A NEW ARISTOCRACY.

"WHAT is it that makes American novels so interesting?" said a literary friend of mine the other day. "Why not say right out," I asked him, "Why are novels by American women so interesting?" For the truth is, if America contained nothing but her commercial riches and her gifted women that country would be one of the most phenomenal since the earliest records of civilisation.

It is futile now to ask why women want this, that, or the other thing. Anyone who takes the time to read can soon find out. Even since the time when Harriet Beecher Stowe astonished the world with "Uncle Tom's Cabin," women in literature have been going from triumph to triumph. I have lately been refreshing my mind and my memory by reading again, and, it seemed to me, with a greater zest than ever, some of the big books in my possession dealing with the work and the intellectual powers of the women pioneers in the "Women's Rights Cause." The list of the names is formidable of itself, and if I were to deal with each one separately, even in short biographical notices, it would require a book, and I may say in passing, the right kind of book has not yet been written dealing with the subject. I am probably the only writer living, born in England, who can say he has personally known most of the women in the long list of the gifted pioneers in the great latter-day movement. Reading over again accounts of the intellectual, political, and social battles fought and won by these American women, I am amazed at the ignorance and stolid indifference shown by men in this country touching that cause. And just here I want to attract attention to an exceedingly important fact in connection with the whole "Women's Movement," which is this: Up till recent years men novelists, men writers, and men editors paid no serious attention to what these pioneer women did or said. They considered the subject as being merely ephemeral in character; men would not or could not understand. But now comes a new force in the Women's Movement, namely, the women novelists, the women short-story writers, the women literary artists, the women who can think as well as write, the women who have ceased to be merely sentimental, the women who can reason as well as feel. Male novelists did not expect such a literary force entering their ranks just at a time when Zola realism had affixed its minotaur seal to the European novel, when writing looked so easy, so natural, so commercial, so profitable. They never dreamed of such an event. What, after all, could these American women novelists do or say to make an impression on European culture? A great gulf separated the American woman writer from the European reader, a distance of three thousand miles in geography, a still greater distance in the realm of the mind, in habits, in thought, in politics, in religion, in atmospheric environment. Such a thing as American women rivalling English writers of fiction was not entertained by anyone here, until it was seen that a considerable section of the more cultured and critical British public began to take serious notice of novels written by American women. Then came a change. American women had come into the arena of literature, sociology, and politics. And they had come to stay. They entered the arena equipped with more than enough to ensure, not only victory on their own ground,
but victories far beyond the lines drawn by sectional and geographical limitations. Now, what first surprised writers and critics in England was the realistic character of the novels by American women. Not only did they meet the European realists on their own ground, they surpassed them by adding to the old, easy-going realism of mere power something far more significant and vital; they brought to the novel that psychic atmosphere without which all literature is but a sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal. Clearly, the realistic novelists of Europe lost all psychic feeling and poetic vision with the advent of Zola.

When George Sand began his career as a writer. This was under the Second Empire. Romance and realism began to clash. Georges Sand was much more romantic and sentimental than realistic, but she never attained the impeccable atmospheric intensity and charm displayed in the works of her friend, Gustave Flaubert. Her work had in it much more enthusiasm and emotion than reasoned art and realistic truth. She worked by impulse. Her illustrious predecessor, Madame de Staël, was all unrestrained enthusiasm. "Corinne" overflows with torrents of ecstatic exclamations and invocations, which come perilously near hysterics. On the other hand, in the creation of a mystical atmosphere, in which two personalities are seen as in a mirror of transcendent magic, Emily Brontë has never been equalled by any writer, living or dead. But "Wuthering Heights" is a novel which is limited in its action and in its environment to a local setting. It does not touch any group of subjects in the vast moving world in which artists and thinkers find themselves to-day. It is a mystic jewel apart.

The thing called modern realism was invented by sentimental men to hide the paucity of their creative faculties. Never in woman's history have women been so intellectually positive as they are now, never so psychically sensitive; for it is now the women who are the real realists. While men are giving their chief attention to analysis of causes of things, particularly American women, are presenting character framed in that atmosphere of psychic reality which men who are not poets find it impossible to achieve. Thus, by their conception of a real realism have women of the present day capitvated all minds who have the moral courage to admit that they feel to be true. One of the causes of England's pessimism is the void left by a blank realism invented by men without the true insight of the artist. Materialism is one of the results of this false outlook on life, and the more women of talent oppose pessimism and negation in philosophy and literature the quicker they will achieve their full rights. Women are now our ruling aristocrats.

When "Uncle Tom's Cabin" appeared in England Lord Palmerston said: "I have not read a novel for thirty years, but I have read that book three times, not only for the story, but for the statesmanship of it." Lord Cockburn declared: "Mrs. Stowe accomplished more for humanity than was ever before accomplished by any single book of fiction." When, during the Civil War, Mrs. Stowe called at the White House, Abraham Lincoln looked at her a moment and then coolly said: "So you are the little woman who brought on this great war!"

Just as women are taking the novel out of the hands of men, so will they soon take power from the hands of the agnostics and know-nothings in politics and other spheres of ambition. As men become more negative and non-creative, as they become more pessimistic and neurotic, as they become more arrogant and vain of their material successes, women will step in and, without any fuss, assume the mantle of power that has fallen from man. There is no other way out. England is now the most pessimistic nation in the world. The reason why America is a land of hope lies in the fact that women there are coming by their own and taking the place of the tired agnostics, who are incapable of maintaining leading positions when such positions are thrust upon them. People who live in an atmosphere of neurotic doubt are bound to find their efforts failures. The negations are doomed in advance.

Speaking of real realism reminds me of a book I have been reading, entitled "Lost Borders," by Mrs. Mary Austin. In this book I was introduced to a kind of realism absolutely new to me, where natural forces of nature, profound feeling which never even approaches the sentimental, imagination controlled by a powerful and reasoning intellect, all work together to produce one great and haunting sensation in the mind of the wondering reader. The short story in this book, entitled "The Readjustment," is certainly in its own sphere the greatest short story I have ever read. No one but a poet and a practical, keen observer of life, both animate and inanimate, could have written such a story. The naturalists, the romanticists, the sentimentalists, or a cynical agnostic, such a story would prove but a trap set for a failure. Mrs. Austin brings to her work an absolute independence and an authority based on her own conscious ability to create. She overcomes the most subtle and complex difficulties. I have now read all her works, and they have served to convince me, once for all, of the vital importance of woman's work and woman's power at this critical juncture in the march of the thing we call civilization.

When I realise that it is women like Mary Austin who have set their intellectual powers to work on the side of the Women's Movement everywhere, all doubts as to the triumph of their cause are at an end. A few more years of effort will usher in the victory.

FRANCIS GRIERSON.

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

Interest.

It is obvious that any newspaper discussion of the interest problem must necessarily be unsatisfactory, because of the vastness of the subject, on the one hand, and the limits of time and space on the other. The fruitfulness of the subject as a topic of controversy is evidenced by the hundreds — if not thousands — of volumes written both against and in defence of the system.
a simpler and infinitely cheaper exchange and credit system than that which has been foisted upon us by these precious Acts of Parliament. What is interest? It is a charge made for the use of money or credit, after all risk of non-payment of the loan is eliminated. It is not in any sense an insurance charge against risk.

As I have shown in my work, "The Money Problem," when one seeks a loan from a bank or moneylender, ample security is first demanded, and if there be any doubt as to one's ability to repay the loan at a future time, it is refused! The problem, as usually stated, is this: "Why should a man who lends his wealth to others be able to draw a continuous revenue without ever reducing or encroaching on the sum loaned?"

"Why should naturally perishable and barren goods be made fruitful and given the principle of immortal life?" The answer is, that this immortality is not bestowed upon the goods loaned—(even legislation cannot perform this miracle)—but upon the obligation which is fastened round the neck of the unfortunate borrower and his legal heirs for ever—until the loan is repaid! Legal tender laws have made it possible for the owners of perishable goods to transform them into, or, rather, exchange them for, legal claims upon posterity.

Although borrowed wealth has to be consumed or destroyed in order that it may be available in creating more wealth, the legal act of borrowing entails virtual slavery for debtors, who are compelled to pay the equivalent of the sum borrowed over and over again without reducing the amount of the debt by one penny! This country, for instance, has paid its National Debt and the interest charges several times over, and yet it amounts to more than it did over a century ago!

The question naturally arises, "Why should borrowers agree to pay interest charges?" The reply is, that our monetary laws having made the possession or ability to procure money an absolute necessity, and having also stipulated that it shall consist of a certain metal or certain certificates (gold), that is, ensuring for it at all times an unlimited market, the dealers in money are able to dictate their own terms, and the masses of the people are compelled to accept the terms offered or perish! The rate of interest is not determined by the amount of capital or wealth existing so much as by the amount of gold available. For instance, notwithstanding the fact that the amount of capital per head of the population has increased enormously during the past sixty years, the rate of interest (i.e., the price of the loan) has not fallen the fraction of one per cent! Indeed, it is higher! And this, in spite of the enormous cheapening in the cost of producing gold and other commodities. Bankers and gold merchants, through these laws, have been given the power to control all production and industry.

A correspondent tells us that gold is supreme, because it is the most saleable commodity existing. But this, again, is due to legal tender laws. In this country the bank and currency laws were made by Sir Robert Peel under the advice of Lord Overstone, the head of Lloyds Bank. Bleichroder, a famous Frankfort banker and a partner of Rothschild, became Bismarck's chief counsellor in making the monetary laws of Germany! Similarly, the gold standard laws of the United States were passed at the dictation of Mr. Pierpont Morgan and his Wall Street friends. (Imagine Mr. Lloyd George appointing a committee of brewers to frame the licensing laws of England!)

