INTERPRETATIONS OF SEX.

It is incumbent upon anyone who writes on "Sex" that they should read dull. Whether dulness arises out of the nature of the theme, or whether dulness is a discreet buffer placed between reader and too fascinating a study, we may not presume to say, but dulness and sex discussion appear twins. Probably the truth is, that owing to the pervasiveness of the effects of sex, we are impelled to make many words round about it, if only to hide the fact that we are swayed by a force which we have failed to understand. In real life, we flutter round sex like moths round a light, but no one is prepared to state outright what they want from it. When the most outspoken have said all they have to say, one is left with the impression that the part which exercised the fascination is the very one of which all remains unsaid. Is it, then, that there is nothing to say, or is it that we have not formed the concept and shaped the phrases to clothe it? To know what we are at, we had best, at the outset, separate the sex-sense from those material considerations which have become so associated with it as to give rise to the idea that they are essentially bound up with it—which, in our opinion, clearly they are not: the considerations of children and marriage. We will consider sex neat, as it were. For it is surely a fallacy to hold that sex is primarily experienced with the motive of continuing the race. From the first protozoa up through the scale of life, it has been experienced for its own satisfaction. That this satisfaction unwittingly should have resulted in the continuation of the chain of life, is part of the working of the same mystery as that which surrounds the impulse which gave the preliminary kick-off to the nebulous mists of primeval space. Even to-day, a pair of humans wanting a child, and getting it, do not thereby experience the sex sense. Race-continuation is a wholly different proposition.

Putting the begetting of children, therefore, aside, as an incidental implication rather than a first factor, we are left with sex supplying as through countless ages, a sense satisfaction, or as supplying a need of the soul which has grown up in some men as a need for a God has grown up with others. In the first instance, we might roughly say that it lent itself to pleasure, and in the second to passion. In the first case, as with any other physical sense, its satisfaction will be largely physical. Courtship, in such cases, is merely the delaying of a satisfaction in order to increase its intensity. It is parallel to the case of a man who refuses a snack lest he spoil his zest for lunch. This process does not lift sex realised in pleasure and satisfaction on to a higher level. It merely makes the most of it on a lower. On the other hand, with passion, sex-satisfaction is primarily mental. Whether it touches the physical, or not, depends upon opportunity and temperament. Just as some religious men desire and obtain an elaborate ritual in their worship, while others are content with, or prefer, few outward forms, so with the passion-forms of sex. Passion can take, and rightly take, all or any forms of expression natural to it. Its expression is a private and individual affair of no more concern to the community at large than the arrangements of one's private room. The same liberty holds...
good for pleasure in sex, though, as with all physical satisfaction, frequently defeats its own ends in saitety. We here approach the source of disillusion and disappointment in sex; most men and women are midway between the two extreme stages of sex which we have indicated, and it more often than not turns out that while their ideals are bound up with the one their conduct is emmeshed in the other. Hence they wander about in a maze, met with seeming contradictions at every turn. Consequently, they despise sex or exult it, according to their temporary luck with it. Too many misleading sign-posts have been erected in regard to sex, as formerly in regard to religion—misleading because based on what Sex Has Been, and it is essentially the thing which Sex Has Been that for most of us it now is not. Sex is become, and is still further becoming, something different. Indeed, in the evolution of the sex-instinct into the sex-sense we have the instance of the faculty whose development has best kept pace with the development of life itself. It is therefore at the cost of uttermost pain, confusion, and bewilderment, that the ordering of sex is now referred for guidance back to the customs of plants, animals, and early tribes. In exact proportion as we are human, such analogies are precluded. Someone pointed out the other day that man—to his shame—had no “close season,” and might advise himself, to his profit, of customs in the animal world. In spite of the well-meaningness of the advice, it is undoubtedly wholly unsound, and tends to the ignoring of what is far too much ignored already, i.e., sex-sense modified by human faculties. Animals observe the close season of nature, i.e., their social season, for their breeding, but because the impulse to do otherwise is not there. The impulse, for the time, has departed, and will return only at its due season—a season which it is not in the power of the organism itself to determine. Man, on the other hand, has qualities which tend to make him more faithful to his yesterdays. Memory, association, psychic attraction, knowledge of cause and effect, make man’s sex-impulse into a sex-problem, a problem which is only further tangled by insistence on the animal analogy. With man, memory and other faculties have sufficed to take from sex its seasonal character, and have turned it into a pervading, continuous consciousness which finds a special pride in its continuity. It creates therefore a mental condition which provides potentialities of sex-impulse at any moment. What form such impulses take depend upon consideration which we shall further on consider at length; here it is sufficient to say that erroneous analogy of sex in the human with sex in the sub-human tends to concentrate it especially upon the form with which we see it mainly connected in the sub-human world, i.e., with the physical. If animals and plants had certain human faculties, their so-called natural sex impulse would result in disorders infinitely worse than anything with which we are acquainted in the human. For it is only by refusing to take note of the mentors—refusing to learn of the animals, that sex in human beings is as decent as it is. By insisting upon a solution based upon animal-sex procedure, we take it for granted that sex in man is for the same purpose as sex in the animal. As we have pointed out, only the incidental, i.e., the reproductive part, is the same. What sex actually means for man, what effect it has on him, is totally different from that which sex has upon the animal. Nine-tenths of all man’s man-made and his spiritual world are based on sex as a passion. Sex, experienced as a mental phenomenon, has been effective in greater degree than any other faculty in placing man in the heart of Creation, of Being. Through it, he has become conscious of the nature of life itself. He has become heir to the creative spirit. He no longer remains a mere life-medium, acted through; he no longer identifies himself with the body, i.e., the medium; he is dimly aware that he is life itself knowing in part its ways. He has learned some of its simpler tricks. Sex, the simplest, the no longer simply uses him: he uses sex. The mischief is that, as yet, he fails to understand what he must use it for. He knows it is only dimly feels. It is this uncertainty which explains the lègancy with which the degradations connected with sex are often regarded. Sex is dangerous, because we are unaware where it will lead us, and only experimenting will open out a clear path. Many of those who have "belled the cat" have been the rakes, and the age-long kindness with which rakes have been regarded is founded on the feeling that, though their results are wrong, they started their adventures on the odd chance that their results would turn out right. The rake, therefore, has always ranked higher than the stupid, and sign-posts, pointing in the direction of the safe and righteous stupid, will never lure the best among mankind. Human sex solutions, therefore, based on sub-human sex solutions, are foredoomed to failure. As fruitless will they be as efforts to persuade sheep to work out problems in the Higher Mathematics. Our very superiority in sex postulates our danger, but we need not therefore attempt to drag the sex-sense back to its lower plane, in order to make things easier. This is the method of the faint-hearted. Rather will it be somewhere very near to the heart of the danger that the solution of sex as a problem will be found. (To be continued.)

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

What skeleton, then, is there to hide, that we strike such an intellectually bankrupting bargain? That such a bargain is struck all our modern "gentility" goes to prove. We have grown afraid to judge. So honeycombed with insincerity, and fear which is insincerity’s offspring, has our social conscience become that we have put judgments with curses, and fear to use either lest they come home to roost. What is this white-bird of fear which is nesting in modern wealthy England? What is it that has bleached the veins of Englishmen till they fear to accord blame as they would accord praise? A correspondent sends us a letter which runs: "Your article on ‘Chivalry’ is marred and
jared, for me at least, by the insulting reference to Mr. Bruce Ismay. I little expected that you, too, would have joined in these vulgar aspersions, in this blind and brutal hounding of a sensitive and brave man. It becomes increasingly clear that his conduct in the time of trouble was unselfish, humane, and brave. He entered the lifeboat on the last moment—"that you have not really considered the case of Mr. Ismay. I ask you to retract, nobly to retract." We wonder if our correspondent understands our dismay that such sentiments should come from one who knows and understands the older traditions of Englishmen and of brave men the world over. Is it insulting to state what in our eyes is obvious truth? Then we insist upon being among those who insult. Is to refer to an incontrovertibly clear delinquency to be vulgar? Then we espouse vulgarity. If to sift evidence in order to uncover culpability is hounding, then we support the "hounders." Words, once we know what they are intended to imply, are all one. The matter is the same as what in our correspondent's mind "insulting," "hounding," and "vulgar" stand for, we can have no objection to such terms being applied to any attitude which we take up. But until the terms have been diverted from their current values, we cannot acquiesce in "unselfish, humane, and brave" being applied to Mr. Ismay in relation to his conduct on the Titanic. Unaffected by any trial, and above anything which could be added in defence, we all know that the fates had inexorably marked down Mr. Ismay as the scapegoat for shoddiness of provisions for which others, as well as he, were responsible. Representing the persons who took risks on the safety of all, as long as the humblest immigrant in the steerage, or a single engineer or stoker lacked a place of safety, there was no place of safety in the boats for the President of the White Star Line. That this should fail to be acted upon circumstances where the eyes of the whole world will be turned on them. It is clear, too, what the end of all this will be. The clean rage which honest hatred of the wrongs the extreme Rich do the Poor, is going to be augmented by a contempt which from one cause and another never was able to attach itself to the Poor's regard of the old aristocracy. Not that they were less selfish, but because they were richer in spirit. They did the deed, but they faced the music better. They stood as long as the humblest immigrant in the steerage, or a single engineer or stoker lacked a place of safety, there was no place of safety in the boats for the President of the White Star Line. That this should fail to be acted upon circumstances where the eyes of the whole world will be turned on them. It is clear, too, what the end of all this will be. The clean rage which honest hatred of the wrongs the extreme Rich do the Poor, is going to be augmented by a contempt which from one cause and another never was able to attach itself to the Poor's regard of the old aristocracy. Not that they were less selfish, but because they were richer in spirit. They did the deed, but they faced the music better. They stood...
no quarter. But boys grown older, whose un­
poverty, distress, and decay, when these are
know, is vulgar, insulting, and anything else which
tripped up, inquiry in just these things we need to
will make it painful to translate judgment into
plain, blunt words. Much of the English outcry
brutal truth. Others are vulgar, because they

vulgar questions, even though he is little more
Michigan has had an opportunity of putting his
out again, and went down with the ship." Was

an expert in seafaring affairs than we are ourselves.
He will get out the essential truth, which is exactly
what a genteel expert committee is intended to
hide. There is that in the history of English in­
quiries which leads one to fear only too well the
spirit of the expert and the genteel.

