THE IMMORALITY OF THE MARRIAGE CONTRACT.

There was an interesting remark in our last week’s correspondence, to which, owing to limitations of space, we had not the opportunity to reply. As this remark illustrates so well the point of difference between ourselves and those who have disagreed with us concerning the immorality of the marriage contract, we reproduce it here. “We are out against cheap women in any shape or form” was how it ran. It was used in connection with prostitutes and wage-slaves, but it illustrates remarkably well a difference in direction which exists between the two lines of advance in what is called the forward woman movement; between a certain kind of reforming suffragist and the feminists. A fight against cheap women indicates an effort to establish dear women, to lay a bigger price on them, an augmentation of price which will in itself guarantee good treatment and adequate protection. Men naturally value that which has cost them much. Property which they acquire for an old song they are notoriously careless of. They value horses, for instance, and look carefully after their well-being. The cost of a horse is considerable. Horses, or motor-cars, cannot be had for the asking. As property, they are dear. Workmen, on the other hand, are cheap. They can be had without the asking. And women are cheaper still. Hence, make them dear; give them that which, as property, will enhance their value. In accordance with the idea that women cannot be bought, is a very successful effort to raise the price of women. Marriage makes women a highly expensive commodity. By means of a bond which the whole weight of the community, religious, social, and legal, goes to enforce, protected by the marriage contract, a woman can only be bought into sexual relationship at the price of sustenance for life, during the lifetime of the man who effects the purchase. That is a price dear enough to satisfy any. Provided the married woman makes no attempt to reassert her power of fresh choice in the sphere of sex, nothing interferes with this claim of hers to maintenance. Such modifications of the marriage contract as are involved in judicial separation and divorce, for instance, do not interfere with it. She remains “provided for.” In the eyes of freewomen there is in the position which these statements outline fundamental immorality, for there can exist little difference between a cheap woman and a dear woman. Both are equally offensive, viewed as human phenomena. Both are property, and no matter how matters may be gilded with tactful deference and outward forms of equality, the position is one which to free people would be intolerable. That it is not intolerable to the vast majority allows of only one inference, which is that they have not the instincts of free people. To be well cared for and protected is not, therefore, offensive. If it were, the immorality of the marriage contract would be a self-evident proposition. As it is not, we reaffirm some of the
fundamentals of morality among free people. For instance, a person cannot be absolved from the necessity of providing his own maintenance. He may not so put himself into the power of another person or other persons, that his circumstances preclude him from being a free agent. He may not morally barter control over any of his functions. A birthright is not to be bartered for a mess of pottage, and a contract affirming any such barter is on the moral level of Antonio's contract to barter his own flesh. Again, among free people, qualities assert their own essential nature and exert their own authority. Love, for instance, requires as much scope for its reserves as for its abandonments. Its intimacies demand new modesties; its impulse to sacrifice everything, individuality included, creates a new fastidiousness that nothing shall be sacrificed, and because it holds that material things do not matter, it holds correspondingly that it must not be fretted by them. In short, there is in love a morality to protect love.

Hence, a contract which encourages persons to absolve themselves from the first necessity of their existence, laying it upon another; to barter the control of a human function; and to do this in respect of the same person upon whom the necessity of the first has been laid, establishes the triune immorality to which most of the sexual miseries which beset a complicated civilisation can be traced. A person may be in the position of being dependent upon another—a "guardian"—for maintenance. It would be an unpleasant enough position, but it would become fairly well intolerable if such "guardian" dished sexual exchanges in return. Yet marriage is merely this in legalised form. To assert that love is the additional factor to be taken into account is an assertion which aggravates rather than assuages the evil. Love is too rare, coy, and evanescent to be mixed with considerations of a person's upkeep.

Perhaps one reason why the unsavouriness of the marriage "deal" are so little resented is to be found in the fact that persons are unashamed of that parasitic form of existence which is involved in having an "independent income." There are so many women who, apart from marriage, make no attempt seriously to create the value of what they eat, wear, and get in comfort and pleasure, that they slip into the notion that what they use and enjoy falls like manna from a bountiful heaven, and that in marriage their maintenance will fall from the same beneficent source. When all is corrupt, the differentiations of more and less are barely apparent. Hence the difficulty in making a special iniquity realisable. We must, however, here deal with the specific arguments which have been advanced in defence of the marriage contract, the one, for instance, which maintains that a goodly number of marriages are the result of genuine affection, the desire for children, and the need of companionship. It is, perhaps, necessary to insist that we keep within the limits of discussion, the immorality of the marriage contract. We are not affirming the immorality of Betrothals, of Parentage, or even of Home Life. When, therefore, we are told that the motive which induces women to enter into the marriage con-
occasion to attack the marriage contract in itself. Here, again, the issue is confused. Divorce has to do only with the termination of a contract. It does nothing to alter the nature of the contract. If, as we hold, its nature is bad, the question as to its dissolubility is a secondary affair. The primary question is the rightness of entering into a bad estate, though only for ten minutes.

Mr. C. H. Norman points out what he calls a "most serious error" in that we said "a man can claim to conjugal rights over the woman he marries, and can renounce them equally elsewhere, without prejudice to his claims upon his wife," whereas "one act of adultery on the part of a man, without anything else, entitles a woman to a judicial separation and to alimony for the rest of her life." There is a technical error in the statement, and we are obliged to Mr. Norman for drawing our attention to it; but it can scarcely be called a "most serious error," inasmuch as what the correction involves does not compel us to alter our conclusion nor even, indeed, to modify the statement of our case, which was that, by means of the marriage contract, the woman sells out her sexual rights over herself to the man who becomes liable for her maintenance. Mr. Norman might say that if the man buys up the sexual rights of the woman, the woman is selling up the same rights over the man. Technically, this may be made to appear so, but the actual practice in the courts does not bear it out. Though, for instance, "one act of adultery on the part of the man" should entitle a woman to judicial separation and alimony for life, public opinion, judicial prejudice, and the like, all militate against a woman obtaining a maintenance. Mr. Norman might say that if the man, by the same contract, buys out the same sexual right, which, technically, is hers. For instance, promiscuous relations between men and prostitutes, public opinion condones in a man; and public opinion expects the wife to condone it likewise. This prejudice is reflected in the practice of the Law Courts. The following extracts from "The Law and Practice of Divorce," by Hardy, will show the reality of "legal" prejudice in this respect:

"Condonation by the Wife."—In Beeby v. Beeby (a), Sir William Scott said: "But the effect of condonation varies according to circumstances; the condonation by a husband of a wife's adultery, still more repeated reconciliations after repeated adulteries, create a bar of far greater effect than does the condonation by a wife of repeated acts of cruelty committed by the husband. In the former case the husband shows himself not sufficiently sensible to his own dishonour and to his wife's contamination." These instances are shown to be valid: the writer is not expected to be sensitive to the hope of infidelities. It is, we believe, extremely doubtful that a judicial separation would be granted for any promiscuous "single act of adultery." We think the case would have to be aggravated by considerations more likely to shock conventional morality, and a woman seeking for a judicial separation on the grounds of a single act of promiscuous adultery, would, it is highly probable, be told to try "moral suasion." Moreover, in view of current morality, a woman's conduct would be considered questionable in bringing such an action into court. The law, therefore, is, without virtue, similar to that which maintains the unlawfulness of a nursemaid to wheel a perambulator on the pavement.

