . A masterly piece of work."—World.

"Vivid and often brilliant episodes of life. . . . Extremely well written and in a sense so true that anyone acquainted with German life will keenly appreciate them. We have seldom read more vivid sketches with so great an economy of words."—Morning Post.

**The Passing of the American**
By Munro Royce
Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. net.

"His remarkable book is a sensational exposure of the disease which is threatening the supremacy of the Anglo-Saxon and Teutonic races in the United States."—Birmingham Daily Post.

"Frank and incisive criticism."—Aberdeen Free Press.

"Attacks New York and New Yorkers in the most terrific way."—Christian Age.

"His masterly deductions have surpassed all other writers who have written on the same subject."—Weekly Times.

"Keen observation and well-judged criticism. . . . It is as breezy a volume as we have seen for some time."—Sheffield Daily Telegraph.

**The Bosbury People**
By Arthur Ransom.
6s.

**Love in Manitoba**
By A. Wharton Gill.
6s.

**Some Aspects of Thackeray**
By Lewis Malville.
Fully Illustrated, 12s. 6d. net.

**La Vie et Les Hommes**
By Francis Grierson.
3s. 6d. net.
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