We think it is sufficient merely to have the com­
position of the appointed Board of Inquiry to make
clear, which we prefer Senator Smith, of Michigan.
There is a Lord, Lord Jameson, Raid Hush-up fame.
There follow Rear-Admiral Hon. S. A. Gough-Calthorpe, C.V.O.; a Board of
Trade Inspector, Captain A. W. Clarke; an
Admiralty official, Commander F. C. Lyon; and
the gentleman, Professor Biles, reference to whose
connection with the White Star Line Co. by Mr.
Bathurst on Monday covered Mr. McKenna with
confusion in the House of Commons. "It would
be difficult to appoint anyone who was unconnected
with this great Line," murmured Mr. McKenna.

We here reply to the correspondent who object to
the course of action in a crisis like that on the
Titanic, because "all the strong and
great-souled of both sexes would be drowned,
and the weak and cowardly saved." We thus get
to fundamentals. Do we, or do we not, approve of
chivalry, which is a tendering out of the strength
of the strong, of succour for the weak? That is the
query which must be answered if we are to
understand the dragging in of ideas of race-preservation is the
merest afterthought. It is wholly alien to the
thought of the man or woman who is exercising
chivalry at the moment when it is exercised, and an
utter straining of the naturalness of the impulse:
"all the strong and

for the uses of the cup." Chivalry will be hard put to it to explain itself by
looking backwards. Its meaning lies in a destiny
which lies ahead of us. It is not so much a means
directed towards the continuation of the race, as it is
a manifestation of the active workings of the
individual in evolution. Chivalry has to do with
intensity of life, that is, with a forward, thorough
power, of a new manner of life. It has little to do with the mere continuity of it. Indeed, in many
cases it is obviously in direct opposition to con­
tinuity. Has, then, chivalry mistaken its vocation?
It is a pertinent question.

More than this talk of chivalry goes on, the more
one is haunted with the vision of the Man with the
Muckrake. Our eyes are fixed on the wrong spot.
Let us take this example from a morning paper,
"Freewomen and Evolution." We here reply to the correspondent who
would, lives too, and Englishmen should know why.

The Discussion Circle.
The preliminary meeting to consider the forma­
tion of a Discussion Circle was held on Thursday,
April 25th, 8.15 p.m., at the International Suffrage
Shop, Adam Street, Strand.

A quite unexpectedly large audience—between
eighty and ninety in number—assembled, and
throughout the proceedings much unanimity and
enthusiasm prevailed.

Mr. E. S. P. Haynes took the chair, and in a short
speech set out the purpose of the proposed Circle,
and the value of carrying on by discussion the work
which THE FREEWOMAN is so vigorously pro­
secuting week by week. He referred to a few of
the problems which beset us to-day, and emphasised the
need of free and sincere discussion on such
matters, if we would find a way out for ourselves.

After the close of the chairman's speech, the
business of the evening was transacted, and the
following decisions were unanimously made:—
That a Central Discussion Circle be formed. That
this Circle meet once a fortnight in some central
meeting-place. That a subscription to the Circle
be asked from intending members, the precise
amount to be fixed later. That the two temporary
secretaries remain in office for the time being. That
the next meeting be held on Wednesday, May 8th,
at 8 p.m., at the Eustace Miles Restaurant (The
Blue Salon), Chandos Street, Charing Cross, at
which a discussion be opened by Miss D. Marsden.

After the business arrangements were completed,
Miss Marsden (Editor of THE FREEWOMAN) gave
a closing speech, in which she expressed the pleasure
it gave her to see this large audience consisting of
readers of, and sympathisers with, the paper. She
added that genuine support was needed if THE
FREEWOMAN was to continue her course so
facto­

dependency. THE FREEWOMAN had met with
unusual success and appreciation, and there was
no doubt that it had a work to perform—a work
which no other journal was doing at the moment.

It will be seen that only a very few preliminaries
have been settled, so far, and this leaves us free to
develop in whatever directions are most desirable.
It is hoped that the question of future discussions may be further elucidated at next meeting, and
any members who have suggestions on this matter
are asked to be kind enough to send them to me
before May 8th.

The matter of the exact subscription is to be
decided by vote at next meeting, but it may here be
said that it seems probable that a yearly subscrip­
tion of 2s. 6d. or 3s. will suffice to defray expenses.
It is desirable to keep the subscription as low as possible, but it must be borne in mind that a meet­
ning-place in the centre of town is a fairly expensive
item.

In future, the ordinary business of the Circle,
its meetings, and any other activities, will be
announced in THE FREEWOMAN for all to see,
therefore members of the Circle are asked to note
these announcements week by week.

Miss Dora Marsden will open the first discussion Subject: "Freewomen and Evolution."
Government and Crime.

"Thou shalt not kill."
"Thou shalt not steal."
"Thou shalt not commit adultery."

At the head of this article are the three major principles of the moral code, as enacted by the governing class of most communities, for the guidance of the masses. The canon law of the Established Church has regarded these precepts as emanating from the mind of the Creator.

The English governing classes have regarded the duty of devising the machinery by which these maxims can best be given effect to in the science of government. "Thou shalt not kill" was the most difficult of the three for any governing class to enforce upon a community, because privilege depends upon the right of the privileged to kill those who question the validity of their privileges. A privileged governing class has a tendency to make laws which will strengthen its position against the rest of the community. The submission of the community to the privileges of the governing class rested upon the force at the command of the governing class. There has been no community in which each person had the same opportunity of education, or the same economic chances. Until such a community is developed, one cannot test the truth of "government by consent of the people." All governing classes have gained their privileges through the ignorance of the people.

There are many degrees of ignorance. As some individual members of the community acquired knowledge, it was possible that the dominance of the governing class might be challenged. All governments have feared the spread of knowledge. That is why the masses have had to wait five thousand years before the right to know has been recognised.

"Thou shalt not kill," if literally interpreted, would soon have rendered the position of a governing class untenable. The governing class limited the application of this commandment to those who were not of itself. For centuries, kings and nobles could slay the common man or woman without any possibility of punishment. Did a common man or woman revenge himself or herself no mercy was shown. "Thou shalt not kill" was sternly put into force against those who raised their hands against tyranny.

One crime of the governing class has been the creation of the armies of licensed assassins. A clever way of keeping the people in subjection was to incite their passions against their neighbours. This involved a continual breach of the sixth commandment. The governing class enlisted the aid of the Churches. The soldier thus has the privilege of assassination, which has been denied to other members of the community. The community has the distinguished honour of paying for the upkeep of these broods of God's law. It even provides the weapons with which they can commit their atrocious crimes. The governing class, having specially granted the right to kill to a large section of the community, it is hopeless to expect a rigid adherence to the sixth commandment.

Mr. Justice Horridge, a man whose mental attitude of superiority over God and man well relieves him for the task, recently decided that the sixth commandment was a wicked doctrine, the promulgation of which was felonious. It was this Judge who imposed heavy sentences in the recent blasphemy prosecutions at Leeds! One can understand the condition the administration of justice is in when a Judge can seriously lay down that it is felony to persuade men not to shoot their fellow-countrymen, their relatives, their wives, or their children. The idea of killing as a trade is revolting to any decent mind. It is a counsel of terror, panic, and evil. It is a doctrine of hell, not of Christian morals, or ordinary human ethics.

The next commandment, "Thou shalt not steal," has been so narrowed down by the governing class that it has become meaningless. Take the ownership of land. Land is something which has not been created by human effort. It is a production of God or Nature. Each human being should be entitled to an equal use of land. The governing class of England has always contested the right of the populace to the fruits of the land, and to the birds of the air. What title the governing class has from the people of England to the pastures and meadows of England no human being can tell. In a recent book, called "The Village Labourer," by Mr. and Mrs. Hammond, there is an account of the aristocracy's land thefts from the populace and commoners of England. The sub-title of that book is, "A Study in the Government of England before the Reform Bill, 1760-1832." One reads of the Duke of Portland, a land-thief of no mean order, intriguing to obtain the striking off from the Commission of the Peace of Capel Loft, a Suffolk Liberal, who had induced the Deputy-Sheriff to postpone the execution of a young girl for stealing. That is a measure of the hypocrisy of the English governing class. They robbed the poor of their remnants of land, and then sentenced them to death for the most trifling theft. One sees the members of Brooks' manipulating the Committees of the House of Commons to conceal their knavery, and then departing to Quarter Sessions to amuse them.
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selves by sending the poor to Van Diemen's Land, or to execution. One notes Lord Ellenborough's protest, in the House of Lords in 1827, against a Bill prohibiting the use of spring guns for the protection of game. At the same period, the Judges of the High Court of Justiciary in Scotland had ruled that killing by a spring gun was murder. Lord Deerbuss, Coke of Norfolk, the Barings of Hampshire, and many other landed families, all played in these transactions a part which their biographers have wisely hidden.

Two boys, aged eleven and ten, were sentenced to seven years' transportation by a famous English aristocrat, who had just robbed the country of the value and wages and descendants are now living luxuriously on the proceeds. Lord Ellenborough told Lord Lauderdale that he had left a man to be hanged at Worcester Assizes, because he lollled out his tongue, and pretended he was an idiot. Another judge condemned three men to be hanged at Maidstone Assizes for thefts, because none of them could get a witness to character. In those days a witness for a prisoner as likely as not would find himself in the dock with the prisoner.

That was how England was governed eighty years ago by the most powerful privileged class that has ruled England. Romilly's Bill to abolish the death sentence for the crime of stealing goods to the value of five pounds was thrown out in the House of Lords, Lord Eldon, Lord Ellenborough, and the Archbishop of Canterbury being its most strenuous opponents. Only thirty-two members of the House of Lords thought it worth while to attend, the division figures being 21 to 11. The 21 included seven bishops, several of whom were fresh from robbing the poor of their allotments and commons. The activities of Wilberforce in depriving the poor of their last enjoyments should be reckoned in their judgment by those who have ennobled that canting prig as a philanthropist. The case of Henry Cook, a ploughboy of nineteen, is one example of the degradation of the morals of the English ruling class. He was receiving 5s. a week as a ploughboy, and had been working apparently since the age of ten. He had hit Bingham Baring, a notorious merchant of those days. Baring was uninjured. Cook was sentenced to death. Before execution, some public sympathy was aroused on his behalf. He was unable to defend himself, as he could neither read nor write. It was said by his accusers that he was of vicious disposition. Stories of his cruelties to animals were scattered broadcast. The *Times* correspondent thundered at this wretched boy, "The fate of Henry Cook excites no commiseration. Justice has seldom met with a more appropriate sacrifice. He shed some tears shortly after hearing his doom, but has since relaxed into a brutal insensibility to his fate."