The accounts of Law Court practice are profoundly instructive as to the legal positions which lie behind marriage contracts. They make it quite clear that such contracts are not those which are made between equals. They are rather those between owner and owned; this accounts for their intolerable offensiveness. All the protection a woman gets, she gets because she is property. The kindly offices which the law performs in protecting women are done in the same spirit as that which prompts the activities of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. They illustrate the common sentiment that if a man elects to own living property he must do his duty by it. He must feed it, be moderately kind to it, and so on; a spirit very estimable—towards property; towards free people, galling enough to rouse the spirit of mankind. The correspondent asks us to explain to what it would be honest and right to own all grades. A large number are property, and love to feel themselves property; others are only partially endowed with the slave-instinct; they are partially instinct with free-will. So the grades rise until we get the small but growing number of free-women: women who would prefer to close their account with life rather than accept the status of property. This accounts for a seeming contradiction which is not without wit, how it comes that, "if the writer's surmise that 'the vast majority,' in the future as in the past, 'will scuttle into the safe shelter of the house of bondage' be true, marriage can be dismissed with the remark that it is 'an institution whose dissolution is already at hand.'" The solution is simple enough. Many women who are only partially property have in-
voked the wide name of Freedom. They have been answered with bigger visions of Freedom and its responsibilities than they dreamt of or are mindful to accept, and, understanding the responsibilities of Freedom, they cry out, "Enough." They are too late. The big vision will stay with those able to receive it, and those who refuse it will never again recover their old innocence. Their condition will be deprived of the moral support which formerly they believed it had. Moral institutions are dissolved, not by the multitude, but by the higher moral consciousness of the few. A handful of moral, thinking, articulate freewomen are more than a multitude of the unmoral, inarticulate bond. In these things the battle is decided by rank and not by numbers. Moreover, even the strength which comes of numbers is being undermined by forces setting out from shifting thought. The divorce reform movement, while it will not alter marriage, will act as the solvent of that sense of permanency and security which is the chief asset of marriage. If marriage is not necessarily until "death doth us part," a woman must be prepared for changes and vicissitudes. And this preparedness will be a factor of incalculable strength. Prepared—a woman will more readily dare to adopt the attitude of a free agent. Another dissolving agent acting on marriage is the emphasis which is being placed upon responsibility to the third party, the "family," the child. The world-wide efforts to give the "illegitimate" child whatever advantages a "legitimate" child may have will effect changes of very far-reaching importance. It is, indeed, felt to be only as much as our actions affect a third party that law has any right to interfere in mutual relationships, and consequently the new law, asserting the responsibilities of parenthood, will be the one about which the forms hitherto clustering round the immoral marriage contract will gather. Christenings, shall we say, will then become the formal public event to which law administrators, busybodies, and ritualists can rally at their heart's content; for the keeping of the vows made then will have public significance. But betrothals, which will take the place of the aforetime marriage, will be mutual and private affairs, into which, unmasked, it is an impertinence for the Public to interfere. And even more so the Law.

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

Why Revolt Drags.

SOMEONE wants to know what Capital is. Capital is the limb of the Devil. Capital is Accumulated Money. It is not, therefore, the root of evil, but it is the starchy trunk, the leaves and branches of it. The root of evil is the malappropriation of land. Capitalism grew up out of that. "Capital is Money." Most people would object to this definition because it is understandable, and "Capital" is the favourite nucleus for economic word-mists. Here are a few definitions. J. S. Mill: "Capital is stock previously accumulated from the products of former labour." A Socialist reckoned in such a stock are the factories, the public ownership, the leviathan, the State, the public buildings, the free gifts of nature, which yield income that is used in the production of further wealth. Capital, thus understood, is not harmful, but necessary to society." It is small wonder, therefore, that out of these mystic definitions there should arise a respect for "capital" in itself, which induces Socialists and even revolutionaries to call it good even when they call capitalism damnation, and capitalists the blighters of humanity. This respect for capital is one of the most real sentiments of the "advance-guard," and it is because of it that the advance-guard fail to advance. They press back rather. This respectful attitude towards capital is an arresting phenomenon. It demands consideration, for as long as it exists there will be no revolution; and when it is turned into contempt revolution cannot be stayed. It is strange, therefore, that so little attention has been given to the function and nature of capital, that is, to money and its manipulations, before. When, therefore, the American revolutionary Syndicalists such as Labriola in Italy (we quote from A. D. Lewis' work on Syndicalism) describing Syndicalist intentions in terms such as these, "It can be imagined that at a certain point of its development the workers' union might hire the capital of the capitalists for a fixed return, and thereby manufacture and work in one mass or by constructing so many separate cooperative bodies, having separate and distinct accounts. And, finally, the federation of various Syndicates could become so strong as to refuse all return for the use of capital, and so become master of it without compensation," the conviction is forced home how little the nature of capital is understood. If the day which is Repudiation Day, the day when the masters are locked-out and given their congé, is not also the Day of Repudiation of landowners and their claims, and of capital and its claims, we might as well spare our labours. For the money-owners will outstrip all the producers of the earth. The manufacturers, the capitalists and financiers, are the leviathans; and the revolution which still leaves it possible for these to work in their own medium, in the accumulating and lending out of money for hire, is the essence of anti-climax.

Money in a form which permits of being hoarded, is hostile to the purposes for which it was created. Money, as a medium of exchange, was intended for exchange. Anything, therefore, in the monetary form which a particular currency takes, which tempts a possessor to hoard it, is something which disqualifies it for the useful services it was intended to fulfil. If the hoarding were done merely to please an individual's idiosyncrasies, as people hoard used stamps and old coins, there would be nothing wrong in the hoarding; a shortcoming would only be apparent if there were something in the nature and quality of the currency to put a premium on such
hoarding. (With the gold currency this premium on hoarding is high.) When the hoarding is done, however, with the intention of making currency difficult, and when it is scarce letting it out on hire for a consideration—as a state of affairs is reached which should properly be regarded as criminal, as it was in times when religions had moral force. Shylock himself would have been astonished to find his type of person the ideal of the business world.

But let us look again at our definition of Capital, i.e., Accumulated Money, and compare it with rival definitions, that of “Accumulated Wealth,” for instance. If we define “wealth” as “that which tends to satisfy human needs,” we recognise as wealth all those specific commodities, food, clothing, houses, railways, and so on, and upon considering the nature of the things which comprise wealth, we recognise an element which militates against accumulation, an element which makes the consumption, the using up of wealth, the lesser of two evils for persons who have the itch to hoard. Realising this, he became man—then Man became capital. For decays, materials rot, the elements disintegrate uninhabited dwellings. So money, which should be a “tally” to real wealth, something which should follow its fortunes, being created and consumed alongside wealth (its only distinction and function being that it should be more fluid and divisible), becomes not a “tally,” but an opposite, and it is just this characteristic in money which is absent from real wealth, which lends itself to the machinations of the capitalists, and makes the definition of capital as “accumulated money” truer than that of “accumulated wealth.” “Accumulated wealth” comes near to being a contradiction. “Accumulated money” is the foundation of the capitalist system. Let us take another definition. “Capital represents tools and instruments of production,” or—following the Daily Herald—machinery, with mills, mines, and railways thrown in. If capital represents these, it seems a pity that the term was ever invented. One could so easily have kept to the specific terms themselves, or covered them by the general term of “capital.” For since land furnishes tools, by taking consumption, the using up of wealth, the lesser of two evils for persons who have the itch to hoard. Realising this, he became man—then Man became capital. For decays, materials rot, the elements disintegrate uninhabited dwellings. So money, which should be a “tally” to real wealth, something which should follow its fortunes, being created and consumed alongside wealth (its only distinction and function being that it should be more fluid and divisible), becomes not a “tally,” but an opposite, and it is just this characteristic in money which is absent from real wealth, which lends itself to the machinations of the capitalists, and makes the definition of capital as “accumulated money” truer than that of “accumulated wealth.” “Accumulated wealth” comes near to being a contradiction. “Accumulated money” is the foundation of the capitalist system. Let us take another definition. “Capital represents tools and instruments of production,” or—following the Daily Herald—machinery, with mills, mines, and railways thrown in. If capital represents these, it seems a pity that the term was ever invented. One could so easily have kept to the specific terms themselves, or covered them by the general term of “capital.” For since land furnishes tools, by taking


War and Finance.