All these Acts have been skillfully drawn (under the specious plea of providing the public with a "sound and honest" currency) for the main purpose of ensuring an inexhaustible market for the bankers' commodity—bank credit. Gold was selected because of its scarcity, and paper money has been denounced as dishonest, etc., merely because it reduced or destroyed the necessity for such credit.

Banking is a huge confidence game, in which the public are forced to pay tribute for trusting and confiding in moneylenders. In this country, with a comparatively small paid-up capital, our banks are able to issue hundreds of millions of credit, upon which they extract interest the same as if they owned more than all the gold mines of the world! The total volume of currency—gold, silver, and paper—in the United Kingdom, is probably not over £1,000,000,000! And yet the deposits alone amount to over £1,000,000,000! This is almost entirely created by bank loans, upon which interest is paid. And this is in a country where banking is said to be the poorest in the world! And yet wonder, our banking companies can pay 20 per cent, and 22 per cent. dividends, even during periods of depression, and after writing off hundreds of thousands of pounds through the depreciation of Consols and other securities? (As a matter of fact, it is owing to the comparatively high rates of interest prevailing that Consols and other low interest-bearing securities are falling so low in price.)

The disproportion between what may be called "confidence money" and legal tender is far greater abroad than here. Mr. Fysher thinks that money-lenders deserve interest because a few of them deprive themselves of its use. This is the old "abstinence" theory which Boehm-Bawerke annihilated. Nobody but Mr. Fysher accepts that to-day! It was this theory which led La Salle to call Rothschild "the chief abstainer" in Europe! One doesn't pay for goods because of the extraordinary pain suffered by one old rheumatic producer. The market rate is made between the producers, on the one hand, and the purchasers on the other. If it were, as Mr. Fysher suggests, the poor Irish lace-makers and those of Belgium, the East End sweaters, the coal-miners and chain-makers of the Black Country, would be receiving the highest rate of wages in Europe!

Similarly, when a merchant borrows from a bank, the rate charged is not determined by the sacrifices made by the lowest usurer, but by the total supply of and demand for gold and bank credit.

State laws are primarily responsible for interest charges as well as the limited amount of wealth annually produced. It is absolutely certain that, but for State interference, money would have been produced at such a rate and in such abundance that producers would gladly offer its use freely in return for a guarantee of its repayment at future dates when needed. Almost everything required for maintaining life and producing wealth is perishable,
except land, and must be used or consumed soon after it is produced. Faced with the alternatives of either losing one's wealth or lending it without interest, is there any doubt as to which course one would pursue?

In new and sparsely settled communities loans are made freely without interest. If Mr. Fysher will travel to Western Canada, he will find that farmers are accustomed to lend each other horses and ploughs and rakes and bullocks, and even their own labour, without exacting one penny of interest. The fact is, that human society never could have started but for the principle of mutual help, which prevails universally wherever the State is unable to interfere. And the more power acquired by the State, the more secure becomes the system of interest.

Interest prevails because the State prohibits individuals from acquiring and using a cheaper instrument than gold for exchange purposes, except bank credit. And even here such credit is made compulsorily payable in gold on demand, and so keeps us always within sight of a panic in the event of some crisis, such as a European war!

The people are enslaved by their own laws. Legal tender Acts create the necessity for possessing legal tender; but Government makes no effort to provide a supply at all proportional to the demand. Hence the people fall the natural prey of the moneylending class, who are able to control every form of industry.

The land monopoly, bad as it is, is insignificant in comparison with the power possessed by the financial classes! It is finance that controls all things—including the land! It is the most malignant and powerful despot that has ever swayed the destinies of mankind.

The Immorality of the Morning Post

Correspondence.

A few days ago a correspondence was started in the Morning Post, in which Earl Percy chose to speak of THE FREEWOMAN as an immoral paper. The epithet "immoral" reflects upon the characters of the Editor, the staff, and, perhaps especially, upon the person who furnishes the sinews of war for the conduct of the paper.

Earl Percy may take it from me that I shall not sit quietly under his tirade. It may just be possible that he does not understand the meaning of morality. His connotation, for example, may be that evidently adopted by the Morning Post itself. It is finance that controls all things—including the land! It is the most malignant and powerful despot that has ever swayed the destinies of mankind.

ARTHUR KITSON.

The New Saviours of Society.

May we not hope that the twentieth century will, be known in future as the century when the Eugenic ideal was accepted as part of the creed of civilisation? It is with the object of ensuring the realisation of this hope that this Congress is assembled here to-day. The Major Leonard Darwin in his presidential address, First International Eugenics Congress, July 24th to 30th, 1912.

So now we know! Our saviours have told us, most obliquely, what they are out for, and we need not plead ignorance any longer.

Some readers of last week's FREEWOMAN may possibly have felt that the Editor's leading article, entitled "The Poor and the Rich," was a little hard on those worthy Eugenists who utter such high-minded sentiments as are displayed in the quotation above. If there be any such, I can only hope they may be able to attend the next International Eugenics Congress (there will be lots more), and, like myself, sit under these gentry for some days. The Eugenists have held their "scientific orgy" from July 24th to July 30th. Gathered from all quarters, they have met together at our noble institution, London University, and under its shadow they have conferred day after day, laboriously pursuing their self-sacrificing toils, their hardships only now and again tempered by such trifling alleviations as a reception at Sunderland House, given by Her Grace the Duchess of Marlborough, a visit to the Hampstead Garden Suburb, with tea provided by the Co-partnership Tenants, and—glory of glories! —a lunch and garden party given by Mr. Robert Mond, in the grounds of Combe Park, Sevenoaks.

One wonders if there is any discrimination on Eugenist principles as to the human types from whom hospitality shall be received by the Congress. It was a strange galère to find oneself in when one attended the First International Eugenics Congress. There was a feeling of walking into a rather suspicious and very well-furnished private lido, around which clung an atmosphere of furtive doings, covered thickly over with respectable-looking wrappings.

After sitting in the Congress a little while, one was much inclined to sleep. (I noticed not a few of the delegates, no doubt the most learned, and certainly the most wise, slumbering peacefully through the proceedings.) When one had done surmising what these mild and dull-looking prosocial persons, and the sprinklings of fashionably dressed ladies (whose motto seems to be, "When in doubt, try Theosophy or Eugenics") thought they were doing, there was little else to do but sleep—at least if one could fail to be filled with indignation. Yes, this precious Congress would be funny, from its ineptitude and its ignorance, were not its humorous aspects all swallowed up in its viciousness, but being what it is, it is absolutely essential that the public should try to understand the significance of this movement.

The first gathering of the clans of the Eugenists in our midst: the first organised effort to get together the leading exponents of what "Eugenics" stands for, to rally their forces, to spread abroad, with all the backing that can be obtained, the "scientific" and "moral" opinions of...
these reformers, who tell us: "The end we have in view, an improvement in the racial qualities of future generations, is noble enough to give us courage for the fight." The programme of the Congress was a wide one: the Eugenists were very thorough-going in their operations. I give the names of a few only of the subjects dealt with, to show some of the ground covered by the Congress: Section I., "Biology and Eugenics"; Section II., "Practical Eugenics"; Section II A., "Education and Eugenics"; Section III., "Sociology and Eugenics"; Section IV., "Medicine and Eugenics."

Under Section I., "Biology and Eugenics," papers on "The So-called Laws of Heredity in Man," "Variation and Heredity in Man," "The Inheritance of Fecundity," "Eugenics and Genetics," were read.

Under Sections II. and II A. we had "General Considerations on Education Before Procreation," "The Bearing of Neo-Malthusianism upon Race-Hygiene," "Marriage and Eugenics," "Practicable Eugenics in Education."


Under Section IV., "Alcohol and Eugenics," "Heredity and Eugenics in Relation to Insanity," "The Place of Eugenics in the Medical Curriculum," etc., etc.

I hope my readers will note some of the titles; they are significant in themselves. The most interesting section, from the point of view of the critic, was Section III., as this revealed most plainly the trend of the Eugenist attitude—though, indeed, it was to be seen everywhere in pronouncements made in the Congress. Roughly speaking, the view is that the "upper" and better-off classes of society are the "superior" and most Eugenic classes, and the Eugenist aims, by training and elimination, at producing more of the one class, that which he terms "superior," and less of the other class, which he terms "inferior."

One paper I have already mentioned, "The Cause of the Inferiority of Physical and Mental Characters in the Lower Social Classes" (by Prof. Alfredo Niceforo, University of Naples), calmly and delightfully assumes the point in dispute, and this paper ought to be printed in full for all to realise what the Eugenist is after. I can only quote a small portion from it, which says as follows:—

"Men who are born with physiological and mental characters of an inferior order tend to sink into the inferior classes or tend to remain at a low level if born there. Vice versâ, men who are born owning superior characters tend to elevate themselves, or to remain in the high economic, social, and intellectual positions which they already occupy." (The italics are the writer's.) Is this, I would like to ask Prof. Niceforo, the reason why Lord Devonport, Sir Thomas Lipton, Andrew Carnegie—not to mention all the members of the Eugenics Congress—have "tended to elevate themselves or to remain in the high economic, social, and intellectual positions which they already occupy"? This nonsense would be negligible, if they were not so damnable in legal earnest, and it was a delight to find that Professor Achille Loria (University of Turin) and Professor S. G. Smith (University of Minnesota) disposed of this absurd and vicious "reasoning" in masterly fashion.