Alas! the virtues of repentance were not reserved for such as him. Demnan, heckled in the House of Commons, lied as his modern representatives would lie to-day. He said Cook was thirty years old, had hit Bingham Baring, as a ploughboy, and had been working apparently since the age of ten. He had hit Bingham Baring, a notorious merchant of those days. Baring was uninjured. Cook was sentenced to death. Before execution, some public sympathy was aroused on his behalf. He was unable to defend himself, as he could neither read nor write. It was said by his accusers that he was of vicious disposition. Stories of his cruelties to animals were scattered broadcast. The *Times* correspondent thundered at this wretched boy, "The fate of Henry Cook excites no commiseration. Justice has seldom met with a more appropriate sacrifice. He shed some tears shortly after hearing his doom, but has since relaxed into a brutal insensibility to his fate."

"Thou shalt not commit adultery" is the commandment which has been used by the governing class to enslave the mass of women. The virtues of the English aristocracy, whatever they may be, were never moral. Morality was a doctrine invented for the benefit of the middle and lower classes. The morals of the rich classes in England simply do not exist. The kings soon evaded "Thou shalt not commit adultery." Adultery may be the sport of kings, but it is not, moreover, a crime, nor ever has been, in their monopoly. Yet, strictly speaking, adultery is a crime nearly as grave as that of murder. Adultery in many societies and in many periods was punishable as a crime. Education and the spread of reasonable views about the sex relationship has broken down the punitive vengeance for adultery; but middle-class society still marks with a social monoply. Even that point of view is beginning to be modified. Adultery is a theological and state-created offence. The prejudices of theologians twisted Christian morals into an assertion that men and women who had ceased to love, though bound in marriage, should share the marital bed in mutual repugnance, or live in an unnatural celibacy. There are undoubtedly many men and women to whom celibacy has natural attractions; but such are not the majority in any state. Whatever the theologians might argue about divine sanction, a freed human reason soon began to criticise the moral basis of the indissolubility of marriage. The clergy would not come to the rescue, but the secular power was stirred. The State permitted persons to dissolve their marriages under certain circumstances; but, in nearly all cases, one or other party must have committed adultery. That is as immoral a theory as the theological view. Persons bound in wedlock should not be compelled to commit adultery, as the law enacts, ere they can secure freedom from the most terrible of terrors. It is especially hard upon women that, to escape the degradation of living with one unworthy man, they must submit their bodies to someone else. But for the State and the theologians, "Thou shalt not commit adultery" might become possible of performance in civilised society. The Church has maintained that marriage must be indissoluble. The State has not persisted in that contention, but has ordained that the commission of adultery is necessary to end the marriage. Adultery is a state-endowed offence against morals; just as the indissolubility of marriage is a child of the plainest moral law: that the true relationship between the sexes is love. When love has ceased, marriage is the grossest form of prostitution, because the prostitute is not compelled to submit herself; whereas, by law, the married woman cannot avoid unwelcome sexual attentions.

These are some of the reasons why an honest inquirer must arrive at the conclusion that the object of Government is to maintain crime rather than suppress it. Why is poverty always prevalent in human society? Because no country has been governed without a privileged class. No privileged class could stand in a state of economic equality. Poverty is a source of many ills. It is a primal cause of drunkenness. Poverty is the mother of crime. In the primitive communities there is no such thing as a criminal type. Criminality is a child of the civilisation of social and economic inequality. The explanation of the persistence of crime is to be seen in the resistance of the vested interests in crime to the civilising influence of civilisation. The cruel tyranny of the English judges was unchecked till the Reform Bill of 1832 allowed the people some influence in Parliament. The regret of the Bar to-day, when there is no criminal list on the Assizes, is quite genuine. In legal slang, the Bar will have no "soup." Crime is a vested interest. The length of the Seddon case, and the way it was
**The True Traveller.**

One man could ever be so impossibly moral as the average journalist is, when writing. Although he lives in the heart of the Modern Babylon, he knows no evil. When he writes of the Drink Question it is plain that he himself is Grand Master of the Rechabites. When he supports the blocking of the White Slave Traffic Bill it is not of ill will: but the subject brings a blush to his cheek, and he thinks us unkind to discuss it. Not only the vices, but even the common passions of humanity are unknown to him. Pain he does not dread, for he scorns the Suffragette who cries out against forcible feeding; nor fear neither, for he despises the railway-shunter for making a noise about the risk of losing a leg. Even hunger he has never felt, for he repines the unemployed for crying about the want that they themselves have. Above all, he has Christian charity. From a careful study of the leaders, reviews, and dramatic criticisms of the Daily Telegraph I know there is no politician who is not honest, no author who cannot write, no actor who cannot act. Truly, there are still saints among us. The Vicar of Christ upsets the Poet and one of the leaders of the Times. Just as in the United States after the Civil War there was little current coin, but too many unrealisable "greenbacks," so we to-day have too little of the coin of good deeds to pass from hand to hand, but are flooded with paper virtues.

From this spiritual perfection we turn with relief to Mr. Davies' account of his wanderings as a tramp. He writes of brawls in common lodging-houses; of adventures with drugged wine and blackmailers in music-hall promenades. Yet his account of the lives of pandars and prostitutes is one of those papers which are wicked or stupid enough to believe in the sincerity of the Garden City movement when the inhabitants of Hampstead Garden Suburb lead an armed attack on the malignant builders who are tearing up the beauties of Mill Hill and Edgware.

**"The True Traveller."** By W. H. Davies. 6s. (Duckworth.)
and peasant speak the same words, so all his characters say their thoughts baldly and alike. The really important thing about the tale of Mad Kitty is the fact that although Death and fantastic Tragedy sat in the house, squadil Sin must still go on earning the rent. So he spares us the oaths and slang used by Mad Kitty and her barman. Those who would have it otherwise would like the conversation of "The Two Corbies" to be rendered by croaks. And the most valuable quality about Mr. Davies is also the most valuable quality of the ballad-makers. He wastes no time talking, for he comes of a class that knows that if a man talks too much he will get the sack. Naturally, sentimentality is the first thing that goes overboard. And it is followed by all the conveniences that Mr. Davies honestly feels to be his.

Mr. Davies ought to be made editor of the Times.

REBECCA WEST.

The New Order.

I.—THE NEW PARLIAMENT: SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION BY FREE CONCERT.


I.—CAUSES OF THE PRESENT UNREST.

The whole industrial field in the Western world is seething with incipient revolt. In spite of many and varied efforts put forth, both individual and organised, numberless institutions competing for the care of social ills, humanity in the mass is still unsatisfied; the helpless remain unhelped. To avert some threatening consequences of this tragic failure by turning the more active forces of rebellion into more fruitful fields of positive reconstruction is the aim and hope of this series.

The growing self-respect and independence of the workers, fostered by the discovery amongst the most sympathetic and intelligent non-workers that the real helpers are those who do the world's work, brings futility upon the old familiar method of forcing obnoxious work-tests upon them whether inside or outside of the Poor Law, and hastens the day when they will realise that the production of their own wants for themselves, if they were free to do this, would be far less burdensome than to toil at these laborious tasks imposed upon them from without, and would, moreover, lie in the direction of a better social order.

What can be said about the latest move on the part of the Government for the relief of poverty or the mitigation of distress? Will Compulsory Insurance ease the industrial unrest?

For all the active fighting workers of the railway world, the coal-mines, the post office, the cotton trades, the whole of this policy of insurance relief is open to one criticism, here as in Germany or elsewhere. Under the guise of protecting the workman from the ravages of ill-health, or from poverty due to unemployment, it seeks more or less openly to reimpose upon him the fetters of personal control, in theory discarded by the abolition of chattel slavery, and the State itself comes to the aid of the employer in the exercise of this control. Thanks to the Education Act (1902), it is becoming everywhere recognised that there can be no State aid without a corresponding degree of State control. Now these same fighting workers are up in arms not for more superimposed control, but for more liberty; hence it is clear that for them Compulsory Insurance affords no solution.

Regarded from a more fundamental standpoint, the insurance method is no less unsatisfactory, since it works within the lines of the present money system, and all such measures can only afford sectional relief, such relief being at the expense of other sections. Moreover, the pressure of the taxation which yields the supposed relief, in the working out of all such schemes, lies heaviest upon those least able to bear it. Through the elastic methods of changes of the cash nexus, as we have it to-day, rents, prices, wages, taxation, etc., acting and reacting upon one another, with the gold monopoly and the privileged position of the possessing classes at the back of all, the moment the compelling finger of the State touches any section, taxing it for the avowed benefit of some other section, not for its own, there is started a process of manipulating the cash nexus as to make good the amount thus contributed by extracting it in some other guise from the non-possessing classes, who are by their very position helpless to resist. So long as the money system remains in its present crude and unnecessary controlled state, compulsory insurance and all other like "remedies" are doomed to be defeated of their intention by the unseen working of this insidious tendency, and this the workers everywhere are more and more feeling to be the case, although for the most part they are unable to analyse or understand the methods of its working.

So long as the State endowed schools to which they send their children is inspired by this same theory of control, it must remain difficult for the working classes to obtain the insight and knowledge necessary for them to understand the process. In moments of supreme crisis, however, when the industrial unrest threatens paralysis of our railway system, or a national stoppage of coal supplies, the hidden theory of control steps suddenly into the foreground, and the military are seen shooting upon the strikers at Tonypandy, or the soldiers bivouac around the great railway termini—lest we forget.

To crown all, the industrial unrest, the general sense of discontent, is heightened by abuses in the administration of justice, both in the higher and the lower courts, by the glaring defects of the prison system, by outstanding franchise abuses, notably the voiceless condition of women, the upheaval against which is threatening of itself alone to develop a revolution, and by the utter failure of Parliament, due to its remoteness from the actual lives of the people and the cramping effects of the party system, to keep pace with the urgent and persistent demands made from all the varying quarters whence men and women are looking to it, but in vain, for the redress of social ills.

II.—HOW TO FILL THE VOID.

In all revolutionary crises, before action comes conference; before the moulding of the new ideals comes the gathering of the stalwarts in council for mutual understanding and encouragement. Hence* to readers of "The New Order" (Quarrell Press, 1911) this analysis will be clear, in the light of the circular quoted on p. 6, since the control which the bankers were then preparing to substitute for chattel slavery would be incomplete without this process.