A
RE war and finance "absolutely antagonistic," as asserted by Mr. Normal Angell, Sir Edward Tritton, and other members of the Peace Society, or is it possible that, in attempting to destroy one illusion, these gentlemen are simply creating another?

The popular impression is that wars furnish unrivalled opportunities for personal gains too great to be resisted.

Not a little of Mr. Angell's popularity is due, I think, to his remarkable announcement that that which most people regard as a constant menace to the world's peace is one of its most powerful allies.

Needless to say, this "discovery" (if I may call it so) was nowhere received with greater surprise and ecstasy than among the financial circles.

There can be no greater satisfaction for one hitherto suspected of fomenting crime than to find himself suddenly held up to universal esteem and admiration as a model of virtue.

Upon what foundation does Mr. Angell's "discovery" rest? So far as I can ascertain, merely upon the fact that war means the destruction of much credit, entailing loss universally.

Mr. Angell and his supporters have fallen into the error of supposing that the financial world consists of one organisation, or one group of men, who have to bear any and all financial losses accompanying a general decline in prices.

The truth is, that the financial, like the industrial world, is peopled with thousands of fierce and active competitors, and the same conditions which mean prosperity to one member spell ruin to another.

Like the ocean, the world of finance contains both big and little fish, and an occasional storm brings the little ones more readily within the grasp of their bigger adversaries.

We have surely enough evidence of this fact in the two great financial panics of 1893 and 1907, which devastated the two Western Continents, and were both precipitated by a group of New York bankers, who emerged from the storm not only unscathed, but enriched with the wealth of their victims!

I maintain that Mr. Angell's "discovery" rests mainly upon assertion, and a careful investigation will convince us that it is as much of an illusion as the one he ridicules.

That finance engenders warfare, both international and industrial, may be seen from the following:

(1) The most important events disturbing the peace of nations during the past thirty years were:
   a. The Egyptian Campaign, undertaken by Mr. Gladstone.
   b. The Spanish-American War.
   c. The Boer War.
   d. The Russian-Japanese War.
   e. The Spanish-Morocco affair.

   Every one of these events had its origin in financial matters.

   The bombardment of Alexandria was due to British bond-holders. The intervention of the United States in Cuba would not have occurred but for certain American investments in that island.

   It is needless to say that Kruger's overthrow was due to the gold discoveries of the Rand.

   Since the publication of General Kurzbachkin's "History of the Japanese War," all the world knows that the investments of members of the Russian Royal Family in the Far East led up to that sanguinary conflict.

   Similarly, the Spanish-Morocco affair started over a mining claim owned by some Spanish bankers.

   Now, the only instance I have seen mentioned in favour of Mr. Angell's contention is the Algerian affair, which rests mainly on a mere rumour!

(2) Since no wars can be undertaken without the assistance of finance, the mere fact that war exists is a flat contradiction of Sir Edward Tritton's assertion that "war and finance" are "absolutely antagonistic."

(3) The mainspring of finance is interest (better known to our ancestors as usury). By this "it lives and moves and has its being." Anything which tends to increase the rate of interest, or the necessity for loans, without seriously weakening the security, is advantageous to financiers, whilst anything that tends to lower or destroy interest, or the necessity for loans, is regarded by them as injurious.

   Our National Debt, like that of all other nations, was created by war, and to ask whether war benefits financiers is the same as asking whether National Debts are advantageous to the money-lending class.

   During the discussion following the reading of Mr. Norman Angell's paper entitled "War as a Capitalistic Venture," before the Economic Circle of the National Liberal Club on January 31st last, Professor J. H. Levy said, "Were it not for war—international and industrial—capital would increase at such a rate that, very soon, interest would disappear. It is that fact which stands behind the disposition on the part of capitalists to favour what looks like a suicidal policy." It is quite true they lose in a certain direction by war, but they are between the devil and the deep sea. If they did not lose in that way, and the accumulation of capital went on in time of peace, interest would go down to zero, and the gains from capital would be extinguished. The question which the most selfish of them might put to themselves is, "Is it not better that we should lose occasionally by war than be snuffed out entirely by peace?"

   Neither Prof. J. A. Hobson, who followed, and who endorses Mr. Angell's assertion, nor Mr. Angell himself, were able to answer what I believe to be a complete refutation of Mr. Angell's and Sir Edward Tritton's assertion.

   My only comment upon Prof. Levy's remarks is, that so long as legal tender is restricted to a commodity or instrument the demand for which is greatly in excess of the available supply and so long as land remains private property, interest cannot fall to zero, no matter how capital increases.

   So long as wars are financed by loans instead of being met out of taxation, and so long as finance is practised for gain, so long must wars find favour in the sight of those who live upon interest.

(4) The very nature of our financial system is antagonistic to the interests of the industrial classes, and tends to industrial warfare. The system depends upon—nay, it breeds—increasing loans, the burden of which rests upon the shoulder of labour.

   Every nation is piling up mountains of inexinguishable debt, the interest charges upon which
limit the returns to labour, and is largely the cause of the present unrest. The payment of these debts, even if possible, would create such a rise in prices as would end in panic and revolution. There is, therefore, but one alternative to perpetual industrial bondage, and that is—repudiation.

Few people are aware that our National Debt has already cost in reductions and interest charges no less than £3,000,000,000!

(5) It can, I think, be shown that the tendency of interest charges on loanable capital is to increase at a greater ratio than the production of wealth, and, therefore, the system can only be maintained by the bankruptcy of individuals whose capital is taken to pay interest charges on other capital. This tendency of interest charges to outrun wealth production is at least one reason why prices advance whilst wages remain stationary.

Mr. Angell is undoubtedly doing a good work in trying to convince people that wars do not pay, but he will have to find a much safer and more reliable weapon for attacking the War God than the one he has chosen if he means to succeed.

ARTHUR KITSON.

The Economic Freedom of Women.

In order to make women permanently valuable as wealth producers, and to enable them to attain to even that degree of economic freedom now enjoyed by men, it is absolutely essential that the great bar to progress, the great burden adding to that already borne by those who do the productive work of the world, the dependence of grown women as well as of little children, shall be removed, and that mother as well as father shall discharge the duty of maintaining children. To bring girls up to earn a living, to train them for it, and then to arbitrarily draw a line of demarcation between their condition before marriage and after, is an illogical and preposterous position in which to place them. No wonder they are not inclined to take their work seriously, and who earn a comparatively decent livelihood before marriage, are faced with an intolerable position—that of a worker becoming a shirker. But that women have age-long slave tendencies and a well-developed liking to "clinging" and to "look up to" and to be "worked for" by a man there would be a greater tendency than there is to put off or to reject marriage, and there is already an outcry!