In the paper on "Practicable Eugenics in Education," by F. C. S. Schiller, M.A., D.Sc., Oxford University, we were told that the great problem for the educator is how to stimulate and encourage to good effort the youth of the upper and middle classes, especially the latter, since, "The youth of these classes . . . form the educators' best material, and the source of most of the efficient intelligence by which the work of life is carried on." (The italics are mine.) Who stokes the engine which brings you to the Congress, Professor Schiller? Who sows and reaps the corn for your table bread? Who builds the (no doubt) elegant residence in which you reside and pursue your Eugenic studies? Is any of this work "the work of life," and does it or does it not demand "efficient intelligence"?

I could quote gems of this kind for ever, but I will only give the closing remarks of this same Prof. Schiller: "Let it not be said that the Eugenical ideal is anti-democratic: it is anti-egalitarian; but it will be anti-democratic only if the intrinsic inequalities of men are such that some must have all power and others none. But this there is much reason to doubt. On the other hand, it is morally beneficial to every man to acknowledge superiority of others and conducive to the stability of society; nor does this even hurt a man's self-esteem, if he can feel himself as superior in some respects as he is inferior in others.

Thus, the aristocratic principle, so far as Eugenics sanctions it, is not wedded to any special form of government; it means only that we should not commit the folly, knowingly or unknowingly, of trying to be the very best.

What is one to say of this but that it is twaddle, and hypocritical twaddle at that? There are many and serious charges to be brought against the Eugenists and the recent Congress, and the wonder is that men of understanding and sincerity can lend their support to this movement.

That they are ignorant, if not of science (though even here they themselves are at variance, and the Eugenists are at variance with other scientific men), at any rate of worldly wisdom, of understanding of their fellow human beings, and of economic and social conditions, is manifest in all they say.

They pretend all sorts of things which they should know to be otherwise (if they do not, it is their first duty to discover the facts). They pretend not to carry out their own expressed ideals for themselves or their own class. I ask, has any member of the Eugenics Congress yet segregated or sterilised any one of his own relatives or friends when the need arose, or advocated such segregation or sterilisation to his friends and colleagues? I shall be interested to hear the answer. If they were such intelligent, beneficent, and benevolent men, they would experiment on themselves, not on the helpless and wretched. They do not face the full implication of the methods they suggest; they do not bravely declare that death or a living death must be the fate of some individuals for the sake of others (in their opinion, at least), but they seek to falsify facts, to assure us that for the individual the end is dual—in fact, quite jolly to be sterilised, and that "there are no ill effects." This was indicated by Mr. Bleecker von Wagenen, in his "Report of the Committee of the Eugenic Section of the American Breeders' Association" to study and to report on the best practical means for cutting off the Defective Germ-Plasm in the Human Population" (a goodly title).

In conclusion, I should like to mention the most serious matter of all in connection with the Eugenics.
Congress—I mean the absence of any forcible opposition at the discussions. Where were all those who, with pen and voice, have done much to show the true facts about the Eugenics movement to the public? Surely they should have been present, and should have helped to get the other side an innings. It is time, indeed, that organised opposition were begun, since at any moment we may find ourselves saddled with some monstrous Eugenic law of the kind that Indiana and California now have in practice.

Let us not forget that the Mental Defectives Bill is on the verge of becoming law! B. L.

On the Utility of Art.

II.—PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF THE FOREGOING THEORIES.

That art is not necessarily luxury is proved by the fact (and there are countless other testimonies) that the Japanese—among whom the artistic spirit is a democratic possession—are, of all civilised nations, the simplest in their needs. I believe this conviction—that art is not of necessity luxury—has a better chance of acclimatising itself among the middle classes than among those (the "rich" and the "poor") with whom money and whatever it represents assumes an all-engrossing importance either by reason of its too obvious presence or absence. And I believe that women, more than men, are fitted by natural endowment to propagate the idea that form is the mediator between the conflicting principles of life; that it is the civilising factor and, therefore, the link uniting and distinguishing simultaneously.

And when they have brought harmony through art into life, then may we turn our attention, at last completely disengaged, to other topics—scientific, philosophical, ethical, sociological. The thinking machine has a stable foundation of argument, and one which is at least in agreement with itself.

Has it not appeared to everyone that, in our modern researches after truth, in our modern endeavours to alleviate each other's sufferings and to introduce equitable laws and customs, the absence of an initial understanding, a common standpoint whence our opinions could fly forth in all the directions of the winds, has caused us to collide with each other as we do, failing this starting-post? Is not this foothold perfectly furnished by the artistic principle, the artistic principle affirming that no really useful object properly adapted to its purpose is artless, a maxim balanced by its complement that uselessness is a condition of absolute beauty? No dogma is viable unless supported by two confronting doctrines—the opossum and the reverse—and between the above two maxims is comprised the entire dogma of art. It is simply not necessary to explain here that, while they are opposed, they are not contradictory.

We do not, in this plea for the recognition of art as a civilising agent, ask for rewards for artists, or pictures for the people, or concerts for convicts; we do not consider that personal advantages to artists benefit art, nor do we expect the rougher minds to refine themselves from one day to another by familiarity with the more spiritual forms of art. What we hope is possible in a near future is that cultivated people will learn that there are no deceptions in the dogma teaching that entirely justifiable utility is in agreement with ideal aspiration, and teaching equally the justifiability of uselessness in beauty. If it satisfies a need of the soul, is it useless?

Think of the benefit to self-respect in this unwavering satisfaction to the artistic conscience! The thought opens out a prospect excluding envy, discontent, the petty desire to resemble our neighbours in their material possessions. To be at peace with our artistic conscience!

The thing, you will say, is to have that conscience, but most people still possess it in a primitive or perverted way, and education can cultivate it or correct it. Oftener there is self-respect and an ideal aspiration, this conscience exists in more or less embryonic form; and who is entirely deprived of self-respect and idealism?)

But it cannot be cultivated or corrected only by artistic instruction—by popularising art, that is. Such measures are more injurious to art than they are beneficial to the people they are intended to influence. "To popularise art is to vulgarise it," and what we desire is to foster wisdom (which brings us nearer happiness as contingencies allow) by permitting ourselves to be led in all our acts and speculations by the artistic dogma—a dogma stable through the ages.

The moral—that is, the human value of art—was not recognised formerly, because humanity was little occupied by humanitarian considerations; nowadays it remains still unrecognised, because our attention has been monopolised by scientific discoveries. Meanwhile art has retreated further and further away from our human preoccupations to take a place on a pedestal, something between a profanated altar and a sanctified trestle.

Since, as has just been so well said by a contemporary writer, "art illuminates, while science explains," all our discoveries, experiments, and speculations are futile, can lead nowhere, unless art is given precedence over them, and there is the more reason to give it precedence now, since lost time has to be made up for. No human effort is worth while unless it has been actuated by an ideal, and the ideal is realised only by art, which, by giving it expression, a form, by proving it as it were, brings it into being.

Moreover, it awakens man to himself, brings him into consciousness with himself, and, by developing his personality, cultivates his self-esteem; and self-esteem is the most useful of social attributes. Such is the smaller and more immediately practical aspect.

In its wider aspect it benefits the individual by showing him that to his own individual resources, as to his individual perception of things, he must rely for all that he is to derive of good from life; and the development of the individual to his utmost possibilities, the exasperation of his faculties, and their harmonious application, makes of him the most serviceable member of society by rendering him independent of it.

Independence and self-esteem, and self-possession in the sense that one's faculties are revealed to one's self—that there is no deception—honesty with oneself and, at the same time, a masterhood over oneself, is what the individual has to gain from art.

For art illuminates not only the outer but the inner world. It helps us to realise ourselves, and, failing this power, we are but the poor, grovelling brutish serfs or dangerous discontented.

"How," you will again ask, "can you expect a lost sentiment to be revived? No life can be artificially restored where the soul has departed." What, I
question again in reply, is the neglect of a paltry hundred years or so, at most, in all the history of civilisation? Can a sentiment which has animated the very life of man die out in this minute atom of time? No; faith, reason, experience of present-hundred years or so, at most, in all the history of man die out in this minute atom of time; but you will when you have seen the very life of man die out in this minute atom of time; and so perhaps have others, for it is the kind of dress which will identify it with our times. Rodin, and so perhaps have others, for it is the art that has been hoisted like an old idol no longer worshipped, but carefully preserved as a precious curiosity. In answer to your question I will say that there are any number of ways, all as important one to another.

No modern error has put a bigger obstacle in the path of artistic action in modern evolution than the antiquity craze, a craze peculiar to those very classes from whom an opposite interest—the patronage of modern arts and crafts—would have come more naturally: the nouveau riche class. By this pressure it has revealed a tendency shared by everyone of the period, save the nobility, who are not of the period—a shame in their class. This reprehensible sentiment cannot be traced to any other epoch in human history, as far as we know. It is a feeble, humble, and cowardly sentiment, and sterile in future energies. What sons can such men hope to beget who are ashamed of their calling, of their race, of that success which has met their efforts; ashamed of the period to which they owe it, and to which they have contributed well or ill, and who comfort themselves with relics for the lack of a name which an ancestor—instead of themselves—has brought into repute, and for the lack of a flamboyant genealogical tree inherited with other goods and débris?

These who owe a debt to their period, should refund it by supporting all those manifestations which, like themselves, appertain to it. The debt is a debt of honour, overlooked, perhaps, therefore.