*To witness the J. Timewell Society for Supervising and Exposing Police Malpractices, A. J. Besty's Judicial Injustice Redress Society, Capt. Arthur St. John's Penal Reform League, etc., which exist to check these abuses.
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the need for the New Parliament. Whence come its members? Where the tormenting inadequacy of the existing order is driving men and women most keenly into revolt, not less than three movements are already visible to the public eye, each having its own mode of operation. The method known as passive resistance has been developed into a fine art in our time, notably by the so-called militant women in England (resisting the arbitrary tactics of Cabinet Ministers and police), by Finland in her long struggle against Russia, by the South African Indians, opposing the tyranny of the Asiatic Acts, etc. The more dramatic and disturbing method of strikes is developing so rapidly in the countries on the Atlantic margin since the notable object-lesson afforded by the great and successful national strike in Finland (1906)—victorious within a week—as to cause severe perturbation in government circles everywhere, and even to possess regular organs of expression in each country.* In the third place, the silent method of the boycott may be none the less effective because it works in silence and unseen, and its victims have no weapon of defence against so secret a foe.

In all these ranks are found those who mainly tend to suffer for their cause, whose motto is self-sacrifice, and, on the other hand, those more pugnacious members who tend to assert rights and resist tyranny for less dangerous or less convenient or comfort of others. In the New Parliament both types can meet to their mutual maturaing and strengthening of character.

The methods of these groups are purely negative, however, though necessary in their time and place for gathering and training the forces of the future. Has not the time now come for action which shall be positive and constructive, rather a making of the new than merely an organised protest against the old?

Since it is a void that has to be filled, a new order that has to be enacted, essentially all that is needed is the courage to step out into new fields of activity, to form new habits, to actualise aspirations which the old institutions have not been formed or fitted to express. To do this we must achieve a feat more difficult than bomb-throwing, though less dangerous to the human race, more rare than fight­ning, to overcome the double tendency to rely upon external legislation instead of upon that renovated action which springs only from within, that fatal waiting till the majority of the voters (vain hope!) may be persuaded into pre­paring our New Jerusalem for us.

Who does not know that to dare the unusual needs greater courage than to walk up to the cannon's mouth? Hence it is to those movements in which such courage has been proved and trained that humanity will first look for the members of the New Parliament.

III.—WHAT THE NEW PARLIAMENT WILL DO.

The basis of all the movements above referred to is the underlying principle of combination; the New Parliament goes a step further and combines the combiners. By their inner psychology, as well as by the logic of their methods, they have unconsciously been preparing for this union.

Being designed to give voice to those needs which are voiceless and unmet, the New Parliament will substitute itself a forum whereon these needs may be expressed from their own point of view by those who feel them, personally or by their chosen mouthpiece, whereupon syndicates of action will form amongst the members, charged with the duty of supplying the needs thus voiced. They may do either by their own initiative and ingenuity, or by backing the individual in the light of this principle when dealing with societies existing nominally for the purpose of such assistance. When driving home the principle of personal choice, they will be careful to demonstrate in what hitherto overlooked that new act of work-shy where it is a question of the kind of work they themselves desire.

The New Parliament in its debates and conferences, and still more by the general trend of its activities, will educate public opinion to perceive that the workers are the true helpers, the parasitic classes being impediments in so far as they block the way of mankind towards a simpler and fairer civilisation, and co-operative societies will surely suffice to influence the bestowal of some of the large funds controlled by these worker's organisations on the purchase of land for this purpose.*

No better moment could be found for embarking upon such a policy than the present (a small section of the operators and directors of the way thereto), when the Legislature, by adopting payment of members and Compulsory Insurance, has set free the heavy contributions hitherto devoted by the workers to these purposes. Urged thereto by syndicates of action from the New Parliament, they will have their attention directed to the immense leverage which they must gain by a considered land policy directed for securing land for the workers, both as independent holders providing for their own needs and as occasional helpers during seasons of unemployment in their own trades—another and infinitely superior form of insurance, which makes them ever-increasingly independent of the possessing and parasitic classes. Imagine the pull that a revolutionist having land at his back must have over the home­less, houseless, starving crowds on Tower Hill†

The revolutionary spirit amongst the insurgent women should impel them to rally in large numbers to the fighting ranks of the New Parliament, adapted as it is for free expression and action on

* See the Syndicalist, published at Walthamstow by Guy Bowman.

† In this respect the "Mexican Insurrectos" are affording a notable object-lesson to the workers all over the world by taking back the land that had been wrested from them by the tricks of the law, and cultivating it once more in commons.
equal terms for both sexes, and the keen sense of responsibility towards crying social ills, which distinguishes all the finest spirits among them, will win practical vent through the syndicates of action, of which they are all the more likely to avail themselves the longer they are denied admission into the Parliamentary arena at Westminster.

Some of the insurgents, both men and women, have already taken up judicial and police court cases, supporting the victims with moral, legal, and financial aid, and into this line of action the syndicates of action organised ad hoc by the New Parliament from all sections of the community will bring material reinforcements.

IV.—THE PRINCIPLES OF ITS CONSTITUTION.

The members of the New Parliament will be of such a character and temperament, having regard to the ranks from which they are primarily drawn, that any element of coercion or compulsion is repugnant to their nature, and they cannot therefore adopt as working rules for its constitution the time-honoured regulations and forms of procedure which characterise all parliamentary and municipal institutions. As a general rule, there will be ultimate allegiance due to the voluntary principle. As a general rule, there will be the domain of compulsion, and from the outset takes its stand upon the voluntary principle.

From the basis of the maxim, the creed is worse than the bludgeon, however—as much as mental compulsion is worse than physical—no generalised rule can be set up in advance, no imaginable printed statement on procedure can cover all the emergencies possible in the world of action.

It therefore follows that each meeting will be responsible for its own order and conduct, and that at a moment of emergency even an act of compulsion might be resorted to without violence to the ultimate allegiance due to the voluntary principle.

Similarly an apparent dilemma confronts us in other directions. As a general rule, there will be no standing orders committee or compulsory agenda, no chairman, temporary or permanent, the voluntary method insuring that the subject which characterises all parliamentary and municipal institutions is that which characterises all parliamentary and municipal institutions in that world wherein dominion is the accepted keynote of the social order. In other words, the New Parliament lies beyond the domain of compulsion, and from the outset takes its stand upon the voluntary principle.

To the surface, and unless challenged will become the new sphere, the true method being to cultivate the subject or the intrusion of old-world habits into the material for discussion, and if need be the observance of the sequence of ideas in debate. The practice in regard to secretaries and the keeping of records generally is subject to the same rule as far as the Parliament itself, its discussions or its syndicates of action.

Membership of such a New Parliament, in whatever city or country its abode may be located, is open to all the world, and its inspiring call, summoning all into the new world, rings out to men and women of every race and condition in the spirit of the singer who sang:—

"O Liberty! the prisoner's pleasing dream,
The poet's muse, his passion and his theme: 'Tis Liberty alone that gives the flower Of fleeting life its lustre and perfume."

W. A. MACDONALD.
HELEN M. MACDONALD.

Woman and Mankind.

CHAPTER XIV. OF WEININGER'S "SEX AND CHARACTER."

Reprinted from Otto Weininger's "Sex and Character" by kind permission of the publisher, Mr. William Heinemann, London.

I

I MUST give warning against the danger of woman trying merely to liken herself outwardly to man, for such a course would simply plunge her more deeply into womanliness. It is only too likely that the efforts to emancipate women will result not in giving her real freedom, in letting her reach free-will, but merely in enlarging the range of her caprices. It seems to me that if we look the facts of the case in the face there are only two possible courses open for women: either to pretend to accept man's ideas, and to think that they believe what is really opposed to their whole, unchanged nature, to assume a horror of immorality (as if they were moral themselves), of sexuality (as if they desired platonic love); or to openly admit that they are wrapped up in husband and children, without being conscious of all that such an admission implies, of the shamelessness and self-immolation of it.

Unconscious hypocrisy, or cynical identification with their natural instincts; nothing else seems possible for woman.

But it is neither agreement nor disagreement with, but rather the denial and overcoming of her own nature. Coming to the question of votes, the most inadmissible of all forms of voting is that in which the economic interests of the minority suffer through the action decided upon by the majority, but this, as will be seen in the next chapter, is a contingency which can hardly be conceived as arising in the New Parliament.
genuine, even although here and there they are actually put forward. For a wise solution who longed for mankind, to break apart from her hypostasis, so stupid and so incapable of truthfulness that she is unable to perceive that she is in this way negating herself, making herself absolutely worthless, without existence!

It is difficult to decide which is preferable: the unlimited hypocrisy which can appropriate the thing that is most foreign to it, i.e., the ascetic ideal, or the neglect of its adornment for the reformed rake, the complacent devotion to him. The principal problem of the woman question lies in the fact that in each case woman's one desire is to put all responsibility on man, and in this it is identical with the problem of mankind.

Friedrich Nietzsche says in one of his books: "To under-estimate the real difficulties of the man and woman problem, to fail to admit the abysmal antagonism and the inevitable nature of the constant strain between the two, to dream of equal rights, education, responsibilities and duties, is the mark of the superficial observer, and any thinker who has been found shallow in these difficult places—shallow by nature—should be looked upon as untrustworthy, as nothing short of a real and genuine existence!—who never gets to the bottom of things. But the man who is not superficial, who has depth of thought as well as of purpose, the depth which not only makes him desire right, but endows him with determination and strength to do right, must always look on woman from the oriental standpoint:—as a possession, as private property, as something born to serve and be dependent on him—he must see the marvellous reasonableness of the Asiatic instinct of superiority over women, as the Greeks of old saw it, those worthy successors and disciples of the Eastern school. It was an attitude towards woman which, as is well known, from Homer's time till that of Pericles, grew with the growth of culture, and increased in strength step by step, and gradually became quite oriental. What a necessary, logical, desirable growth for mankind! if we could only free ourselves from it!"

The great individualist is here thinking in the terms of social ethics, and the autonomy of his moral doctrine is overshadowed by the ideas of caste, groups, and divisions. And so, for the benefit of society, to preserve the place of men, he would place women in subjection, so that the voice of the wish for emancipation could no longer be heard, and so that we might be freed from the false and foolish cry of the existing advocates of women's rights, advocates who have no suspicion of the real source of woman bondage. But I quoted Nietzsche, not to convict him of want of knowledge, but to lead to the point that the solution of the problem of humanity is bound up with the solution of the woman problem. If any one should think it a high-flown idea that man should respect woman as an entity, a real existence, and not use her merely as a means to an end, that he should recognize in her the same rights and the same duties (those of building up one's own moral personality) as his own, then he must reflect that man cannot be the ethical problem in human life, if he continues to ignore the idea of humanity in the women by using her simply for his own purposes.