It is argued by some people (since we do not use plain terms when dealing with such "sacred" matters as this) that the wife and mother in the home is as economically free as her husband. Some husbands, indeed, aver that their wives have a monopoly of freedom, but there are not many men who have not at some time in their lives felt devoutly thankful that they are not women. The idea is that the wife and mother does give something to the community, something for which the community either does or ought to pay for. To those who argue that she is paid, one would ask, How? By her husband's wages, earned by taking part in economic processes? But if he is paid for her work, too, and she dies, is he therefore paid less? "No, is the reply, "but her work is necessary; therefore, when she dies, he has to get somebody else to do it." On the same terms paid to the wife? No, the work now has an economic value—low, but surely, since so much of it is done for nothing—thrown in, as it were, with the wife's body—and the husband now has to pay for it in money wages as well as food and shelter. To get it done on the same terms as before he must enter into sex relations, and marry again. A married woman dependent on her husband earns her living by her sex. The man's wages do not alter, whatever his domestic relations are. And the fact that he must keep his home, and to "clinch" the wife, is, therefore, as well as in health, is one of those necessary parts of a system which guarantees a livelihood by means of sex, so long only as the rules are observed and the women are respectably married, and therefore within the folds of the trade union. And if the man dies, what is the wife's position? If she is also a mother her responsibility is now doubled, and the upkeep of the home is her husband's, and her work, therefore, is more valuable than ever. But is she now paid extra for it? On the contrary, she must now herself take part in economic processes, in order to live at all, because, with her husband's death, her means of living ceased. It is abundantly clear that the work of the average wife and mother (and she of the working classes is perhaps the hardest hit of all) is performed for nothing, and that return to those who daily serve her, as thousands do, but as a personal service to her husband. It is not an adequate answer to say that a working man can only have a home at all if a woman consents to give him her whole power as a worker as well as her person. The Lancashire man is notably amongst the most prosperous working men in the country. His home and his standard of life and comfort are much higher than that prevailing among men who are the sole bread-winners. His wages are not less because his wife earns, too, and he is one of the most obstinate fighters for what he considers his rights. Why not? For there is another "man" in the house, as well as herself—his wife—and he need not put up with anything because the children will starve if he does not. Two are better than one, for they can help each other to rise. If women are paid—by means of their husbands' earnings—for "making the home happy" (which in most cases means doing all the dirty jobs about the house), how is it that other women who do nothing except wear handsomely—or costly—clothes and look pretty at dinner (which another woman has cooked) are paid more? We extol the value of the work done by the working man's wife, which we say is equal to that of her husband. But it is more valuable still to look pretty and to spend money. That is why the butterfly woman is so well paid? As a matter of fact, this aspect of our study will not bear examination. It is more clear at every step that it is the economic position of the husband which is the deciding force governing the life of the married woman, and that, in a strict economic sense, she has no value or place at all as a worker. She is "kept" for the sexual satisfaction of her husband, and earns her living by selling her sex, just as does her out-cast sister of the streets. It is true that she sells herself to one man only, which is an essential condition of belonging to the trade union and the necessary equivalent for life-long maintenance), and that the woman of the streets, who is not bound by the union rules, may sell herself to as many as she pleases.

The two classes (only) of women who do not come under that heading would be the women who work for their own living all their lives, and who
marry with that intention, or those women who are "economically free" in the usually accepted version of that term, and who have an income derived from the labor of others. The former class is so small as to be a negligible quantity, and to utter a woman already being "kept" in so immoral a way that their being "kept," by one man for his sexual uses only would seem to be a matter of which the iniquity quite pales beside the former sin. There is a difference between the two ordinary classes of women who sell their sex. Those who sell it frankly to any who will buy have no other obligations to their purchasers. But she who elects to be a trade mistress falls about our ears, and brings us now to the point where we are obliged to recognise that wives to spend on themselves. Again, our "reform" (oh, Reform! what crimes are perpetrated in thy name!) "right" to-day). "Oh, no," say the advocates of "reform" (oh, Reform! what crimes are perpetrated in thy name!), "we simply want to ensure that the work of domestic drudge into the bargain. If a partner in any business or profession dies, a readjustment is necessary, without which the profits and income will suffer. But wives can and do die every day, and the income brought into the home suffers not at all. A doctor's wife is not a doctor, an engineer's wife is not an engineer, a miner's wife is not a miner; and though each man may suffer much unhappiness at the loss of his wife his income suffers not at all—except that he may have to pay a small sum to have the jobs done by his wife performed by some other woman, and, in the case of the classes "above," the workers, that might quite easily mean a saving of income. Excepting always mutual obligations to children—which are not relevant at the moment—it is only when a wife adds her earnings to the family income that she can be said to be her husband's partner, and only in this case does she become an economic asset. 

But women are mothers! we say with hypocritical reverence. And surely as mothers they are an economic asset, as without mothers all economic processes would cease. Just the same argument is applicable to men as fathers, since now, at any rate, whatever may have been the case in prehistoric times, fathers are as necessary to the production of children as mothers. But nobody excuses them from earning their living on that account! But the work of mothers in rearing children which is incomparably greater than that of fathers, say the sentimentalists, and it is this work which is economically valuable. If that be so, why then do we pay wives who are not mothers at a higher rate? Since they have no children they have more of their husbands' income to spend on themselves. Again, our house of sentiment falls about our ears, and brings us now to the point where we are obliged to recognise that wives and mothers are really—and there is no way out of the disagreeable and distasteful conclusion—dependent on men. And to many people it is, instinctively, a disagreeable conclusion, in spite of the fact that most men want women to be dependent, and very many married men want to be dependent than otherwise. Sentinel men those who are usually described as "a decent sort"—would like to keep wife and children under a glass case, labelled, "These are my goods. Hands off!" And sentimental women, whose whole lives have been a negation of responsibility and initiative, much prefer to be "supported" and to have a comparatively easy life of dependence than an equal sharing of the work and marriage's penance.

But there is a growing sense of unrest, even in these quarters, and proposals are afoot, and are seriously advocated as a way out of economic dependence, that a wife and mother shall be paid for her work. Some propose that her husband shall pay her, and others propose that the community shall do so. These proposals are not really intended to mean that women shall be paid for loving their husbands and adoring their children, and for all the wealth of service of which that is an integral part. What is meant, in plain terms, is that the house a family live in must be kept clean, the family must be fed, the clothing must be washed, ironed, and mended, and that helpless babies die unless mothers come to their rescue. So as the economic position of so many men is of such low value that marriage for their wives means undertaking to be the husband's cook, laundress, and general bottle-washer, all for nothing, she must have a legal title to half his wages! It would be as reasonable to argue that, if the wife earned money, her husband should have a legal right to half her earnings (as a matter of fact, she is probably entitled to charge her earnings to her husband's property at one time, but few people would be found to defend that "right" to-day). "Oh, no," say the advocates of this "reform" (oh, Reform! what crimes are perpetrated in thy name!), "we simply want to ensure that the work of wife and mother being paid for her work. So she really is employed by her husband, and one proposes that the community should employed by her husband, and we 

...
and it outrages his sense of fair play that the law shall step in and interfere with the disposal of the trifles of money for which he works so hard. The majority of men are too good for this proposal to carry weight, and the minority are not good enough. And it is difficult to see how such an arrangement would benefit wives, except by publishing a fact which is hidden in sickly sentiment—that wives really are employed by their husbands. Unless the law regarding parentage, which now recognises the father as the sole parent of the child, were altered at the same time, the quite dependent position of wives would be altered no whit by such “reform.” And even if the law were altered, and the mother became the parent, whilst the economic value of so many mothers is so considerable, her dependence would not relieve her dependence, because the sum paid would be too small to enable her to keep her children. And a mother’s relation to her children is more binding on her than her relation to her husband. So long as he only provides for the children’s needs he owns the body and soul of his wife as if he bought and sold her in actual fact. Wherever there is a division of work, and she, she only, shall sweep the hearth shared by both? Be­there any reason why, because a woman desires to be a mother, and loves one particular man enough to trifle of money for which he works so hard. The necessity, of permanent advantage. It is, therefore, essential that women shall take a serious view of themselves, women must take their industrial and pro­fessional work seriously, and insistent on equal pay for equal work; and to insist effectively they must organise, industrially and politically. And a necessary corollary, an imperatively necessary con­dition of organisation, is a sense of spelling neces­sity, of permanent advantage. It is, therefore, essential that women shall take a serious view of their position as industrial and professional workers, and they can never do this whilst the bulk of them take no part in the world’s work, but are content to fritter their lives away either as domestic drudges or “ornamental burdens.” The conclusion reached, there­fore, is that marriage must not bar women’s work any more than man’s, and that men and women together must make that effective demand for a more equitable system of providing for the world’s economic needs than that which prevails to-day.