To these men we turn in vain for that support princes used to confer on artists, but our modern parvenu prince prefers to flatter his own humility by surrounding himself with a fictitious past, thereby adding to the corruption he has probably already sown in his track by encouraging swindle, fallacious values, and generally obstructing the progress of art, for art is a living, active spirit, and neither a ruin, a ghost, nor a mummy. Yet a contrary practice would prove of mutual advantage: By affirming his place in his period the modern citizen manifests esteem for himself—a worthier attitude, surely, than the attempt to roll himself up into borrowed shells not made to his measure. And self-esteem actuates noble, useful, and fruitful deeds. Moreover, it leads to contentment, the absence of which state gives rise to every human meanness and vulgarity.

The man who is indebted to his period, as his period may be to him, should call upon the artists of the day to glorify that period. But a man who prefers to live in a false world, who prefers to assume delusive appearances rather than to affirm the existing truth with the dignity sincerity always imparts, is not an idealist, but simply a man lacking in self-esteem; consequently a man not at peace with himself. So much for one evil. It will be seen that it is not incurable. Now to another.

In our schools—Board and others—children are taught reading, writing, arithmetic, geography, and history, but they are not taught to call forth and cultivate their natural aptitudes. Through mutual intercourse they gather tolerably correct notions of their mental duties towards each other. In their games they learn the value of solidarity, also the absence of which state gives rise to every human meanness and vulgarity. The man who is indebted to his period, as his period may be to him, should call upon the artists of the day to glorify that period. But a man who prefers to live in a false world, who prefers to assume delusive appearances rather than to affirm the existing truth, is not an idealist, but simply a man lacking in self-esteem; consequently a man not at peace with himself.
if he does not naturally like it, but you can teach him other occupations which will be of future use to him, and in which he can manifest his feelings, his heart, his individuality, everything that partakes distinctly and entirely of himself, an occupation to which he can "give" himself (as the French expression se donner has it so significantly), and which is man's enthusiasm striving to find a vent, and to which we owe every great deed, every heroism, every generosity, every work of art or skill that has ever been accomplished in the world. Maim this natural enthusiasm by limiting its possibilities of demonstration, sterilise it by repressing it, and you will breed automats (poor automats!) and blind-worms in place of men. It is the antithesis to the theory that every individual gift is of service to the world, and that our every aim must be to cultivate and suitably direct and apply these gifts for fear of missing or wasting any.

Muriel Ciolkowska.

(To be continued.)

Reperatory and a New Morality.

With the departure of Miss Horniman from the Coronet Theatre and her subsequent reappearance at the Playhouse, it naturally occurs to one to ask whether the Repertory Theatre has arrived in response to any definite demand, or whether it has merely been pumped down upon us. It is true that there exists a small body of people, who have been labelled "Advanced," to whom the mere fact that a play is being produced by a reper­ tory theatre is sufficient recommendation. These, however, are so very small a proportion of the community that their patronage alone would not be sufficient to keep any theatre open.

It is possible that Miss Horniman has heroically adopted Mr. Tree's advice, "Don't give the people what they want; give them what they ought to want, and in time they'll want it," in the hope that, by continuous small doses, just as an organism may store up quantities of accumulative poison without feeling any ill effects for some time, public taste may be vitiated until finally it appreciates and asks for the wholesome.

What, after all, is Miss Horniman offering the public? In an age where the churches are half-empty, she is offering it a three-hours' sermon from the stage. It is small wonder, then, that the comfort and glamour and voluptuousness of the musical comedy stage should appeal to the public more strongly, for the two classes to whom the propagandist may be of use, exploiters and exploited, are united by that touch of nature which makes most of the world kin—vulgarity.

True, the small body of "advanced" referred to previously is sufficiently enthusiastic, but their presence is little better than useless. The discussion of social questions forms but a part of their literature and their conversation; but they still feel they need a knowledge of the crude, hard facts of life, and this they seek to acquire across the footlights of the repertory. It is, therefore, the strangest perversion that the propagandist playwright should have come to take a pride in the fact that only "advanced" people can appreciate his work. That his work should prove successful with the "crowd" is to damn it. The propagandist drama, therefore, is in the paradoxical position of being successful only when it is abortive. The "Drama of Abortion" would, indeed, describe it only too well, and its activities are settling into those of a mutual admiration society, in which advanced people write for advanced people, circle within circle, with result—nil.

It is little more than a platform for platitudinous and rhetorical opinions. All that is left is to preach new habits of living. For, having failed in the attempt to create living entities embodying new values, it falls back upon the mere pulpit-device of preaching to its audience. So our modern stage young woman (compound of Ann Whitefields and Nora Helmers) and our modern stage young man (John Tanner in all moods and tenses) spout modernism for the uplifting of morals and for the intellectual instruction of their audience, and with what results? None; for the propagandist drama; therefore, not drama but a vehicle of opinion, an animated debating society. When the propagandist dramatists have grasped their own opinions, established their morality, when their own theories have arrived, so to speak, and feel at home, modern drama may be said to have begun. At present, these writers are but dimly aware of their own gospel. That they are going forward, at least in one respect, may be seen in the surprising unanimity with which the authors of the plays recently produced by Miss Horniman at the Coronet have treated woman as an entity, distinct and apart from man, having definite needs and desires. Mary Broome, for instance, asserts her independence by leaving her husband in order to go to Canada with the milkman. Emily Vernon, a poor and struggling actress, rejects her fiancé because of his inability to treat her as an intellectual equal. In "Hindle Wakes," Alan indulging in vain recriminations because he has seduced Fanny, is told by her that he was merely a means toward her amusement.

Each of the plays "Mary's Wedding" and "Mary Broome" seeming almost to be stages in the life of the same individual—in the former the thrill and glow of adolescence, in the latter the staidness and the realisation of responsibility that come with age.

"Mary's Wedding" is, however, worthy of notice on account of the intensity with which with which it is worked out. Its plot is, roughly, this: On the day of Mary's wedding, the mother of Mary's sweetheart warns her against the approaching marriage, since Bill, having inherited the drink craving from his father, will prove a ruined man in order to drink. For the moment, however, he were the remotest man in all the world, I would take him," Mary says. Bill appears at the door drunk. "I have come to show myself," he says, staggering.

In the treatment of all this there is an intensity which, given a settled morality, might have risen to the grandeur and strength of Greek drama. Things being as they are, with no settled morality even in respect of the elementals of life, a member of the "advanced" audience is plagued with the thought that a knowledge of preventives would have saved all this pother. It is too shattering. There can be no tragedy when morals are in the melting-pot. The moral is the expression of moral "views." For the moment, however, he were the remotest man in all the world, I would take him," Mary says. Bill appears at the door drunk. "I have come to show myself," he says, staggering.

In the treatment of all this there is an intensity which, given a settled morality, might have risen to the grandeur and strength of Greek drama. Things being as they are, with no settled morality even in respect of the elementals of life, a member of the "advanced" audience is plagued with the thought that a knowledge of preventives would have saved all this pother. It is too shattering. There can be no tragedy when morals are in the melting-pot. The moral is the expression of moral "views." For the moment, however, he were the remotest man in all the world, I would take him," Mary says. Bill appears at the door drunk. "I have come to show myself," he says, staggering.

In the treatment of all this there is an intensity which, given a settled morality, might have risen to the grandeur and strength of Greek drama. Things being as they are, with no settled morality even in respect of the elementals of life, a member of the "advanced" audience is plagued with the thought that a knowledge of preventives would have saved all this pother. It is too shattering. There can be no tragedy when morals are in the melting-pot. The moral is the expression of moral "views." For the moment, however, he were the remotest man in all the world, I would take him," Mary says. Bill appears at the door drunk. "I have come to show myself," he says, staggering.
The New Sense of Sin.

The modern revolt against all forms of servitude is a sign of a new sense of sin. I need hardly say that by the term sin I do not mean what is generally understood by the popular mind and by official religion. All forces, laws, customs, ideas, and institutions which prevent the enfolding of selfhood and the living of the best life are a sin against the holy spirit of man. On this point we ought to be quite definite. We have been so misled on the problem of what is and is not sin. We cannot dismiss the subject by saying that the Church knows all about it and the matter must be left for one small class to deal with. The very word sin suggests a force which degrades, a spirit which separates, and a morality which enslaves. It is really a deep, searching, vital word.

We have to interpret the term in the light of new social, economic, and intellectual facts. Without a full knowledge of soul and body it is impossible to understand what sin really is. The popular meaning has been given by a dogmatic theology which has never been based upon all the facts of our complex life. Hence the unreality, and the make-believe, and the manufactured sins, and all the confusion and absurdity as well, on this problem.

People have gone to the Bible for their ideas on sin when they should have gone to life itself. The question is not what Isaiah, or Jesus, or Paul, or Augustine, or Luther, or Calvin, or Wesley have said on the subject, but what the facts are now. What is the disease? What really is wrong with us? Who or what keeps the soul back? This involves the environmental and brings every one of us into touch with each other.

The conventional Church idea of sin simply leaves the majority of people who hear it unmoved. Certain words and phrases are the correct things to say and to hear, that is all. But we cannot go on playing a game of make-believe in face of the new feelings and facts of modern life. We need a new sense of sin, and I believe that a new feeling of what is the matter with us, a new sensitiveness to human injustice, a new perception of what life means, are powerfully at work. A recognition of the crime of poverty and all government which gives a few the privilege to dominate the lives of the many are evidences of a new sense of the rights of the individual to freedom and life.

To think of sin as bound up with a “scheme of redemption,” and with an Oriental theory of man as a “fallen creature,” is to be out of touch with reality. These views may be safely disregarded, for they represent the opinions of a class, not the convictions of the community. A theology dealing with an abstract sort of existence is as mischievous and as unwholesome as the “economic man” of the old political economy.