Coitus is the price man has to pay to women, under the Asiatic system, for their oppression. And although it is true that women may be more than content with such recompense for the worst form of slavery, man has no right to take part in such conduct, simply because he also is morally damaged by it.

Even technically the problem of humanity is not soluble for man alone; he has to consider woman even if he only wishes to redeem himself; he must endeavour to get her to abandon her immoral designs on him. Women must really and truly and spontaneously relinquish coitus. That undoubtedly means that woman, as woman, must disappear, that she must give up all that has contrasted the most foreign to her, as far as there is no possibility of establishing the kingdom of God on earth. Pythagoras, Plato, Christianity (as opposed to Judaism), Tertullian, Swift, Wagner, Ibsen, all these have urged the freedom of woman, not the emancipation of woman from man, but rather the emancipation of woman from herself.

It is easy to bear. Nietzsche's anathema in such company! But it is very hard for woman to reach such a goal by her own strength. The spark in her is so flickering that it always needs the fire of man to light it; she must have an example to go by. Christ is an example; he freed the fallen Magdalen, he swept away her past and expiated it for her. Wagner, the greatest man since Christ's time, understood and fulfilled the real significance of the act: until woman ceases to exist as woman for man she cannot cease being woman. Kundry could only be released from Klingsor's curse by the help of a sinless, immaculate man—Parsifal. This shows the complete harmony between the psychological and philosophical deduction which is dealt with in Wagner's "Parsifal," the greatest work in the world's literature. It is man's sexuality which first gives woman existence as woman. Woman will exist as long as man's guilt is unexpiated, until he has really vanquished his own sexuality.

It is only in this way that the eternal opposition to all anti-feministic tendencies can be avoided; the view that says the emancipation of women is nothing but the exploitation of man—that we might be freed from the fall of woman, that the woman question lies in the fact that woman is there, being what she is, and not to be altered, man must endeavour to make terms with her; it is useless to fight, because there is nothing which can be exterminated. But it has been shown that woman is negative and ceases to exist the moment man determines to be nothing but true existence.

There must be fought against is not an affair of ever unchangeable existence and essence: it is something which can be put an end to, and which ought to be put an end to.

This is the way, and no other, to solve the woman question, and this comes from comprehending it. The solution may appear impossible, its tone exaggerated, its claims overrated, its requirements too exacting. Undoubtedly there has been little said about the woman question, as women talk of it; we have been dealing with a subject on which women are silent, and must always remain silent—the bondage which sexuality implies.

This woman question is as old as sex itself, and as young as mankind. And the answer to it? Man must free himself of sex, forget that he is of this sex, being what she is, and not to be altered, man must endeavour to make terms with her; it is useless to fight, because there is nothing which can be exterminated.

She must certainly be destroyed, as woman; but only to be raised again from the ashes—new, restored to youth—as a real human being.

So long as there are two sexes there will always be a struggle between the sex—being what she is, and not to be altered, man must endeavour to make terms with her; it is useless to fight, because there is nothing which can be exterminated.

She must certainly be destroyed, as woman; but only to be raised again from the ashes—new, restored to youth—as a real human being.
man and woman a third self, neither man nor woman, is evolved.

Now for the first time, looking at the woman question as the most important problem of mankind, the demand for the sexual abstinence on the part of both sexes is put forward with good reason. To seek to ground this claim on the prejudicial effects on the health following sexual intercourse would be absurd, for any one with knowledge of the physical frame could upset such a theory at all points; to found it on the immorality of passion would also be wrong, because that would introduce a heteronomous motive into ethics. St. Augustine, however, must certainly have been aware, when he advocated chastity for all mankind, that the objection raised to it would be that in such a case the whole human race would quickly disappear from the face of the earth.

This extraordinary apprehension, the worst part of which appears to be the thought that the race would be exterminated, shows not only the greatest unbelief in individual immortality and eternal life for moral well-doers; it is not only most irreligious, but it proves at the same time the cowardice of man and his incapacity to live an individual life. To any one who thinks thus the earth can only mean the turmoil and press of those on it; death must seem less terrible to such a man than isolation. If the immortal, moral part of his personality were really vigorous, he would have courage to look this result in the face; he would not fear the death of the body, nor attempt to substitute the miserable certainty of the continuation of the race for his lack of faith in the eternal life of the soul. The rejection of sexuality is merely the death of the physical life, to put its place the full development of the spiritual life.

Hence it follows that it cannot be a moral duty to provide for the continuance of the race. This common argument appears to me to be so extraordinarily false that I am almost ashamed to meet it. Yet at the risk of making myself ridiculous I must ask if any one ever consummated coitus to avoid the great danger of letting the human race die out, if he failed in his duty? And would it not follow that the man who prefers the charge of immorality to be open to the charge of immoral conduct? Every form of fecundity is loathsome, and no one who is honest with himself feels bound to provide for the continuity of the human race. And what we do not realise to be a duty, is not a duty.

On the contrary, it is immoral to procreate a human being for any secondary reason, to bring a being into the limitations of humanity, the conditions made for him by his parentage; the fundamental reason why the possible freedom and spontaneity of a human being is limited is that he was begotten in such an immoral fashion. That the human race should persist is of no interest whatever to reason; he who would perpetuate humanity would propagate the problem and the guilt, the only problem and the only guilt. The only true goal is divinity and the union of humanity with the Godhead; that is the real choice between good and evil, between existence and negation. The moral sanction that has been invented for coitus, in supposing that there is an ideal attitude to the act in which only the propagation of the race is thought of, is no sufficient defence. There is no such imperative in the mind of man; it is merely an ingenious defence of a desire, and there is the fundamental immorality in it, that the being to be created has no power of choice with regard to his parents. As for the sexual union in which the production of children is prevented, there is no possible justification.

Sexual union has no place in the idea of mankind, not because ascetism is a duty, but because in it woman becomes the object, the cause, and man does what he will with her, looks upon her merely as a "thing," not as a living human being with an inner, psychic, existence. And so man despises woman the moment the coitus is over, and the inner, psychic existence. And so man despises woman the moment the coitus is over, and the woman knows that she is despised, even although a few minutes before she thought herself adored.

The only thing to be respected in man is the idea of mankind; this disparagement of woman (and himself), induced by coitus, is the surest proof that it is opposed to that idea of mankind. Any one who is ignorant of what this Kantian "idea of mankind" means, may perhaps understand it when he thinks of his sisters, his mother, his female relatives; it concerns them all: for our own sakes, then, woman ought to be treated as human, respected and not degraded, all sexuality implying degradation.

But man can only respect woman when she herself ceases to wish to be object and material for man; if there is any question of emancipation it should be the emancipation from the prostitute element. It has never until now been made clear where the bondage of woman lies; it is in the sovereign, all too welcome power wielded on them by the Phallus. There can be no doubt that the men who have really desired the emancipation of women are the men who are not very sexual, who have no great craving for love, who are not very profound, but who are men of noble and spiritual minds. I am not going to try to palliate the erotic motives of man, nor to represent his antipathy to...
the "emancipated woman" as being in any sense less than it is; it is much easier to go with the majority than, as Kant did, to climb, painfully and slowly, to the heights of isolation.

But a great deal of what is taken for enmity to emancipation is due to the want of confidence in its possibility. Man does not really want woman less than it is; it is much easier to go with the slow stream to the heights of isolation.

The battle against her real bondage. The last the present day receives is not calculated to fit her for the battle against her real bondage. The last resource of her "womanly" teacher, if she declines to do this or that, is to say that no man will have her unless she does it. Women's education is directed solely to preparing them for their marriage, the happy state in which they are to find their crown. Such training would have little effect on man, but it serves to accentuate woman's womanishness, her dependence, and her servile condition. The education of woman must be taken out of the hands of woman; the education of mankind must be taken out of the hands of the mother. This is the first step towards placing woman in a position from which the Catholic Church has not retrogressed since the days of Cranmer! It can happen only by her being penetrated by an ideal, brought to the guiding star. It can happen only if the categorical imperative were to become the moral. It is this: is it possible for woman really to wish to realise the problem of existence, the conception of guilt? Can she really desire freedom? Can such a thing be?

There is no absolute woman, but even so to say "yes" to the above question is like giving one's assent to a miracle. Emancipation will not make woman happier; it will not ensure her salvation, and it is a long road which leads to God. No being in the transition stage between freedom and slavery can be happy. But will woman choose to abandon slavery in order to become unhappy? The question is not merely if it be possible for woman to become moral. It is this: is it possible for woman really to wish to realise the problem of existence, the conception of guilt? Can she really desire freedom? This can happen only by her being penetrated by an ideal, brought to the guiding star. It can happen only if the categorical imperative were to become active in woman; only if woman can place herself in relation to the moral idea, the idea of humanity. In that way only can there be an emancipation of woman.

[We hope to give a criticism of Weininger's work very shortly.—Ed.]

"Divorce."*

Earl Russell, who is well known for his advocacy of marriage reform, has now published, through Mr. Heinemann, a thorough-going examination of the marriage laws that obtain in this country. The book is divided into fourteen illuminating chapters, and contains, besides, three appendices, and a Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Law relating to Divorce, Marriage, and Legitimacy." This Bill, it will be remembered, was introduced in the House of Lords by the author in 1902. The book further contains a useful table of cases cited in the text.

After passing in brief review the three modes of marriage practised in civilised Rome, the author deals with the effect of the Church's power in matters spiritual and temporal, finally quoting those decrees of the Council of Trent, "which deal with marriage and divorce, and which define the position from which the Catholic Church has not since seceded." He then proceeds to the quarrel of Henry VIII. with the Pope, incidentally vindicating the conduct of Cranmer, and cites those portions of the "Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum" that are relevant to his subject.

These proposals for reform, although never carried into effect, are of extreme interest, displaying as they do a much broader and more human conception of marriage than that which the Church of to-day manifests. The mere heading of one chapter is enough to show this: "Divorce on account of the too long absence of the spouse." That heading alone would now be enough to make a bishop's hair stand on end. Evidently we have retrogressed since the days of Cranmer!

In concluding his review of ecclesiastical influence the author says:—

"The relation of married persons and questions of divorce remained a matter of ecclesiastical jurisdiction exclusively for another 300 years, until the passage of the Divorce Act in 1857, and . . . even after that Act and down to the present day the effect of ecclesiastical tradition is to be observed in the daily working of the Divorce Court."