ADA NIELD CHEW.
"Shadows Out of the Crowd.**

ALTHOUGH inclined, like Mr. Henry James, to make a fuss about nothing, Mr. Richard Curle writes excellent short stories. It is his medium: as he has at present, my point of characterisation he would be intolerably monotonous as a novelist. As it is, this deficiency sometimes wrecks his stories altogether, as in the case of "Fire Within and Without" (which reads like the pathetic novelist. As it is, this deficiency sometimes wrecks type English Review his stories altogether, as in the case of "Fire London of mind trying to write a story for the level of Garshin rather than Tchekhov. But in the description of one particular phase of human existence—the agonising moments before the tides of madness break down the dams of self-control and invade the shuddering levels of the ordinary mind—he is magnificent. He describes it proudly but wistfully. "The normal has little creative energy, though it is the most to be desired because it is the happiest." The perception of the abnormal has widened his outlook as much as it has distressed him; just as the visit to a new country is worth while because of the new art and a new people, even though one has to pass through unimagined perils on the way.

At times Mr. Curle makes the mistake of writing of madness for the mad, which limits his public. I think I understand "The Life Illusion" which I first read it a week ago, at three o'clock in the morning after having had five hours' sleep out of the last forty-eight. But by broad daylight I cannot imagine what it means; nor can the eight people I have forced to read it. When the nation steadily refuses to pay out four-and-sixpence for a novel, which it dearly loves, it is not likely to stay up all night in order to understand short stories, which it so heartily dislikes.

But there is a real terror, to be perceived by all, in "The Crisis," where Somers sits alone in his flat waiting for the crisis of his mania to break over him like a wave of the sea. "Through all that flat, where every door was flung wide open and every light was scintillating brightly, there seemed to hover a suppressed emotion. Anyone entering at that moment would have known that something unusual was about to happen. So it is occasionally as if things could suggest dumbly the contortions of the soul." He sits in his library watching the men and women whom he knows to be phantoms walking quietly from room to room. His distress unconsciously sends out a cry for help to the woman he loves, who comes through the night to him. The sound of her knocking on the door, the words that she cries out, seem to him the last, the most penetrating, the last word that will come

*A* Shadows Out of the Crowd.* By Richard Curle, 6s. (Stephen Swift and Co., Ltd.)

start all afresh. . . . I saw little by little that my illness was slipping past my guard, just as sleep overtakes the-sentry though he is certain that he will be shot by the morning. . . . And I knew that I might still be saved. So I stood thinking and thinking till light dawned. There wasn't too much time. Light dawned, I say. I realised what must be done. I went down to the kitchen, and, collecting my energies, began to rush backwards and forwards between there and the attic. What's this? I see you looking at me again in that fashion! Don't you get away with any of your ideas till you've been followed! I am tormented! I stood and went down the stairs in the darkness with every faculty, every nerve, every muscle at full tension was to serve a purpose. It was to clear all disordered thoughts from the brain, to make it blank like an unused sheet of paper. Then it would happen as it happened in my dream—a sudden clarity, all simple, all plain. Do you follow? "Every longing, every desire, every plan do you think I hit on? I reasoned like this: I've settled it all." So he throws himself out of a top-floor window into his trim little garden, painted so gay by the sun. When they found him he had the semblance of digging treasure out of the ground."

This extraordinary sympathy with madness probably arises from the fact that Mr. Curle—judging from the two tales of childhood, "Our Quicksand Years" and "The Happy Past"—was brought up in that most eerie country, the Scottish Lowlands. "They began to enter a deserted, rolling country. On the horizon were rounded hills, topped by cairns, by stunted firs, by the open moors. Clumps of beech and young larch grew by the roadside, and occasionally across a field there would stand out a thick, black wood of pine, assuming the clear-cut shape of a gigantic serpent. And above it would be seen the white wings of wood pigeons gliding in the sun, as they wheeled over the tops of the most trees. Behind the grey stone dykes, the fields of rough tufted grass, the wastes of moorland stretched away with long undulations like silent, arrested waves. The Cheviot sheep raised their heads and stared at the travellers; the shrill whistle of curlews resounded from afar, seemed to sweep across the air, and, echoing faintly, to die away in the hollows of the Lammermours. A few rooks flew lazily overhead, now and then a rabbit lying in the bracken on either side the road would jump up and scurry across the track. And everywhere there was the stillness of an inviolable rest, the kind of untamable stillness of a primeval and changeless existence."

It is a strange, empty land, ribbed with gaunt hills. On the white roads that run straightly west and west between the wastes of black moss-hags and rusted heather benth with heat, one may for fifteen miles meet no one but an Irish tramp carrying home his bent scythe from the harvesting. It is a ghastly place, full of memories of dead peoples. For into the black, high cairns, where the 'little people' of Scotland have crept the conquered Picts; for many years afterwards the knavish black peoples stole down among their prosperous invaders, on malicious errands that laid the foundations of Scottish fairy-lore. That is why the Scottish fairies are so much uglier and crueler than the "little people" of England. Later on, in the Middle Ages, the Templars built their castles on these hillsides, and their chapels lay in hollows where now the grey waters of reservoirs lap over their hidden towers. This civilisation, too, was slowly wiped out.

The mystery of this land, whose edges stretch to

* * *
July 18, 1912

Glasgow and Edinburgh, is in the blood of all Lowland Scotsmen. It inspires them with a grief for the past which makes them incurable and sometimes maudlin Romantics. In their dissatisfaction with the present and its circumstances they set out for distant tropics, hoping to find their lost paradise. While, as a matter of fact, the indignity of modern life is largely due to the fact that we are all going about trying to get rid of these standards in various furtive ways, like thirsty tramps dropping dry bread down areas. On every possible anniversary Scotsmen herd together to honour dead champions of liberty such as Bruce and Wallace, although in the everyday world they act like slaves, even to the point of refusing to join trades unions.

This lack of interest in the present and its circumstances is shown in an extreme form by Mr. Curle in his determined refusal to consider the normal state of mind wherein most of us live. It seems to him as well charted a sea as the English Channel. That, of course, comes very largely from the indignity of modern life, which is picking his avertcd from his colleagues, patiently listening for the voice of a dignified Liberalism that died a little before Gladstone. Sir William Robertson Nicoll goes on editing the British Weekly, that most romantic of all journals, wherein he persuades a vast mob to rally like Jacobites round the old standards of morality. While, as a matter of fact, the indignity of modern life is largely due to the fact that we are all going about trying to get rid of these standards in various furtive ways, like thirsty tramps dropping dry bread down areas. On every possible anniversary Scotsmen herd together to honour dead champions of liberty such as Bruce and Wallace, although in the everyday world they act like slaves, even to the point of refusing to join trades unions.

The Signing of the Will.

MONG the papers of a country solicitor who died about five years ago there was found a meticulously sealed document. Its contents are unique, and at this distance of time identification of the real persons is impracticable. The date, which was in the early nineties, is omitted. The document runs as follows:—

"I think it as well to note down particulars of what happened to me yesterday in case, during my lifetime, some discovery may be made in psychical research which may shed some light on the matter. Without any belief in personal immortality, I have always found it difficult to conceive the instantaneous extinction of the human will and personality when the human body takes so much time to dissolve. The doctrine of Conservation of Energy seems to demand more than meets the eye. Thus, if a body is cremated, one finds a fairly exact equivalent in gases, water, calcined bone, and other materials, but there is no equivalent for all the force we know as human character or volition—often so tense and vivid at the very moment of vivisection and death. The same sort of phenomenon occurs, of course, if a charged electric battery is burnt. The chemical equivalent of the battery itself is there, but there is no trace of the electricity. Centuries hence both the human volition and the electricity may be perceptible by means as yet unknown to us, and my own experience seems to point to something of the kind. So also does the instinct of the savage to protect himself from the dead. I am at least convinced that some kind of volition may possibly survive bodily death, whether consciously or unconsciously, though, as this force is the highest function of the organism, it probably perishes before the physical substratum is completely dissolved.

"Such is my theory, and these are the facts. Yesterday I was summoned by telegram to make the Will of a client who was dying in a nursing home. On arriving there I heard from the nurse that he had sustained, on the previous day, an abdominal operation which not only gave no hope of recovery, but also indicated rapidly approaching death. He might, in fact, die at any moment. He knew this, and was only concerned about making his Will. From some chance remark the nurse inferred that he might have made some other informal Will in his own writing which he desired to alter.