As a result of this we have had to endure more or less complacently a formidable number of man-made, artificial sins, the worst effect of which has been that the community has been blind to the real sin in their midst. The most innocent and necessary pleasures and acts have been solemnly anaesthetised, but the old idea has had its day and almost ceased to be. Primitive conceptions of man settle nothing for us. The question is not where we are going, and to what heights we can rise. And this introduces the problem of the social value of personality, and all the complex conditions of life. We are involved in the well-being of each other if only to get out of each other’s way a little more. The forms of corporate responsibility may be organised to such an extent that the individual is let alone to grow far too little. The repudiation of the old individualism in ethics and in social welfare is founded upon the better understanding of social facts, traditions, and emotions, but the urgent work of the day is to emphasise another kind of individualistic truth, which is not incompatible with the truth that we are members one of another. It is not necessary here to point out the limits of this latter spiritual fact, but to affirm that praise or blame, success and failure, good and evil, can be understood only in the light of sociology and the deeper knowledge of selfhood.

Do we know in any final way what really is good and evil? Of course not. What we have is a sense of direction. Human nature is good enough to surpass itself, and sin is any work, or desire, or choice which prevents the soul from advancing beyond its present life. When we spread the term sin out, so to speak, it means disease, discord, selfishness, weakness, fear, and surrender. Forces which make against personal and social health or holiness are sinful. It is still everybody for himself, but it is also one for another, and the perception of this fact is giving us a new idea of sin. After all, there was a right instinct in the old appeal and warning to the individual, and to him alone. We owe it to ourselves to see before the things which are above, to choose the best way, to cherish the nobler vision, and to be honest with ourselves. No social efforts can take the place of that self-discipline. Indeed, that is the only vital, creative, social power. We have to be awakened out of sleep in order to see that we may be comfortable yet enslaved, and may sin against the light if we prefer an ease which may be pleasant at the price of freedom in the broadest, fullest sense, and the effort to be worthy of it.

The old theology has never given human nature the credit for its own good. All the evil has been attributed to “sinful nature,” and the highest virtue to a supernatural being. But there is no more an original endowment of evil than there is of good, and the oppression of the individual in the life of society from the ideal as a working power we know what we are up against. The sin of greed, selfishness, and diseased forms of goodness and charity and morality have to be overcome. Unless human nature is courageously faced and understood we shall commit a deeper sin, while all the time we may think that we are doing a work for the individual soul. We cannot be saved by the mere laying on of the hands of someone else. There is too much fashionable and organised mauling of character.

Sin, as a tragic reality, is bound up with poverty, labor, the sweat of the brow, the streets, the condition of someone else. There is too much fashionable and organised mauling of character. Sin as a tragic reality, is bound up with poverty, labor, the sweat of the brow, the streets, the condition of someone else. Sin of this kind deludes no longer. Sin of this kind makes us into touch with each other.

The sin of social injustice, of being “under” someone
else, of being a mere convenience for the pleasure of others, of being virtually owned, is growing. It shows what the individual must do. It gives a real conflict, and not a sham fight. F. R. SWAN.

**Women as Sexualists.**

("The female principle is sexuality and nothing more. . . Woman is devoted wholly to sexual matters; her relations to her husband and children complete her life. . . When man turns from the higher to the lower he gives woman existence. She would disappear did he become unsexual, therefore her one object is to keep him sexual."—WEININGER.)

**THIS** is an assertion against which femininity will, for once, combine to protest, for it wars against the leading feminine principle, i.e., individuality.

It is necessary to the happiness of woman that she should, with a fair amount of reason, be able to present herself to herself as a success in some department, and one of the most important items in her mental picture is influence—power. The feminine ideal is the indelible impression of itself on its surroundings, whatever they may be, as a power, if possible, which, by its refining influence, softens the coarser nature of man, but, at any rate, as a conscious and self-emaning power.

Now, Weininger not only implies that any power woman possesses is evil, but he says that she derives it from the will of man: that "she is guilt through man's fault." And woman, the individualist, though she might condone the loss of her virtue, will wage eternal war against the submersion of her personality.

Before she enters her protest, however, let her reflect on the exact meaning of that much-abused word sexual. Let her be clear as to what she means by it, and what Weininger means by it; also as to what she implies if she asserts that she is non-sexual.

I have purposely avoided the subject of intermediate sex-forms, on which Weininger dwells at some length, as a work intended for general reading, simply because the general public has a rooted impression that what it does not know is unknowable, and an unfortunate habit, due probably to mental inertia, of confounding the novel with the improper.

It is difficult to place this characteristically British tone of thought. I have heard it described as "nice-mindedness," but it may be noted in this connection that the same public which refuses to consider certain existing facts of nature will crowd in hundreds to shows of revolting "monstrosities," where the same facts are travestied by fraudulent imitations.

It is also noteworthy that if any of those "monstrosities" were to act in accordance with their supposed natures, the modest British public would retire blushing!

Personally, I am convinced that the subject of intermediate sexual forms will be forced upon our notice in the immediate future as containing an explanation of many psychological problems which now find their solution in the lunatic asylum or the gaol. I am inclined to agree with Weininger that they are natural and not pathological developments—a conclusion, by the way, which, if it were generally adopted, would entirely reconcile the British public to their consideration; but I entirely deny his application of the statement to the modern woman. That is to say, I account for her, not by the amount of maleness, but by the amount of revolt against maleness in her composition.

I have already alluded to the abuse of the word sexual; in fact, that word, in the majority of minds, has come to be regarded with aversion; and in close connection with this fact is to be placed that absurd veil of romance which sentimentalists have thrown round what they are pleased to term "love," but which is in reality a natural instinct, no more suitable for idealisation than any other function of the body.

People, particularly young people, need plain speaking on these points. There is no delicacy in removing the veil with which mock modesty has surrounded them; neither are the people who approach these matters in a proper spirit the prurient-minded people. That term should be applied to those who discuss for the sake of discussing, and to those who refuse to discuss because they "think evil."

If you bridle at the word sex you bridle at the word human nature, and here apparently Weininger and I agree, only that what he applies to women only I apply to men and women equally; also, in asserting that the sexual woman is the one engrossed by home and children, he is not following the popular idea of a sexual woman, which is contained in the prostitute type presented by him in the following chapter.

It is obvious that every complete woman and every complete man must be a sexualist, but it is also obvious that every woman and every man must be something beside a sexualist.

In regard to Weininger's statement that woman would disappear if man became unsexual, the reverse must also apply. It is, therefore, as much to the interest of man to keep woman sexual as of woman to keep man sexual. In fact, from Weininger's point of view, it is man only being permitted to an "intelligible ego."

I protest altogether against the discussion of whether the sex instinct is stronger in man than in woman. In the first place, it is even less possible for a woman to judge a man's instincts in this respect than for a man to judge a woman's, except on certain broad lines. Weininger, however, has not only no knowledge of this, but he has also completely contradicted the intimate personal experience of every woman about herself. He does not only say that he knows women, but that he knows them better than they know themselves, and, as my quarrel with him is on that account, I do not wish to lay myself open to the charge of having, in the slightest degree, followed in his footsteps.

I am only concerned, then, with the sex-instinct of man as it affects the sex-instinct of woman, and I consider the two so out of proportion both in kind and degree that comparison is hardly possible. In fact, the sex-instinct of woman, both by reason of its slightness and its subtlety, can be easily ignored. Weininger is right when he remarks that a woman can, in certain cases, find faith, happiness, and her sexuality, but the reason he gives is entirely opposed to the truth. He says that it is because she is entirely sexual. On the contrary, she is so little sexual that matters outside sex can exclusively engross her attention.

A woman's sexuality, in contradistinction to a man's, is always indirect. Take, for instance, her inherent desire for a position of authority, not necessarily over a husband, but in a home of her own. To every normal adult woman the idea of being dominated by another woman is abhorrent, though she may not, by any means, desire to be dominated by a husband; also, in the majority of women, the desire for children is inherent, while the necessary process is regarded with aversion.
Here, again, the male and female instincts diverge. In fact, the physical suffering on the one hand is a sufficient and a rational answer as to the relative strength of the instincts. Quite apart from the question of modesty, the natural shrinking of the sub-conscious ego from physical suffering makes a woman's sexual desires of necessity half-hearted. Putting out of consideration women whose health standard is below the average, I maintain that the typical woman can never, for physical quite apart from moral reasons, be so entirely a sexualist as the typical man.

GRACE CARTER SMITH

The Life History of Mary Smith, M.A.

MARY began her education at the local high school. She soon made a name for herself as a star of rare intellectual brilliance. One examination success followed another, prizes rained thick upon her, and she promised, therefore, to attain to a standard of high moral excellence.

The head mistress said at the prize-giving: "We desire above all things so to build up the character of the young people committed to our charge, that they may, in these days of moral laxity, stand firm for all the great guiding principles of life." (Great applause.)

From this it will be seen that the head mistress was a wise woman. Moreover, she was a diplomat of no mean order. She marked Mary out for special approval, and held her up as an example to the other students. She knew as she that there is no more effective way of advertising a school and increasing the number of its pupils (for the numbers of a school are, of course, a sure criterion of the excellence of its teaching) than by a continuous stream of examination successes. Mary had done admirable service as an advertising medium, and the head mistress meant her to cap it all by winning that most distinguished of all distinctions—a scholarship to the University. It was true that Mary was puny, undeveloped, overworked, and be-spectacled, but what was that in comparison with the "kudos" she gained for the school? "Besides, bodily health is as nothing in comparison with intellectual growth," said the head mistress to those members of the staff who hinted at the danger of overwork.