Up to this point Earl Russell has conducted a judicial and apparently an impartial inquiry; but the passage following that just quoted reveals the attitude he takes up later in the book.

"The writer considers that it is too late for
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any contention founded upon interpretation of the New Testament or upon sacramental religious views to be taken into account in any discussion in this country. It is perfectly true that these views are, and will be, responsible in a great measure for opposition to reform, but from the logical point of view they must be ruled out of the discussion in a legislature which has already created an Erastian National Church, and which has already provided for civil marriage before a registrar and civil divorce before a judge of the High Court.

After setting out the practice in other countries, Earl Russell proceeds to state the case for the reform of our own laws. I have no hesitation in saying that this statement of his case is the most valuable contribution to the controversy that has yet appeared. He shows the immoral condition in which an increasing section of the community is compelled to live through their inability to obtain relief for lunacy, life-long imprisonment and habitual drunkenness, and gives a number of letters from sufferers, which speak for themselves. In the chapter entitled "The Proposed Remedy Considered," appear opinions of the Press and of well-known persons on the subject. In these, too, the necessity for reform is made clear. Finally, he weighs the objections which are put forward against reform.

Taken altogether, Earl Russell has written a book that should be read by every adult in the country. It is packed with the legal knowledge necessary to a successful handling of the subject, but it is never tedious. It is a well-reasoned appeal for reform, never impassioned, but always splendidly human. Once the author frees himself from the technical side of the question he writes with great clarity and ease. Indeed, the lucidity of his style is felt from the first page to the last. I heartily commend the book to the attention of every reader of _The Freewoman_.

CHARLES GRANVILLE.

**Contrasts in Black and White.**

I.

This is a mad world.

The great church is crowded.

The ancient torn battle-flags are hung high on the walls, where the dusty red and yellow rays from the stained windows strike them.

The monuments of generals who died fighting look down at the multitude, among whom we see here and there uniformed soldiers from the garrison.

And the priest drones: "But I say unto you, Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you; and whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also."

Yet no one smiles—but the devil.

II.

This is a mad world.

In the congregation are great land-owners and millionaires, statesmen and magistrates. They sit content, and the rest admire them and would be as they are.

And now the organ peals forth, and the choir sings gloriously:

"He hath put down, He hath put down the mighty from their seats, and the rich, the rich, He hath sent empty away."

And once more the priest reads: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God"; and again, "Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them, but it shall not be so among you."

Yet no one smiles—but the devil.

IV.

This is a mad world.

The heroes have met together to proclaim liberty. They have just signed the great charter which declares that all men are created equal, and that they are endowed by their Creator with the inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Many of these men have slaves on their plantations at home, and the slave-trade is prospering.

Yet no one smiles—but the devil.

V.

This is a mad world.

For many long years the foreign slave-trade will go on, while men shout "freedom."

For many years longer men will buy and sell their fellows, and still shout "freedom."

And after the word "slave" has been abolished, still for many long years will men oppress their fellows and rob them of an equal chance to live, and still shout "freedom."

Yet no one smiles—but the devil.

By permission, from a reprint of "Plain Talk in Psalm and Parable," shortly to be obtained from Henderson's, Charing Cross Road, W.C.
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Correspondence.

NOTE TO CORRESPONDENTS.—While quite willing to pub­lish letters under noms de plume, we make it a condition of publication that the name and address of each cor­respondent should be supplied to the editor.—ED.

PRAISE AND BLAME.

To the Editor of THE FREEWOMAN.

MADAM,—Your powerful and elevated article on "Chivalry" is marred and jarred, for me at least, by the insulting reference to Mr. Bruce Ismay. I little expected that you, too, would have joined in these vulgar asper­sions, in this blind and brutal bounding of a sensitive and brave man.

It becomes increasingly clear that his conduct in the time of trouble was unselfish, humane, and brave. He entered the lifeboat only when every other passenger had been taken off that deck. Had he remained to die, he would have died, not a hero, but a mock hero. He could not have given his life for another, for there was no other. The boat would simply have left with an additional vacant place.

Madam, I suggest—nay, I aver—that you have not really considered the case of Mr. Ismay. I ask you to retract, nobly to retract, when you have considered only the present. But what of the past? What of the par­aphasia, he could hardly be prevailed upon to take food, or to transact business, because he was “obsessed” by the notion that he should have sunk with the ship.

E. H. VISIAK.

[We regret having to disagree so entirely with Mr. Visiak’s views in last week’s letter. We refer at length to the letter in this week’s Topics.—Ed.]

THE SERVILE STATE.

To the Editor of THE FREEWOMAN.

MADAM,—When the discussion on the Servile State began in the columns of THE FREEWOMAN, I was under the delusion that we were dealing with a problem of the future, first from your article in the issue of the 18th inst. that it is a problem of the past, that it was William the First who introduced slavery into England. That reading of history startles me, and I can only ask a few questions about it. How much Celtic, Saxon, Scandi­navian, Norman, Flemish, Spanish blood have you in your veins that poor William should be stigmatised so late in the day as a foreigner? If you date the introduction of slavery so far back as 1066, why not go a little farther back still—to Egbert or Canute? Why not, indeed, go back to the Romans, who perhaps laid the found­ation of the system of serfdom against which you inveig­le? Your definition of the Servile State is quite acceptable, but my own reading of history gives it a very different meaning. It is only now that the State is ceasing to be an external authority; it is only now that it is beginning to govern people for their own good. It is less than half a century since the men of England were first allowed, even in form, any continuous influence on the govern­ment of the country. Even now all the women are denied any direct influence. It is hardly ten years since the form began to change to a reality, since the will of the people did really begin to make itself felt, growing from a fickle voice into the dignity of a convinced volition. Before long I hope, and, indeed, believe, we shall be able to say, “L’Etat, c’est nous.” The big, looming notion of the State, as something which stands over and against individuals, as the child­ish delusion. The State will be no more than a registration machine, plus an execu­tive, with the difference that the machine will not sway like a weathercock.

That State, of course, will presume to interfere with your right to do as you please, probably to an even greater degree than the present. And with very good reason, for you have no right to do as you please. If you refuse to work, I personally should not have much objec­tion, provided that you also refrain from eating. If the cessation of work seemed likely to be permanent, I should probably have not the slightest reluctance in helping to expedite your dispatch, so that you should no longer cumber the earth—with me would not hesitate to forbid certain persons to marry.” Their children are ugly and weakly and expensive; they even threaten the existence of the State, that is, our existence. If we decide that something is good and useful, and you fail to persuade us to the contrary, and we put our executive in action—well, either you or the State must give way, and which ought, which must? To call that slavery is to give a new meaning to the word. The term would become applicable if the State, the organised people of the future, were to bow down to the will of an individual.

You are at least consistent in your individualism, but it often leads you to expound ideas that are, to me, at all events, incomprehensible. Your suggested course of action in a crisis like that on the Titanic is ingenious; but it has its disadvantage—the divided coun­souled of both sexes would be drowned, and the weak and cowardly would be saved. Surely a strange selection of the un­equal, and we real found too much of it. For the men on the Titanic—of the men who were third-class passengers—is not, I think, simply the chivalry of the strong individual towards the weak. It is a deeper, greater motive. The distinct government culminat­ing in a centralised government gave place to a centralised government culminating at last in local forms. There in very bold outline we have the two types of government: one where the mass of men are privileged, and the great mass enslaved, working from the pinnacle downwards. The organisation of the W.S.P.U. is a fairly accurate modern instance.

1. Poor William annulled all rights to land. From one end of the country to the other he said, “All is mine.” This was the birth of the people back slaves, therefore having no rights save at the King’s good pleasure.

2. There was slavery in England in Early Anglo-Saxon days, but it was very limited in extent. The mass of the people were freemen owning their own land, submitting to redistribution of their land as the community grew.

3. “Poor William” annulled all rights to land. From one end of the country to the other he said, “All is mine.”

4. The political institutions followed in the wake of these two. In a few short centuries, the organisation of the W.S.P.U. is a fairly accurate modern instance.

5. Paragraph three explains our clear division of paragraph two. “It is only now that it (the State) is beginning to govern people for their own good.” Well, as we say it is beginning to govern people for their own good.

Ronald J. P. Mortished.

[Our correspondent is evidently not afraid of provoking a historical treatise. On this occasion we are not to be provoked, and the following remains.

1. No problem of the future can be considered wholly of the future. It obviously has bearings in the present and in the past.

2. There was slavery in England in Early Anglo-Saxon days, but it was very limited in extent. The mass of the people were freemen owning their own land, submitting to redistribution of their land as the community grew.

3. “Poor William” annulled all rights to land. From one end of the country to the other he said, “All is mine.”

4. The political institutions followed in the wake of these two. In a few short centuries, the organisation of the W.S.P.U. is a fairly accurate modern instance.

5. Paragraph three explains our clear division of paragraph two. “It is only now that it (the State) is beginning to govern people for their own good.” Well, as we say it is beginning to govern people for their own good.

For instance, if for our good the State takes upon itself to expedite our despatch, simply because our “cessation of work seemed likely to be permanent,” and begins forbidding persons to marry, lest presumably their children are likely to prove “ugly, weakly, and expensive,” we should be fairly safe in prophesying a Civil War—or less melodramatically, an exhibitionary force armed with umbrellas and canes would be sufficient to bring self-satisfied people to their wits again. We point out with the most dangerous truth of the tyrant into the plural. “L’Etat, c’est moi”—there is sense in that. “L’Etat, c’est nous,” is beyond the limits of conception.—Ed.]

© © ©

REMEDIES FOR DISEASE.

To the Editor of THE FREEWOMAN.

MADAM,—As a woman worker in the City and having had a great deal of experience, I have often observed silently in the ranks of the toilers, that I earnestly plead for the discussion of a subject which is, to my mind, too much neglected, viz., the true physical development of the “Freewoman.” We have at our disposal the best-paid wage-earning women, such as are to be found in the Civil Service, are not, on the whole, to be so much pitted as women in other occupations, who are either worked to the ground in their thousands pitted against tremendous odds, with their physical strength for ever in the balance.

Very few women that I have come across will ever take the trouble to either think or study what it can possibly
mean if we continue to allow the present amount of ignorance on the subject of women's special physical needs to be ignored. Most young girls, working in unhealthy, badly-ventilated offices, shops, or workrooms, bear a heavy burden because they have to work long hours, and, in that state, they fly to any over-advertised "certain and safe remedy," with the result very often that the plight of the dim-witted young woman is worse than ever.