"Without further delay I went with her straight up to the room where my client, an elderly, clean-shaven man, lay. He looked relieved as I came in, but his eyes were glazed and bright, and he urged me to begin at once. In all my experience of him I had never before seen him look so grimly set and determined.

"There was a fading sunset out of doors, so I inferred that he might have made some other informal Will in his own writing which he desired to alter."

"Without further delay I went with her straight up to the room where my client, an elderly, clean-shaven man, lay. He looked relieved as I came in, but his eyes were glazed and bright, and he urged me to begin at once. In all my experience of him I had never before seen him look so grimly set and determined."

"There was a fading sunset out of doors, so I asked the nurse to light up the pale little gas globe which hung in the middle of the room, to prevent interruption, and started making penciling notes of the heads of the Will. The nurse let in a rambler and a bottle of brandy on the table beside me, in case my client should have any sort of collapse.

"After naming executors, he began dictating various legacies in thin, low, but unfaltering tones. He was lying flat on his back, and I saw that it would not be easy to get his signature. He was particularly emphatic as to the disposal of the residue to a certain relative, and this residue would (I gathered) amount to about £30,000. He did not mention any former Will to me, nor had I ever made a Will for him before, but from his earliest-
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ness I guessed that some previous Will, the provisions of which he now detested, might be in existence. He then quietly remarked that he might die at a moment's notice, and asked me to write out the Will for signature at a desk which stood at the right hand of the bed. I took my paper and fountain pen, and concentrated all my forces on copying the document with as much speed as precision allowed. I thought no more of the dying man, and never turned round even to look at him. Just as I was getting near the end of the legacies I began to feel a sort of nightmare sensation that I should never finish the Will. It seemed, too, as if I were being oppressed by some terrible weight on the heart without being able to move or even to speak. This was succeeded by a kind of somnolent lethargy, much as if I had fallen into a nap after dinner. Suddenly I woke with a start and a feeling of nausea. With a hideous kind of astonishment I perceived not only that the Will was completed, but that it had been signed by my client, and the signature attested by myself. Simultaneously it occurred to me that I had meant to summon the nurse as the second witness required by law, because the signature would not be valid unless both witnesses were in the room at the time of the writing such signature by the Testator. I again looked at the signature. The ink was dry, as in the case of my own; the handwriting, though sprawling and shaky, was clearly my client's. I tried the nib of my fountain pen. It gave signs of vigorous and unaccustomed use. I have often imitated signatures to amuse myself, but this particular signature was not easy to imitate. All this time it had never occurred to me to look at anything but the Will on which I was absolutely engrossed. Suddenly I turned round to the right to where my client lay. There, along the level line of the bed, I saw, in the twilight and pale gaslight, the upturned tip of a nose, a gaping jaw, and a red stain on the sheets below. I wanted to move, but I could not. For some period of time that I cannot exactly define I felt rigid and paralysed in my chair. Then I seemed to get drowsy again, and felt as if some person or thing were standing just behind my right shoulder. I felt impelled by this influence to call the nurse and make her attest the Will, and explain that just as I had attached the seal it had fallen off. The nurse came in. As she signed I grabbed the brandy bottle and took a large gulp. I felt warmer inside, and vaguely realised that that Will would, in no circumstances whatever, be disputed. I had no personal interest in the contents, nor anyone belonging to me. When the old Will came to light I found that the residuary legacy in it had inflicted some little injury on my client. The operation had had to be performed at half an hour's notice to relieve an agony of physical pain, and he had probably only remembered the old Will just when recovering from the operation.

"I may think it desirable to destroy this record before I die myself, but the exact facts may be interesting to refer to while I live. They constitute a pretty problem for the Councils of the Incorporated Law Society and the Psychical Research Society."

[Our contributor desires to remain anonymous.]

A National Gallery Reverie.

W.E cannot now sever art from life. No real artist ever did. The artist feels; he does not reason. Like life itself, he works by instinct, and if his instincts are sound his work will necessarily be sound also, provided that he has trained his ability for expressing on canvas everything he feels. The artist who hesitates, whose critical faculty is exercised during the actual production of his work, instead of being bound up with his primary instincts and exercised subconsciously before the brush touches the palette, betrays himself in his work unmistakably. Look at Millais; look at Watts; look at the "British School."

Art is an inspiration for higher minds. The brain, chilled and jaded by the cares of existence, by sickness, death, and the commonplace routine of work and play, may find in art its invigorating medicine. Art, if the comparison may be permitted, is a stimulant for the higher sides of our nature; a medicine of which, if we would purify our soul, we must take periodical doses. Lines from the noblest poets may float in our memory; we may carry with us the recollection of some superb work in imperishable rock left us by Michelangelo and his peers; and in our mind's eye we may still see some beautiful painting or some striking architectural design. Yet this is not enough. We may stand on Ben Nevis or on the shore at Valentina and breathe the pure air from the mountain or the sea; but let us once go back to the capital and the effect is lost amid the smoke and roar and din of London. In like manner the mere recollection of works of art, however inspiring and lasting, is not enough. We must renew our acquaintance with the great masters from time to time; and thankful indeed ought we to be if we have sufficient facilities for doing so. Paris, Venice, Munich, Florence, Rome, may call to us; but if the Louvre and the Uffizi Galleries are out of reach, let us at least be thankful for small mercies if we live near Trafalgar Square.

For an artistic education—using the word
artistic in its narrower sense, and applying it to painting only for the moment—our National Gallery is not good enough. Spain, for example, is not well represented, nor is the Italian Renaissance "school," nor is Oriental art. Still, the National Gallery is interesting; and ample, even, if we have seen other galleries, and wish merely to keep our mind and soul fresh. We can look in now and then, pick out a masterpiece, and find something new in it—one always finds something new in masterpieces. At every inspection they tell us a different tale, they help us in a different way, they convey to us some new point of view, some new idea. And in the National Gallery there is one masterpiece in particular which I am never tired of looking at myself. I refer to No. 1172: the "Equestrian Portrait of Charles I," by Sir Anthony van Dyck.

Nobility, greatness, superiority, may be expressed in as many different ways as there are artists' thoughts. Yet here Van Dyck has risen to an uncommon height. Charles I. was to the tips of his fingers an aristocratic ruler; all we know of him confirms this. Being aristocratic, he was well liked: remember the story of the weeping House of Commons or House of Lords' debates—"DOUGLAFROC" (c/o "FREEWOMAN").
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I.
Walk with me down through the furnace-like street;
Feel the hot paving-stones under your feet;
Breathe the dead air; smell the vile human smells;
Don't lag behind though your stomach rebels.
Now it is night, and the sun has long set;
Still how his rays seem to blister us yet.
Woe-begone women, with babes at the breast,
After a day ninety-nine in the shade.

II.
Follow me now to the streets near the Park.
Palace and mansion loom up in the dark.
Windows are closed; in all the houses we have fled.
Surely this seems like a town of the dead.
Gone to the mountains or gone to the sea,
Palaces and mansions loom up in the dark.
Come, I've a latch-key, let's go in and roam.

As I look up at the stars, lo, behold!
Here they have left in the heat and the gloom
Palace and mansion loom up in the dark.

Soon will the work of a new day begin.
Houses as empty of life as the tomb.

Follow me now to the streets near the Park.

Interpellation.

TO MEN AND WOMEN OF ALL CIVILIZED COUNTRIES.

LIFE is evolution. The sense and aim of all evolution is perfection. The first condition of progressive evolution is the maintenance of the health of the race.

Viewed from this standpoint, actual sexual life shows us symptoms which not only hinder progress, but which threaten it in the most alarming manner. These symptoms are not merely a flagrant contradiction of the external brilliance of our civilisation, but are also violations of our knowledge of the conditions of evolution, gained by science.