There was a certain amount of opposition to be overcome before a University career was finally settled upon. Mr. Smith wished his daughter to attend lectures, passed examinations, played games, fell ill from overwork, thus gaining much valuable knowledge of human nature. Altogether they gave every promise of becoming efficient citizens.

They discovered that the world was in a very unsatisfactory condition, and that women, especially those who had gained some knowledge and understanding of life by means of the higher education, must put it to rights again. Men had made a hopeless mess of things; indeed, it was hard to see why they should exist at all. The world without them would be a much pleasanter place to live in. How ever, their presence could be ignored in the pre­ cincts of St. Christabel's, and the students, with their abundant dons, debated the problems of life, undisturbed by masculine intrusion.

Mary studied mathematics—a subject calculated to make clear the workings of the human mind; eminently suitable, therefore, for a future efficient citizen. She knew all there was to know about human beings to a higher standard of civic and guidance. To reform life, you must know life; to raise human beings to a higher standard of civic and ethical morality, you must understand them.

Mary and her companions read learned treatises, attended lectures, passed examinations, played games, fell ill from overwork, thus gaining much valuable knowledge of human nature. Altogether they gave every promise of becoming efficient citizens.

They discovered that the world was in a very unsatisfactory condition, and that women, especially those who had gained some knowledge and understanding of life by means of the higher education, must put it to rights again. Men had made a hopeless mess of things; indeed, it was hard to see why they should exist at all. The world without them would be a much pleasanter place to live in. However, their presence could be ignored in the precincts of St. Christabel's, and the students, with their abundant dons, debated the problems of life, undisturbed by masculine intrusion.

Mary studied mathematics—a subject calculated to make clear the workings of the human mind; eminently suitable, therefore, for a future efficient citizen. She knew all there was to know about dimensions, and was on the point of discovering a new one, when she had a nervous breakdown. This was a pity, because it is obvious to the meanest intelligence, that an extra dimension would have completely altered the affairs of life. As it was, her mathematical studies enabled her to reduce that most illogical of all factors, the human one, to terms of a common denominator. This simplified life so much that she felt she could face every difficulty.

She also took up science, so that she might take the scientific, viz., the right, view of things.

She joined as many of the college societies as
time allowed, selecting those avowedly serious in purpose and likely, therefore, to help her to take the best line in matters of political and social import. Her ideals were high, and she meant to leave the world a better place than she found it. A mock House of Commons always sat in term-time, and Mary was the leader of the Liberal party. Questions affecting women were warmly discussed, and each party, when in power, vied with the other in passing legislation favourable to their interests.

There was not much enthusiasm or interest shown in other and more general matters which touched on the welfare of the community as a whole. It was rightly felt that men could be trusted to look after themselves, but that they must not be allowed to look after women, whom they invariably oppressed.

What Mary lacked in appearance she made up for in learning. Like one of her mathematical lines, she had length and no breadth. Her father was distressed, and told her plainly that if she didn’t look out, she wouldn’t get married.

"Married!" gasped Mary, "you don’t suppose I’m going to marry. Why, all my education would be wasted."

"Wait till Mr. Wright comes along," said Mr. Smith.

Mary flushed. Her father jarred on her sometime.

Before going down from college for good, she gave a farewell tea-party to a few students and one or two dons. The conversation turned upon matrimony.

"I can’t understand any self-respecting woman getting married," said one student. "The most hard-worked and ill-paid of all professions."

"Yes," agreed Mary. "A man pays his house-keeper, so why shouldn’t he pay his wife? She toils and slaves from morning till night, and gets nothing for it."

"And then," chimed in a third, "think how a clever, well-educated woman wastes her gifts and opportunities for good work if she marries. Her life, to all intents and purposes, is over, and the community is the poorer for her loss.

"It is only second-rate women who marry nowadays," said a don, high-souled and serious-minded.

"We intellectual women have learnt to regulate our affections and subordinate our hearts to our heads. That is why the position of women has more dignity and importance than it had. We lead the way, others follow."

At the end of four years, Mary came down from College laden with honours and certificates. Her brother refused to go with her. "I never saw such a fright as you, Mary," he said.

"You’re a learned pig," Mary interrupted him. "You don’t understand, father," she said. "Women have serious work to do in the world now. No thinking person can be interested in such banalities as clothes. Am I a doll that I should care about such things? I can’t live at home; the atmosphere is so un intellectual, and Charlie (her brother) won’t bring in his friends. Young men are so dull and not in the least interested in matters of vital importance. Besides, I must be in the centre of things in order that I can devote all my energies to the great progressive movements of the day."

Mary took rooms in a residential club in London, much frequented by the leading Feminists. She associated herself, of course, with the party of Progress and Reform, and joined all the Liberal associations she could think of, and in every one she endeavoured to interest the will of the people must prevail. Consequently, she was a warm supporter of such legislative proposals as the Payment of Members, the State Insurance, and the Home Rule Bills, which had been greeted with the unanimous and warm approval of the whole nation. At least they ought to have them, and that is the same thing. If Demos is occasionally blind to his own interests, he must be forcibly guided along the right path by those who have the light. She was also a firm believer in the virtue of total abstinence. "Rare, refreshing fruits" are an admirable democratic diet, provided they are not in a state of fermentation. In that condition, they are a curse and no blessing. Their sale and consumption should be prohibited. The nation must be raised to a higher moral plane.

In short, Mary stood by the party which was founded upon and lived up to that great fundamental principle of Liberalism—Government of the People, by the People, for the People. Naturally, however, she devoted most of her time and energy to hastening on that great day when she and her friends should become persons in the eyes of the law. For that consummation she worked hard. As efficient citizens, armed with the vote, they would be able to cleanse the Augean stables of a corrupt and man-governed state.

"New brooms sweep clean" was the title of an address Mary gave, one Sunday afternoon, at a chapel P.S.A. By means of the new wine in old bottles, she was able to give the necessary religious touch to her oratory. She pointed out that the introduction of politics into the pulpit was a sure sign of the advancement of Christian progressive thought.

The club where Mary lived was one of the headquarters of the Militant Suffragists, of whom she was one.

At a breakfast given in her honour, following on a sojourn in Holloway Gaol, after she had broken man-made laws and windows, one of the leaders of the cause made a highly eulogistic speech. "I call upon all true women to pay their homage to Miss Mary Smith," she said. "She has helped to make them in servile docility. We are soldiers in a sacred cause. It is war to the knife."

Mary glowed.

HELEN HAMILTON.

(To be continued)
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.

To the Editor of The Freewoman.

SPINSTERS AND ART.

MADAM,—I have edited a woman's page (for a week), so I can give people advice as to how to use up odd scraps of macaroni, velveteen, and biscuit tins, and how to play the fool by painting drain-pipes and milking-stools. But I refuse absolutely to give any advice to "A Disappointed Reader," who appears to contemplate stepping down the primrose path in order to please the Editor of The Freewoman and myself. She ought to toss up.

To begin with, spinsterhood is not necessarily a feminine quality. It is simply the limitation of experience to one's own sex, and consequently the regard of the other sex from an idealist point of view. Walter Pater and A. C. Benson are typical spinsters: Miss May Sinclair, though an unmarried woman, is not. I thought my reference to "a mother-in-law," looking at the world through the drawn curtains of the boarding-school or the equally celibate boarding-house made it plain that spinsterhood implied a segregation from the opposite sex. Portia, for instance, accustomed to manage men and sailors from her girlhood, was not a spinster.

As a mother sacrifices everything to her children, and an artist sacrifices everything to her art, I never said that an artist should be a mother. Therefore I object at the remark that "instead of sending our girls to studios, conservatoires of music, or making them familiar with the masterpieces of literature, we should first see to it that they have become mothers." When Ruskin said that no one could paint until he had seen Venice, I wonder if people thought he disapproved of artists learning from life. The artist declares itself at an age when at least most women are spinsters: roughly speaking, from four to eighteen years of age. And if you starve it of intellectual and emotional experience, it will go away again. I, when the "charms of poetic gifts," you shut her up in a prison cell, her epics will be of poor and monotonous quality. For want of emotional experience Jane Austen's imagination never developed virility. And, though of course her comic characters had human failings, her heroines (that is, the men she regarded from a sexual point of view) were "strong gods." The mother-in-law makes one feel how splendidly right the people are, even in their vulgarity. The spinster is ridiculous because she 

With regard to your statement, Madam, that I answered not the substance, but the "temper" of your article on Suffragism, I can only suppose you have forgotten what the substance was! Permit me to remind you: it was that Suffragism had no programme and no philosophy. I showed that this programme certainly contained only one leading item, and that is the equal rights of the sexes—but that one is so far-reaching that it involves a complete readjustment of the social state. You now acknowledge that you recognise these adjustments: that is, you grant to Suffragism a programme. But you say, thus reduced to a purely different programme involves no ideas. Now, if the reconstruction of a civilisation can be accomplished or conceived without ideas, I may suppose you have never read the "price" to the riddle, "When is a idea not an idea?" must be, "When it is put into action."

But I not only gave you a sketch of a programme, I gave you the germ of a philosophy, of which the other starting point is, "Thou shalt not live by sex." And that is precisely the philosophy you yourself express in the leading article of the issue in which my letter appeared, except that you therein state that Suffragists are backing sex-sale by encouraging the marriage contract. Having given you both programme in one item, and the roots of that programme in another, you then give the "instinct of your attack. I made no complaint of your "scathing" criticism; it was the grounds I challenged—and challenge now.