On the other hand, we must afford the luxury of going in for sport enthusiastically and keenly competing for all sorts of championships, medals, trophies because they are more technical to be understood if put into the hands of a fairly well-educated boy or girl of eighteen or nineteen?

Such young people, though they generally know a few at least of the facts about normal sexual intercourse, hardly know that bi-sexuality exists; and certainly, it warned in general terms of a danger, have no idea that what dangers there are, have to be guarded against. How much Marah and other sufferers are obliged to draw a veil.

It is with a hope that some help may be within reach that I write, your paper being, I believe, the only one in which such a letter as this would be printed.

NORTHERNER.

We have referred the above letter to Dr. Drysdale, as secretary of the Malthusian League, and he informs us that the League, while desirous of seeing a general knowledge of the hygienic methods of family limitation extended to all adult persons, has found it necessary to abstain from circulating any written information on the subject, owing to the misconceptions and legal attacks to which this gives rise; and it leaves it to its members to communicate such information by word of mouth to those whom they consider in need. 

Yet, that its members may be able to obtain the best information on the subject, a qualified medical specialist has kindly consented to supply it.

If our correspondent will write to Dr. and Mrs. Drysdale, the hon. secretaries of the Malthusian League, at 49, Kotherwick Road, Hampstead Garden Suburb, N.W., she will obtain all particulars.

THE FREEWOMAN.

To the Editor of THE FREEWOMAN.

MADAM,—"Women all saved!" Glaring posters bearing that announcement were everywhere last week. I hated to see it, to read it. It seemed to me a thing to be ashamed of, to grieve over. "Women all saved!"

But it was not true. We know now. The daily Press, sounding brass that it was, tinkling the cymbals of popular sentiment. It was titillating the vanity of a people whose ideal of heroic chivalry is, "the women and children first"—men who, dying, would cry, "Let the women and children first!"

But women are intellectually alive, though not "persons" within the meaning of the Act. "Women and children first," we read in the right hand column of the papers, for times when women were helpless, loving, dutiful chattels; their weakness claimed consideration. It is still a popular sentiment, now that men are more and more care and themselves, and men and co-workers, but, it seems to me, not a right one.

Men may have made their supreme sacrifice in this tragedy of the Titanic as a matter of course; women may have accepted it as a matter of course. It may have been a triumph for them, a national duty. Nevertheless, most we, with all that is intense, reverent, and worshipful in us, do honour to the memories of those who "did what they could," and went into the shadows. But women who claim sex equality, in common honesty, common justice to themselves, cannot consent to this formula of "women first," in moments when life beckons and death waits. We cannot, logically, allow men to die in wholesale fashion for the sex.

Economically it is unsound. We send our men to the wars, standing guard, to find our "women" and our sub-marines! They are buried in the bowels of the earth, the deeps swallow them. Men still bear the stress and foreordain the future of the earth. Yet, so our surplus female population, with its attendant cheap labor, is likely to keep apart for dreary years.

If our correspondent will write to Dr. and Mrs. Drysdale, the hon. secretaries of the Malthusian League, at 49, Kotherwick Road, Hampstead Garden Suburb, N.W., she will obtain all particulars.

THE NEW CHIVALRY.

To the Editor of THE FREEWOMAN.

MADAM,—"Women all saved!" Glaring posters bearing that announcement were everywhere last week. I hated to see it, to read it. It seemed to me a thing to be ashamed of, to grieve over. "Women all saved!"

But it was not true. We know now. The daily Press, sounding brass that it was, tinkling the cymbals of popular sentiment. It was titillating the vanity of a people whose ideal of heroic chivalry is, "the women and children first"—men who, dying, would cry, "Let the women and children first!"

But it was not true. We know now. The daily Press, sounding brass that it was, tinkling the cymbals of popular sentiment. It was titillating the vanity of a people whose ideal of heroic chivalry is, "the women and children first"—men who, dying, would cry, "Let the women and children first!"

But we are intellectually alive, though not "persons" within the meaning of the Act. "Women and children first," we read in the right hand column of the papers, for times when women were helpless, loving, dutiful chattels; their weakness claimed consideration. It is still a popular sentiment, now that men are more and more care and themselves, and men and co-workers, but, it seems to me, not a right one.

Men may have made their supreme sacrifice in this tragedy of the Titanic as a matter of course; women may have accepted it as a matter of course. It may have been a triumph for them, a national duty. Nevertheless, most we, with all that is intense, reverent, and worshipful in us, do honour to the memories of those who "did what they could," and went into the shadows. But women who claim sex equality, in common honesty, common justice to themselves, cannot consent to this formula of "women first," in moments when life beckons and death waits. We cannot, logically, allow men to die in wholesale fashion for the sex.

Economically it is unsound. We send our men to the wars, standing guard, to find our "women" and our sub-marines! They are buried in the bowels of the earth, the deeps swallow them. Men still bear the stress and foreordain the future of the earth. Yet, so our surplus female population, with its attendant cheap labor, is likely to keep apart for dreary years.

If our correspondent will write to Dr. and Mrs. Drysdale, the hon. secretaries of the Malthusian League, at 49, Kotherwick Road, Hampstead Garden Suburb, N.W., she will obtain all particulars.

THE NEW CHIVALRY.

To the Editor of THE FREEWOMAN.

MADAM,—"Women all saved!" Glaring posters bearing that announcement were everywhere last week. I hated to see it, to read it. It seemed to me a thing to be ashamed of, to grieve over. "Women all saved!"

But it was not true. We know now. The daily Press, sounding brass that it was, tinkling the cymbals of popular sentiment. It was titillating the vanity of a people whose ideal of heroic chivalry is, "the women and children first"—men who, dying, would cry, "Let the women and children first!"

But we are intellectually alive, though not "persons" within the meaning of the Act. "Women and children first," we read in the right hand column of the papers, for times when women were helpless, loving, dutiful chattels; their weakness claimed consideration. It is still a popular sentiment, now that men are more and more care and themselves, and men and co-workers, but, it seems to me, not a right one.

Men may have made their supreme sacrifice in this tragedy of the Titanic as a matter of course; women may have accepted it as a matter of course. It may have been a triumph for them, a national duty. Nevertheless, most we, with all that is intense, reverent, and worshipful in us, do honour to the memories of those who "did what they could," and went into the shadows. But women who claim sex equality, in common honesty, common justice to themselves, cannot consent to this formula of "women first," in moments when life beckons and death waits. We cannot, logically, allow men to die in wholesale fashion for the sex.

Economically it is unsound. We send our men to the wars, standing guard, to find our "women" and our sub-marines! They are buried in the bowels of the earth, the deeps swallow them. Men still bear the stress and foreordain the future of the earth. Yet, so our surplus female population, with its attendant cheap labor, is likely to keep apart for dreary years.

If our correspondent will write to Dr. and Mrs. Drysdale, the hon. secretaries of the Malthusian League, at 49, Kotherwick Road, Hampstead Garden Suburb, N.W., she will obtain all particulars.
duty to give precedence to men with obligations in respect to tender lives—seedlings of a new generation. To them belongs a place prominently. But lives that have to be apologetised for are not worth living.

Reversion of the old heroic order will be difficult? Oh, yes! There are always difficulties. No decent man, it is said, would consent to dismount from his old-world hobby-horse of chivalry. Not even for so short a time as would enable him to amend a little matter of suffrage? Really, a family man’s right, and of the right of unattached men and women to stand on an equality in said, would consent to dismount from his old-world hobby-horse of chivalry. Not even for so short a time as would enable him to amend a little matter of suffrage? Really, a family man’s right, and of the right of unattached men and women to stand on an equality in

Education in the idea, and action by common consent, will do all that is necessary in the near future.

Katharine Susannah Prichard.

THE TITANIC AND THE MINERS.

MADAM,—A few days ago I noticed in the papers that some dirty journalists made out that had it not been for the miners several people would have caught earlier trains and sailed by a different ship.

These fellows, having been base enough to connect the catastrophe of the Titanic with the Coal Strike, deserve to have the following points rubbed into them:

1. It might have occurred to these writers that if only the miners had struck a little more thoroughly and brought out the transport workers and seamen as well, the Titanic probably would not have sailed at all until the ice had melted. How would this have suited the papers?

2. The curtained train service was not caused by the strike at all, and that many companies were selling coal at 200 per cent. profit, while running a short service to renewable railway troughs.

3. It must have been noticed by everyone how prompt the miners were to suggest the obvious remedies for such loss of life as occurred on the Titanic—searchlights, more boats, less record-breaking. A committee of passengers was formed at once to get out a manifesto on the subject, and it is very gratifying for us to feel quite certain that greater care and more precautions will be made compulsory in the near future. The reason that we may be so certain is that first-class as well as steerage passengers and crew were drowned, and millionaires and shipowners as well as emigrants escaped in great peril. Death from suffocation and burning and by burial alive are the common risks of every miner, and the all-too-frequent occurrence. What is more, the miner dies not only in ones and twos, but in hundreds—as at Whitehaven.

If only a few mineowners and shareholders and members of the Board of Trade could be bricked up in the nearest Supervisory, the precautionary measures necessary to prevent great loss of life in mines would soon be made compulsory. Until this happens I fear all our pleading and agitating will be useless.

K. D. Scott.

TITANIC MORALITY.

To the Editor of The Freewoman.

MADAM,—The tragic loss of the Titanic may almost be said to have caused the senses of civilised humanity to suspend their normal functions temporarily, whilst our hearts are strained indeed to the verge of breaking to suspend their normal functions temporarily, whilst our hearts are strained indeed to the verge of breaking to the removal from our midst of the many heroic victims of this all too sad disaster.

Surely the shock administered should serve some good purpose, since to quote an immortal authority, “Not a worm is cloven in vain.” What this good purpose is may be discerned by our united mental efforts to fathom the fundamental truths of the case as it appears to our individual pitifully limited comprehension.

Who or what is responsible for this stupendous catastrophe? Who or what is responsible for the deaths of all he most dearly cherishes without apparent reason?

On all sides one hears expressions of criticism of this or that: even scurrilous reports and base misstatements of facts circulate. One gets the impression that many men are now known to have died in a manner that can only add a further lustre to the halo of mortal heroism.

No man is to blame! No syndicate or company is responsible! Is it not a spirit at whom we should hurl our severest anathemas—the inhuman, soul-destroying, body-ravaging, nerve-wracking spirit of commercial competition in this our age.