We see that to-day the sexual life of all social classes is governed by prostitution, state-regulated and clandestine, that is, by compulsory sexual abandonment, for material profits. Sexual maladies, consuming the strength of nations, are rife, and in innumerable marriages baulking the realisation of the highest functional aims of the race. By hypocritically misrepresenting the nature of the sexual impulses, which are in our blood, we create that dissimulation and secrecy which forms the most propitious arena for the development of these diseases. By the association of money and love, and by the deplorable influence of economic interest in the choice of marital partners, a great and adverse influence is exerted against marriage, the most important territory of sexual selection. Marriage itself, as monogamy without constraint of the one or the other, is the ideal of the sexual union. But in the present conditions marriage is not estimated according to the advantages it confers upon the common life, according to its effects upon personality and responsibility in regard to the family, but according to an inflexible formalism. It thus forms a perpetual constraint by its systematic indissolubility. So sexual intercourse, out of marriage, was constrained to live in celibacy, renouncing human happiness and progeny, coerced by the social and economic considerations which marriage imposes on them. Thus marriage, nowadays, hinders evolution instead of assisting it.

So sexual intercourse, out of marriage, was created by marriage, and at the same time condemned by it. The girl mother is laid open to misprize and outlawry, and the "natural" child—harmfully alike to mother, child, and society—is laid under a ban, and often allowed to starve and die in neglect.

A great work is to be done in the sphere of sexual reform and in the care of motherhood, and in order to unite all the forces which are trying to effect this object, an International Federation for Mother Protection and Sexual Reform was formed at Dresden, September 30th, 1911.

Admitting that the attainment of healthy relations between the sexes and the idea of a higher evolution of the human race is not to remain the concern of one country only, we ask everybody— singly or in societies, men or women—to join us with their efforts in the fight against existing abuses. Without happiness in the majority of the cases, marriage is leading, in fact, to countless adulteries, and to still more, in thought. Thousands of men and women, in the prime of their lives, are constrained to live in celibacy, renouncing human happiness and progeny, coerced by the social and economic considerations which marriage imposes on them. Thus marriage, nowadays, hinders evolution instead of assisting it.

HELENE STOCKER.

The Executive of the International Federation for Mother Protection and Sexual Reform:—Justizrat Dr. Max Rosenthal, Breslau; Dr. phil. Hélène Stöcker, Berlin; Ines Wetzel, Berlin; Dr. med. Iwan Bloch, Berlin; Marie Hübner, Breslau; Dr. phil. Eduard David, M.d.R., Berlin.
Correspondence.

IDEAS OR NO IDEAS.
To the Editor of The Freewoman.

MADAM,—Permit me to clear the decks a little. First, I am one of the N.U.W.S.S., though an
official position, being merely on the committee of a
local branch. Second, I shall hope, with the Editor's
permission, to contribute from time to time to The Free­
woman, if I may have the pleasure of discussing the
question of suffragism as it arises, and in the mean­
time, as a means of learning what the more
insidious enemies of Feminism have to say—those who pretend to
vary warfare by undermining rather than by
assault. As the Editor has defended his separate
moral, and in the name of feminism, and therefore of suffragism—for the two are
their part in crystallising the thought formation which
will one day be the center of the movement: its final
ing, in essentials, an expansion of the life-force. It is
prefer warfare rather than undermine.

I am certainly a member of the N.U.W.S.S., though I
that of the principle of political sex equality, which, in
his letter to the editor of THE FREEWOMAN describing various erotic experiences are not
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CONCERNING THE IDEA OF GOD.

MADAM.—Your note on p. 155 of your issue of July 11th sent me back to a re-perusal of your article, entitled "Concerning the Idea of God," and what in it moved me especially, was the last paragraph in which you seem to have been leading the reader to the conclusion that each human being is not so much an individual at present, but is on the way to become the Individual. You say rightly that this proposition has an absolute meaning, and that it is inconceivable that we may not all be instrumental in bringing an undesired child into the world. They should learn that a child has two parents, because the girls at the least do not feel the need of it. In addition, the many girls of my acquaintance seem to be of the opinion that marriage under the present system is very undesirable. A youthful marriage is perhaps advantageous, inasmuch as the parents live to see their offspring safely launched on the world. The young wife is on the watch for dynamite exploded at the base of society as at present constituted. Each Church imposes a collective creed on its members; the State is thrusting for greater and greater power to limit individual freedom; custom, whether ethical or fashionable, depresses the individual and exalts the community. All this has been said before, and said better, but it is not the really vital thing in your "extraordinary article."

The vital point in it was the tracking of individualism to its lair in God as the one and only Individual in the full sense of the word. I am sure there is no need for fear. They are things of justice in any ideal sense."

Against the existence or, at any rate, the freedom of such codes of ethics and religious creeds and conventions are all made for man, and not for man, and it rules out for all who would evade the attempts of Socialism in all its hydra-headed forms to employ its physical force, and so by experience of the Many to become the One. If this be true, then all interference with this indwelling God in each of His forms is pernicious; and when we are so far endowed as to recognise him, such interference is probably the unforgivable sin. Your article will help to gain this recognition more widely.

July 13th, 1912.

W. F. CORB, D.D.

SELF-ABUSE AND INSANITY.

MADAM.—Every doctor I have met is disposed to think that sexual intercourse is a necessity, therefore an effect, and not the cause, of insanity. Those who put the cart before the horse are usually quacks with electric belts and patent medicines to sell. All these topics—particularly that of a presumably diagnostic and undoubtedly diagnostic—treated in Mr. Havelock Ellis's last volume, entitled "Sex and Society." After reading this volume, it may be profitable to discuss these matters, but I doubt if it is worth doing so before reading it. A. B.

"WHAT IS JUSTICE?"

MADAM.—Under the above heading, Dr. Whitby says: "It is, in my opinion, a tenable position that there are certain actions and even certain agents which and who cannot safely be tolerated by any community, and that, consequently, the community, on grounds of mere self-preservation, is practically compelled to take precautions against the commission or repetition of such actions, and against the existence or, at any rate, the freedom of such agents. But there are actions of expediency, not of justice in any ideal sense."

Will Dr. Whitby give his reasons for thinking that justice is anything but society's method of preventing those actions which it conceives to be harmful to itself, or, in other words, why justice is other than expediency?

July 6th, 1912.

S. E. HADDEN.

CHILD MARRIAGES.

MADAM.—I cannot help thinking that Miss Oliver is judging Mr. Woods rather harshly. In reading his article, I found nothing to incite her passionate outburst, nothing, indeed, to suggest that she seems to have had any more correspondence with him, which, perhaps, gives her some ground for this explosion. Like herself, I think child-marriages undesirable, and I am sure there is no need for fear. They are things of the past. We have all heard from our grandparents of the good old times, when girls did not ask embarrassing questions about sexual matters, of the meek and dutiful way they allowed themselves to be bartered in the marriage market, and even the young women who charged themselves through a pitious series of shocks. That has all gone. Our girls to-day have an intelligent, persistent curiosity, and this, with their education and economic independence, serve to safeguard the ethics of spiritual happiness and holy motherhood, with its God-sent babies and domineering husbands.
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identical with the similar desire with them, and quite a different thing to the desire for a child.

Girls should be taught that it is immoral to live with a man whom they no longer desire, because he happens to be the father of a child. They should be taught that self-respect is better by far than self-sacrifice. They should be taught that these opinions, experiences, and suggestions; and in view of arriving at something, I pass on my paper every week to others who need the necessity for it.

Another correspondent puts forward a suggestion which is very acceptable to independent women. The State regulation of marriage is as repulsive as the State regulation of prostitution; in fact, it is the same thing. I and others of my class feel assured that we are capable of choosing our own mates and the fathers of our children. We do not need the State there. That the State should recognise our children is a different thing; but, at the same time, we know that they are not entirely ours, and we have hopes that the fathers feel some ties of relationship.