The only remark I made as to the tone of the article was to say that anyone who argues or infers that because many women "acquiesce in social injustice" they should only be "dear" means of second commodity. There is besides another sort of cheapness, that of status, which drives many a woman from an independent life of despised spinsterhood into the trap of a marriage, in order to get sufficient measure of social importance. I gather from the articles and correspondence that the majority of Freewomen and Freemen despise the "old maid," whatever her service to the State, her achievements, or her genius may be. That is, the Freewoman, not the Suffragist, would drive the woman to make herself "dear"—by marriage!

Nor is marriage a means, in many cases, of making a woman "dear" in the market sense of the word. Take the case of the working woman, or the woman who marries a struggling professional man, though she improve his face. The in the eyes of the public, and of the young - Early Victorians—she is actually cheap to the man. The working man gets, without salary, just for board and lodging, a cook, laundress, charwoman, housekeeper, and nurse—sometimes a mistress thrown in, of course, counts as good investments, who will help support him in old age. The professional man gets, perhaps, a house sitter, or if any rate, a tout, whose social business it is to keep up his practice, as well as a housekeeper and mistress. All this is much cheaper, of course, to him than if he had to pay all these various officials. If driving women to this existence is making
them "dear," then there is no meaning in the word at all. Why then do women marry thus? They weigh the balance of their ill-paid, undervalued work with—their bodies. That is, cheap, before they make themselves still cheaper. The encouragement of the financial marriage contract by Suffragists I have never seen. If it existed, it is vanishing like mists before the sun. For Suffragists are looking facts in the face. Would that the Freewoman were doing as you say—making women costly for their sex, they ought to be encouraging, not the wife, but the professional courtezan to make herself still more expert, and therefore more costly. For many ruthless and clever women of this class retire at middle-age on a competency. Now, what middle-class or working wife can retire at forty-five from her work? For the true blackleg in the "oldest profession in the world" is the wife who—works. As do, after all, the large proportion of married Englishwomen. For your remarks apply only to the woman kept in idleness—sanctified by the sentimentality of the "marriage lines."

We are out against not only cheapness in the labour market for women, but against the low estimation in which this world holds the gift of love—a thing which cannot in any great social state be bought, but must be given. But sale there will always be till women get full value—in money, estimation, dignity and power—for their labour of hand and brain. It is because as human beings they know themselves to be cheap that they sell themselves as women. How often will a girl say, "Oh, it doesn't matter what becomes of me!" And she is right—it doesn't. Cheapest of the cheap is she. So she sells herself, nightly, for so many separate sales, or she takes out an investment at low interest—a home and board, with hard labour thrown in. Suffragists would fain make women sexually so dear that no money and no price can buy her. It sounds a hopeless task, but one fact there is on our side: the natural woman hates this sale. She has mostly either to be driven to it by ill-usage and starvation, or trapped into it by the lie that she is signing in a register, or gabbling words can, in themselves, sanctify that which is unclean. It is a superstition, this latter idea, which has in its time served its purpose in curtailing the worst licentiousness, but its day is over. It will go when the veils fall from women's eyes.

And she is right—it doesn't. Cheapest of the cheap is she. So she sells herself, nightly, for so many separate sales, or she takes out an investment at low interest—a home and board, with hard labour thrown in. Suffragists would fain make women sexually so dear that no money and no price can buy her. It sounds a hopeless task, but one fact there is on our side: the natural woman hates this sale. She has mostly either to be driven to it by ill-usage and starvation, or trapped into it by the lie that she is signing in a register, or gabbling words can, in themselves, sanctify that which is unclean. It is a superstition, this latter idea, which has in its time served its purpose in curtailing the worst licentiousness, but its day is over. It will go when the veils fall from women's eyes.

M. P. WILLCOCKS.

[Suffragists would fain make women sexually so dear that no money and no price can buy her]. "We should prefer to leave the controversy at that, for it only needs us to add to it, that we "would fain make men and women economically so assured, that no money and no price can buy them," to state fully the basic principles of The Freewoman. There is a universe of achievement in life outside these, but it is time we settled once and for ever these two essential principles.—Ed.]

MR. C. H. NORMAN AND MR. MCKENNA.

MADAM,—May I draw Mr. C. H. Norman's critical attention to the conflict between fundamental principles demonstrated by him in certain articles and letters to the editor, which have recently been published in your columns, and in those of his contemporary, The New Age? The quotations have been scrupulously chosen for their positive significance, and not with the view of misrepresenting the author, or of confounding the issue. If Mr. Norman were the Home Secretary would he (should he) forcibly feed prisoners, whether Suffragists, Syndicalists, Ulster Unionists, or "ordinary" prisoners, who have sustained the courage of the hunger strike in sincere protest against unfair prison treatment? All the italics used are mine.

Group A.

1. "There are plenty of men in Fleet Street to-day, but there are few gentle-men." (The Freewoman, April 11th.)

2. "In other words, rather than accept the money of such men as the present-day newspaper proprietors, they would have died of starvation." (The Freewoman, April 11th.)

3. "Taking the definition of a gentleman to be a person who shows his consideration to others in all things, not all English judges could claim to be gentlemen." (The Freewoman, March 14th.)

4. "I wrote my letter in defence of Mr. McKenna, because, having put the question to myself, I cannot see how otherwise Mr. McKenna could have acted. That is the practical test—what would one do oneself?" (The Freewoman, July 16th.)

5. "Forcible feeding is a practice which he has been compelled to authorise, because the convicted militants have chosen to refuse food." (The Freewoman, July 18th.)

Group B.

1. "When the people come to their own, to the fruits of their own labour, the parasites of royalty, the churches, the army, and the law will be overwhelmed." (The Freewoman, May 2nd.)

2. "Nothing but a revolution can sweeten the air of England, and destroy the Putrescence of conventional morality." (The Freewoman, June 6th.)

3. "You may say this foreshadowed line of policy is an incitement to break the statute. Permit me to reply that there are limits even to the powers of the House of Commons, the House of Lords, the Cabinet, and the Insurance Commissioners. The capacity of the prisons places a limit to the powers of the judges who have the duty of administering the law." (The Freewoman, July 4th.)

4. "Mr. McKenna has the duty of seeing that offenders against the law are duly punished." (The Freewoman, July 18th.)

5. "... the object of prison administration is to punish law-breakers..." (The Freewoman, July 18th.)

Group C.

I trust you will permit me to draw attention to the scandalous proceedings of these officials, who have decided to put in operation against these women the processes of the criminal law. The competence of Mr. Snow Fordham and Mr. Curtis Bennett to administer justice has always been a matter of doubt. How men of this
character ever got into the responsible position of magistrates it is most difficult to understand. The misery these individuals inflict on the community is fearful to reflect upon. The dialogues which have taken place between them and the women brought before them have shown them to be the worst kind of bully." (The New Age, March 14th.)

2. "There is no greater provocation to social discontent than the present system of force-feeding — from a criminal and wicked motive. The most prejudiced and unreasonable person (a description which has often been applied to me) cannot pretend that these women come within that category. They are acts of cruelty and torture from an ignoble motive. In reality these sentences are merely vindictive. When the Courts begin to impose sentences which have as their sole justification the motive of revenge, and not the spirit of justice, then the administrators who give themselves for law, and the magistrates have become more criminal than the persons whom they are sentencing." (The New Age, March 14th.)

4. "Mr. McKenna is not responsible for the law; he has merely to insist upon an impartial and just administration of the law." (The Freewoman, July 18th.)

5. "The prosecution of Mr. and Mrs. Pethick-Lawrence and the Pankhurst family stands on a different footing. . . . Mr. Bodkin, in his speech in the Pethick-Lawrence-Pankhurst case, described the women engaged in this agitation as "apparatively respectable members of society." Mr. Bodkin may imagine he is a judge of what should constitute respectable conduct; but from some experience of his tricks at the Bar, I venture to differ. In any event, he has no right to insult persons not the subject of the prosecution, who have no means of replying to his insolence. Moreover, as an officer of the court, he must know that the use of such language under such circumstances makes him a proper subject of physical violence at the instance of persons aggrieved." (The New Age, March 14th.)

6. "The public should be entitled as of right to demand ordinary courtesy from men who are their paid servants." (The New Age, March 14th.)

Group D.

1. "My only comment upon Miss Bain's letter is that there is no greater provocation to social discontent than the present system of force-feeding — from a criminal and wicked motive. In reality these sentences are merely vindictive. When the Courts begin to impose sentences which have as their sole justification the motive of revenge, and not the spirit of justice, then the administrators who give themselves for law, and the magistrates have become more criminal than the persons whom they are sentencing." (The New Age, March 14th.)

2. "A word as to the so-called 'innocent tradesmen.' Some of them, no doubt, are quite unconnected with this movement; but the business methods of any of the places attacked is one of the causes of the deep-seated agitation among English women. They are some of the most notorious sweaters in London—the low-wages and latches-key type of employer, whose proper place is in the I.L.P., Manchester. They are doing criminal acts from a non-criminal motive. In reality these sentences are merely vindictive. When the Courts begin to impose sentences which have as their sole justification the motive of revenge, and not the spirit of justice, then the administrators who give themselves for law, and the magistrates have become more criminal than the persons whom they are sentencing." (The New Age, March 14th.)

3. "The woman who sells her body, whether it be for a wealthy marriage or for a sovereign, to the passer-by is a prostitute; the woman who sells her love is a virgin. The woman whose only motive is to please her lover, whose only aim is to satisfy her husband, whose only care is for her children, whose only joy is for her love is always a virgin." (The Freewoman, April 11th.)