It is surely this belligerent spirit of a phantom supremacy that caused risks to be taken that have terminated in catastrophe. May I not be allowed to say that in my humble opinion, the life of man now is far more strenuous and possibly infinitely less free from care and anxiety than it was in a golden, untroubled age. The existence and survival depended almost solely upon accuracy of vision, fléteon, strength, skill, or strength of arm.

To-day physical attributes will not overcome men's most dangerous oppressors; it is our minds and souls that are attacked from every quarter by enemies whose presence cannot be detected by the highest cultivation of the powers of sense, or even sound of hearing.

Many captains of industry, directly the product of a commercial age, live two lives, a business and private one. We have not only new but traditional notions of the right of men to circulate the facts, and many acts of heroism, bravery, philanthropy, and gentleness performed by such men in their private capacity.

Can the same attributes be applied to them as business men? Happily, in many cases, yes! But in far too many instances this hydra-headed monster Competition drives all humanity, fair-mindedness, charity, and gentleness from the scene when he enters upon his business undertakings. Care for the thoughts, feelings, or even lives of others is banished as he goes on with his work with mindless, one-sided devotion to that which he himself was never yet worthy of the slightest effort of a moral or physical hero—Worth.

In closing my brief, and probably futile, analysis, I would like to draw the attention of those who may not remember them to some lines of Hood that appeal very strongly to me:

Not for this, not for that, not for any:
Not for these, not for those, but for all:

To the drop of blood, the penny,
Together let's stand or let's fall.

A. L. B.

THE POPULATION QUESTION.

To the Editor of The Freewoman.

MADAM,—Mr. Collins may perhaps appear to have convinced me of some inconsistency in the two passages he has quoted from my letter. I believe, however, that both tendencies to which I have referred exist—that any improvement in the condition of the lower classes in itself tends to increase reproduction (and, therefore, to do away with the benefit of these improvements), but that the increased knowledge and foresight, which improved conditions are to-day likely to bring in their train, will probably ultimately bring about a restriction of reproduction. It is, as Mr. Collins will no doubt agree, all a matter of knowledge, and the problem before us is: What is the purpose of increasing knowledge? The only difference between Mr. Collins and myself (if, indeed, there is one at all) concerns this question; and, I must confess, I do not feel at all convinced on this point. I cannot help thinking that if the Population Question were only to receive as much attention among the poorer classes as, say, Socialism, Tariff Reform, or Co-operative Home Rule (to do which I mean to imply that these and other questions should not be considered as well), the problem would be solved before many years are past because we do not see it, we do not feel it, and we have much attention. The Population Question is not intrinsically more difficult than many other questions in which the whole electorate now takes an interest, and it is certainly far stronger in its immediate appeal to personal motives.

We must remember, moreover, that even energetic, straightforward measures (e.g., the proposal that had yet been tried on a large scale) in fact, the majority of influences seem to have been working in the opposite direction. Revolutionaries and reactionaries alike have agreed in refusing to give the Population Question the attention it deserves. And it is this fact which makes me believe that it is desirable that, while we should not rehabilitate our efforts in other directions, we should,
nevertheless, devote a much larger proportion of our energy to Neo-Malthusian propaganda than has been the case up till now. Other methods have been tried, and have failed to bring about the permanent improvement that was hoped and expected. Why not give a trial to this new method, which is admittedly based upon the soundest economic principles? It is possible that Malthusians are in some cases rather too much inclined to suppose that "theirs is the only straight road to Utopia," but I cannot help thinking that they are amply justified in demanding that the Population Question be raised, for far greater amount of attention than it has in the past.

J. C. FLUEGEL

LAND TAKING AND ENGLAND.

To the Editor of THE FREEWOMAN.

MADAM,—Mr. Hunt now agrees that a field is made by man as well as an engine, and that the extent to which man collaborates with "nature" is only a matter of degree. But if you want to know what is produced by any one individual man, your task is immense. What does the engine-driver on the railway produce, or the sewerman, or the tax-collector (single-tax collector, if you like), and how do the labours of these men affect the value of the labour of the cultivator of the soil, and how are the products of the engine-driver connected with those of the labours of the labours of these men? What products should belong to the producers, but it is impossible for each producer to identify his individual product. What you can do is either (1) let every man take what he can get—the present devil's idea of society; (2) divide the total income equally; (3) pay according to needs—age, health, etc.; (4) get the Prime Minister to draw up a scheme for the organisation of society for different professions according to it; or (5) abolish private property rights, so far as is possible, and let each man take what he wants.

Mr. Hunt keeps on assuming that the single-tax would enable every man to get land in England that he could live on, and that he would thereby be independent. I have explained more than once that in that country country like England the land that would be available rent-tax free would be so bad as to be worth nothing. Unless Mr. Hunt will try to understand my fundamental principle, that he could enable every man to get land, I am not likely to be bamboozled with his "college manner " of another college-bred man.

A "FREEWOMAN" ?

To the Editor of THE FREEWOMAN.

MADAM.—We hear a great deal to-day of the "economic position" of woman, her "right to be self-supporting," human nature, and the relative working value of types shown in it at first seems obvious, but the extension of this to the workers is a very different matter. The pecuniary interest of which public attention was intelligently directed by Mr. Rowland Kenney's article on "The Brains Behind the Labour Reform College," May 2, 1912, "The Free Woman," is to deal with the problem of raising the workers to the position of the controlling class in society. It was the existence of such a demand which led to the foundation, twelve years ago, of Ruskin College at Oxford. It was the reality and coherence of that demand which led to the strike of the more "revolutionary" students at Ruskin College three years ago, and the founding of a new institution—the Central Labour College. Mr. Hunt in his professed aim of which was to turn out, not men with University diplomas, but "agitators and malcontents."

An army of college men, knowing what it is, a "college manner" of another college-bred man. It is quite to be expected that a culture more real than the non-worker, and reality is the avenue of real progress. Mrs. Adams already has given a short account of the "college manner" of another college-bred man. It has other advantages doubtless; but this is its greatest. In the college man is not likely to be bamboozled with the "college manner" of another college-bred man. It has other advantages doubtless; but this is its greatest. The only straight road to reality—real emotions, real forces—brings to earth the most elaborated schemes of phrase-makers. Mrs. Adams already has given a short account of the "college manner" of another college-bred man. It should be glad to hear more.—ED. D. D. D. D. D.
May 2, 1912
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her cry for "liberty in love." We have a splendid propagandist paper for the promotion of freedom of speech and action; enthusiasts rate on public platforms of "parastical servitude." But surely we are singularly unobservant.

It is only in a small section of the community that women of the "parasite" kind— to my mind, an unnecessarily harsh term—exist. Among the labouring classes, who, after all, are the vast majority of the population, men and women are self-supporting. A labouring man who entirely supports his family is practically unknown. The wife works, brings grist to the mill, and bears children too.

Womenkind is practically unknown. The wife works, who, after all, are in the majority, females are self-supporting, free to choose her mate for love. Has she unconsciously reached the goal towards which her more educated sisters are so eagerly striving?

C. M. THEOBALD

GOLDEN RULE ETIQUETTE.

To the Editor of the Freewoman.

MADAM,—Will the writer of "The Right to Love" (issue of April 23rd) forgive me if I bring to his notice, not in a vitriolic, though possibly in a manner he may consider as a يريد denial, the fact that for a crude, uncultured edition perhaps, but still a Freewoman, self-supporting, self-respecting, free to choose her mate for love, in a grown-up sense, appear culpable will be seen to any part of the human anatomy is likely to result in the development of virility, a characteristic not possessed in the same degree by women. The effect of the contact with the realities of life has given her under­

Rosalie R. Lewis

"DAUGHTERS OF ISHMAEL."

To the Editor of the Freewoman.

MADAM,—In your recent review of my novel, "Daughters of Ishmael," you say that the chief difficulty in the trade for a woman is that her more educated sisters are so eagerly striving for a position. "The chief difficulties women into their homes. And this is easy to understand. There is nothing more anti-social than the fear of infection and contagion, and these women suggest both that they are not under any circumstances would be especially interested in the kind of life which her more educated sisters are so eagerly striving for. Not many of us, and certainly not in our own houses.

It is true that few householders care to incur this "risk," but it is also true that the "risk" is far less than it seems. The girl that wants to give up prostitution is the girl upon whom the habits of that trade have not yet taken root. It is the girl that has just learned to love the trade long enough to be certainly diseased. As for the danger of so-called "moral-contagion," that, in nine cases out of ten, is simply non-existent. These things being so, I cannot for the life of me understand the prejudice.

There is, however, another side of the question, apart from the householders, and that is the prostitute's side. I think that I know something of the life of the average prostitute. It is my opinion that I have had a fair chance to observe the life of the average domestic servant. Con­sidering these two occupations, and considering what they do to those who live them, I think that the average prostitute is too good for domestic service.

Pray let me add that I read and greatly admire your journal. It is the sort of journal that would not be tolerable for women. Some of the articles are absolutely perfect,—for ten weeks, and that is an excellent proof of the excellence of true education.

Reinald Wright Kauffman

[Owing to lack of space, our reply to Mr. Kauffman is crowded out.—Ed.]

A BOOK FOR MARRIED WOMEN.

By Dr. Allinson.

The information contained in this book is to be known by every married woman, and it will not harm the unmarried to read it. The book is compiled from the case history of two hundred cases of the changes of puberty, or when a girl becomes a woman. The second chapter treats of marriage from a doctor's standpoint; points out the best ages for marriage, and who should have children and who not, and gives the best information in regard to children, as far as can be obtained from an intelligent doctor. The third chapter treats of the marriage of blood relations; and condemns such marriages as a rule. Chapter four deals with the signs of pregnancy. The fifth chapter tells how a woman should prepare herself for the act of child-bearing; the sixth chapter tells of the best methods of midwifery; and how to avoid them. The seventh chapter treats of material im­pressions, and shows that birth marks are not due to longings on the part of the mother, but rather to her poor health. The eighth chapter teaches how to treat the mother until she is up and about again. The ninth chapter tells how to treat the child, and how to avoid its death. The tenth chapter tells how to make the child happy and how to avoid its death. The book is full of useful information, and no book is written which goes so thoroughly into the subject of marriage and the rights of the child. The book is too much is told, so each sentence is a case for knowledge and power so long as sterilisation is an option, the book must be read and the book must be the key to understanding human nature and human character.

Dr. T. R. Allinson, 331, Room 4, Spanish Place, Manchester Square, London, W., in return for a Postal Order for 1s. 2d
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