I think he will find that most women contemplating child-bearing do so from selfish reasons. The country does not come in at all. The individual does, to this extent—that the woman knows well that the child she may have will not be accepted as a child of the State for all the reservations that we are to see to; and, to say the least, thinking women will not encourage their children to take up the trade of butchery. They may be the first of their children will be by that time think less of country, and more of the world and humanity.

These suggestions of remedies for prostitution show that the readers of the Free Woman do not accept prostitution as inevitable. In concluding, may I say that "A Plea for Marriage Reform is so moderately framed that it is acceptable to many who are too advanced in our language, having a common and definite meaning. You may call saved-up wealth, functioning to produce, and capital is a Latin word which conveyed much the same meaning long before our present capitalistic system commenced. It is useless to say "we do not accept this definition of capital," i.e., "the tools of production," and to the word in our language, having a common and definite meaning. You may call saved-up wealth, functioning to produce, and capital is a Latin word which conveyed much the same meaning long before our present capitalistic system commenced. It is useless to say "we do not accept this definition of capital," i.e., "the tools of production," and to the word in our language, having a common and definite meaning.

Another correspondent suggests that a writer in the Free Woman is apt to write for themselves, forgetting all about the people whose surroundings will not enable them to look too far ahead.

CAPITAL.

Capital.—Capital is a Latin word which conveyed much the same meaning long before our present capitalistic system commenced. It is useless to say "we do not accept this definition of capital," i.e., "the tools of production," and to the word in our language, having a common and definite meaning.

You may call saved-up wealth, functioning to produce, and capital is a Latin word which conveyed much the same meaning long before our present capitalistic system commenced. It is useless to say "we do not accept this definition of capital," i.e., "the tools of production," and to the word in our language, having a common and definite meaning.

COOKING AND DRUDGERY.

Madam.—In answer to your correspondent of July 4th, there is not much further to be said.

The opening remark of her letter point to the question, what exactly constitutes "drudgery"? Probably there are no two individual minds which place an exactly similar value upon the work. To a woman of what I hope we may term, without offence, the primitive type of mind, housewifery may not be drudgery. She is perhaps quite happily engrossed in the interests of merely living from day to day, and she may enjoy doing housework for its own sake. Intellectual minds, also, may be so constituted as to enjoy making a study of the art of cooking and serving meals.

If, however, this latter class of persons were limited to this department entirely, they would soon come to consider it as anathema maranaetha. There is urgent need for this subject. The State has no claim to pecuniary remuneration, and no holidays whatsoever. Where a large family has to be waited upon at meal-times it is often half-starved—or perhaps even more than half-starved. For the lack of fresh air, and the weariness of her limbs, together with an inappreciable home atmosphere of nagging and grumbling, often nauseate her from food when it proves obtainable.

Legalised Prostitution.

Madam,—It is doubtful whether any woman would welcome the suggestion of a writer in the Free Woman, Mr. Richard Tayleur. What revolts so many of us against the marriage-tie is that it so often means children begotten of parents indifferent to each other. Mr. Tayleur's arrangement is far more than this, for the marriage pair may be supposed to have once been attracted by each other. Their first-born at least did stand some chance of being decently brought up.

Men and women should be celibate save when under the influence of a great passion. Marriage is disgraceful inasmuch as it is simply legalised prostitution. Encourage marriage, by women and men, to banish artificial passions when they ought to be chaste. And even as these artificial passions are but shadows of the real thing, so the children that come to life in these conditions are but shadows of the real thing. One of the writers of the Elizabethan age asks why it is that the "love-child"—with everything against it apparently—is yet stronger, handier, and more easily recognized in the present than in all great enterprises. The women that Mr. Tayleur mentions have, most of them, loved and "been beloved again," and then been inured to the idea that they long for had "respectability" barred the way.

If women are once free, there will be no more of these unhappy ones. Most of the women who say they care nothing about it—will have once cared when they have not had the opportunity of meeting kindred souls. How limited an acquaintance many well-do-to women have of men in the streets—"with the kindred does not belong to Grand's "Beth Book." This, however, is their own fault nowadays, for the world is now open to them, and they need no longer sit in a corner with folded arms. With respect to the suggestions of other correspondents for Co-operative Housekeeping, I should like to add mine, which is that buildings devoted to this purpose should be arranged in each city, that each room be indicated by a separate flat, and respect each other's "Outs." How many household couples would have loved each other all their lives had they been free to be alone when they wished—had they not been linked together by a short chain, like the dogs in Hogarth's "Marriage à la Mode" picture?

Meals should be served in the flats, if preferred, and this should not entail hot viands being served lukewarm or cold. In University towns hot meals can be served streets away. A proper hot-water apparatus, hot water
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dishes, and tin covers would obviate this sort of folly. The restaurant below should be laid out with separate small tables, and not the long, narrow ones beloved of boarders. One meal a day only should be served, and the housekeeper should be sure to have enough to call their souls their own. Tea should be made by each person in his or her own flat. The "tea-things" could be collected and washed up at the one great wash-up after dinner—which means the evening, after the work of the day is done. The work of the housekeeper and her maid would not, of course, be done by themselves. They need not work five hours at the least, which is three hours more than the many nurses have, though cooped up in sick-rooms.

A good breakfast and a good dinner, with a tea of biscuits, would provide the man's food. In a family similar to those of last century "supported" themselves and would be self-supporting. As a matter of fact, this phrase, "self-supporting," has only himself to keep. He can live fairly comfortably and not the long, narrow ones beloved of boarders. One meal a day only should be served, and the housekeeper should be sure to have enough to call their souls their own. Tea should be made by each person in his or her own flat. The "tea-things" could be collected and washed up at the one great wash-up after dinner—which means the evening, after the work of the day is done. The work of the housekeeper and her maid would not, of course, be done by themselves. They need not work five hours at the least, which is three hours more than the many nurses have, though cooped up in sick-rooms.
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TRIPOLI AND YOUNG ITALY
By CHARLES LAPWORTH in collaboration with HELEN ZIMMERN. Fully Illustrated. 10s. 6d. net.
A LARGE ORDER FOR COPIES OF "TRIPOLI AND YOUNG ITALY" HAS BEEN RECEIVED FROM THE ITALIAN GOVERNMENT THAT IT MAY DISTRIBUTE THEM AMONG ITS EMBASSIES AND CONSULATES. The Italian Prime Minister has written officially to the author expressing his congratulations and thanks for a book which he describes as "a veritable act of homage to the truth . . . a book which will make all fair-minded people realise the sincerity and righteousness of the new manifestation of vitality on the part of the Italian Nation."

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA: For the Enlightenment of John Bull
By BARON VON TAUBE. 5s. net.
"Baron von Taube has the faculty of keen observation, not altogether superficial, and the rare gift of expressing his conclusions convincingly and with the saving grace of humour."—LITERARY WORLD.
"Tactful and interesting eulogy of the United States takes a form which makes it peculiarly effective."—SCOTSMAN.

FROM THEATRE TO MUSIC HALL
By W. R. TITTERTON. 3s. 6d. net.
"How admirably he describes and analyses the work of many of the actors and dancers of the day. The book is certainly quite a brilliant picture of its side of London life, and to say that it does not contain a dull page underrates badly its extraordinary vivacity."—OBSERVER.
"A most vivacious volume . . . a second edition of the book which seems sure to be called for."—PALL MALL GAZETTE.

READY SHORTLY
THE DOCTOR AND HIS WORK. With a Hint of his Destiny and Ideals. By CHARLES J. WHITBY, M.D. 3s. 6d. net.
In this book the author has reviewed the existing position of the doctor and indicated the signs of a new sociological era in which he will be called upon to accept new and important functions.

THE CONSUMER IN REVOLT
By Mrs. BILLINGTON-GREIG. 1s. net.
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