4. "The prostitute is there, chiefly because, until women have a decent alternative in the way of earning their bread, a large number must either become prostitutes or starve. It is a terrible waste of life and honour." (The Freewoman, June 6th.)

There is only one question to ask: Which is the real Mr. McKenna? (Mrs.) Bridget Adams, Hon. Organiser, Working Women's College.

A REPLY TO MR. PRICE.

Madam,—I have not read Mr. W. C. Anderson's article on "The I.L.P. and the Woman's Movement," for I shun the Labour Leader as I do all incomplete and dull journals; but I have read Mr. Price's remarks thereon. I am no longer a member of the I.L.P., but have been one for six years. I have anything but admiration for its chairman, but when Mr. Anderson claims a good record for the I.L.P. I have to be for once right. Therefore, faute de mieux, I will take up Mr. Price's challenge.

Like him, I regard all "leaders" out of the question, its leaders, even by Mr. Price, being admittedly "among the women's best supporters." Briefly—for I value your space even as the intelligent advertiser—I will deal with the attribution of leadership on the I.L.P. rank and file, and in a series of dogmatic assertions, which may be defended more fully at another time, if you, madam, think well.

(i) Without the twelve years' pioneer work of the I.L.P. there would be to-day no W.S.P.U.

(ii) The W.S.P.U. was formed in 1903 by the I.L.P. rank and file, and its strongholds, if not the birthplace, of the I.L.P., Manchester.

(iii) During the first year or two after the commencement of militant agitation, practically the only platforms opened to the W.S.P.U. were those of the I.L.P., and during those years the coming of a W.S.P.U. organiser would be preluded by a letter to the I.L.P. branch secre-
tary. I was such a secretary, and although it meant the certain loss of many women members of the branch, I gladly convened the meeting to be addressed by the W.S.P.U. representatives. That organisation in its weaker days did not fail to recognise the extreme value of the support accorded by it. I.L.P. branches in each of the 600 towns where they existed. (4) Of the eleven women sentenced on October 24th, 1906, for partaking in the previous day's demonstration in the interest of Women's Suffrage, except Irene Miller were then members of the I.L.P. They were Miss Billington, Mrs. How Martyn, Miss Mary Gawthorpe, Miss Sylvia Pankhurst, Mrs. Montefiore, Mrs. Cobden-Sanderson, Mrs. Baldwin, Miss Arora Kenney, Mrs. Drummond, and Mrs. Pethick-Lawrence. (5) At the Stuttgart International Socialist Congress, 1907, the I.L.P. and the Fabian Society were the only Socialist bodies to support the "limited" franchise that the W.S.P.U. was then demanding. (If, as he claims, Mr. Price speaks from experience of the Socialist Movement, he will appreciate the risk of high disfavour which Mr. Wallace and Mrs. Keiries incurred.) (6) As an instance of the cordial relationship of the I.L.P. and the W.S.P.U. members prior to the Cocker­mouth bye-election, I quote from an unsigned article by Mr. W. Price, "The Reformer's Year­book," 1907, on page 10. "The I.L.P. and the W.S.P.U. inaugurated at that election 'marked a new epoch in the movement. Previously it had been a definite phenomenon) of the day is the positively amazing vigour and vitality of the women's movement. I don't want to waste your time trying to analyse or justify it. Such energy and vitality are surely themselves the hallmarks of real metal. The whole thing is a dramatic reminder of what has been forgotten for the last century, that freedom is intrinsically woman's prerogative: that doesn't attack you. I know your weakness for the other trick has duped and imposed upon men more thoroughly? The working man, above all, is the one most concerned, and in three thousand years of existence in building up a comedy of "combination," he finds he can no more control the quantity doled out to him than the quality. His power to regulate his own share is still less. More than that he has no purchasing capacity. And for this idol he deserted the fields, despising the rewards of Nature, the incomparable fruits of which her thoughts are shared. [326x-658] features of which are revolt against machinery in all its forms as the symbol of man's hideous degradation, are things that show clearly the passion and intensity with which I.L.P. members prior to the Cocker­mouth bye-election, I quote from an unsigned article by Mr. W. Price, "The Reformer's Year­book," 1907, on page 10. "The I.L.P. and the W.S.P.U. inaugurated at that election "marked a new epoch in the movement. Previously it had been a definitive order of the countryside? It seems to me sometimes that the feeling necessary to sustain and carry through any revolution must come from women; but, so far as this aesthetic revolution is concerned, what possible hope can it be drawn from her? With no other trick has duped and imposed upon men more thoroughly? The working man, above all, is the one most concerned, and in three thousand years of existence in building up a comedy of "combination," he finds he can no more control the quantity doled out to him than the quality. His power to regulate his own share is still less. More than that he has no purchasing capacity. And for this idol he deserted the fields, despising the rewards of Nature, the incomparable fruits of which her thoughts are shared. [326x-658] features of which are revolt against machinery in all its forms as the symbol of man's hideous degradation, are things that show clearly the passion and intensity with which I.L.P. members prior to the Cocker­mouth bye-election, I quote from an unsigned article by Mr. W. Price, "The Reformer's Year­book," 1907, on page 10. "The I.L.P. and the W.S.P.U. inaugurated at that election "marked a new epoch in the movement. Previously it had been a definitive order of the countryside? It seems to me sometimes that the feeling necessary to sustain and carry through any revolution must come from women; but, so far as this aesthetic revolution is concerned, what possible hope can it be drawn from her? With no other trick has duped and imposed upon men more thoroughly? The working man, above all, is the one most concerned, and in three thousand years of existence in building up a comedy of "combination," he finds he can no more control the quantity doled out to him than the quality. His power to regulate his own share is still less. More than that he has no purchasing capacity. And for this idol he deserted the fields, despising the rewards of Nature, the incomparable fruits of which her thoughts are shared. [326x-658] features of which are revolt against machinery in all its forms as the symbol of man's hideous degradation, are things that show clearly the passion and intensity with which I.L.P. members prior to the Cocker­mouth bye-election, I quote from an unsigned article by Mr. W. Price, "The Reformer's Year­book," 1907, on page 10. "The I.L.P. and the W.S.P.U. inaugurated at that election "marked a new epoch in the movement. Previously it had been a definitive order of the countryside? It seems to me sometimes that the feeling necessary to sustain and carry through any revolution must come from women; but, so far as this aesthetic revolution is concerned, what possible hope can it be drawn from her? With no other trick has duped and imposed upon men more thoroughly? The working man, above all, is the one most concerned, and in three thousand years of existence in building up a comedy of "combination," he finds he can no more control the quantity doled out to him than the quality. His power to regulate his own share is still less. More than that he has no purchasing capacity. And for this idol he deserted the fields, despising the rewards of Nature, the incomparable fruits of which her thoughts are shared. [326x-658] features of which are revolt against machinery in all its forms as the symbol of man's hideous degradation, are things that show clearly the passion and intensity with which I.L.P. members prior to the Cocker­mouth bye-election, I quote from an unsigned article by Mr. W. Price, "The Reformer's Year­book," 1907, on page 10. "The I.L.P. and the W.S.P.U. inaugurated at that election "marked a new epoch in the movement. Previously it had been a definitive order of the countryside? It seems to me sometimes that the feeling necessary to sustain and carry through any revolution must come from women; but, so far as this aesthetic revolution is concerned, what possible hope can it be drawn from her? With no other trick has duped and imposed upon men more thoroughly? The working man, above all, is the one most concerned, and in three thousand years of existence in building up a comedy of "combination," he finds he can no more control the quantity doled out to him than the quality. His power to regulate his own share is still less. More than that he has no purchasing capacity. And for this idol he deserted the fields, despising the rewards of Nature, the incomparable fruits of which her thoughts are shared. [326x-658] features of which are revolt against machinery in all its forms as the symbol of man's hideous degradation, are things that show clearly the passion and intensity with which I.L.P. members prior to the Cocker­mouth bye-election, I quote from an unsigned article by Mr. W. Price, "The Reformer's Year­book," 1907, on page 10. "The I.L.P. and the W.S.P.U. inaugurated at that election "marked a new epoch in the movement. Previously it had been a definitive order of the countryside? It seems to me sometimes that the feeling necessary to sustain and carry through any revolution must come from women; but, so far as this aesthetic revolution is concerned, what possible hope can it be drawn from her? With no other trick has duped and imposed upon men more thoroughly? The working man, above all, is the one most concerned, and in three thousand years of existence in building up a comedy of "combination," he finds he can no more control the quantity doled out to him than the quality. His power to regulate his own share is still less. More than that he has no purchasing capacity. And for this idol he deserted the fields, despising the rewards of Nature, the incomparable fruits of which her thoughts are shared. [326x-658] features of which are revolt against machinery in all its forms as the symbol of man's hideous degradation, are things that show clearly the passion and intensity with which I.L.P. members prior to the Cocker­mouth bye-election, I quote from an unsigned article by Mr. W. Price, "The Reformer's Year­book," 1907, on page 10. "The I.L.P. and the W.S.P.U. inaugura...
of it to other people at a remunerative rate, is greatly beneficial to the human race, and is one of the most important of the commercial features which raise this above all other animals. This operation in all but cases on and below the margin, which are so few that they may be neglected, enforces the borrower and the payer of interest far more than it is likely to.

Throughout the realm of commerce the deputing of the custody of valuables to workers and managers for manipulation on trust or on credit is constantly observable, and is almost always mutually helpful. In the vast majority of cases the worker could produce nothing whatever unless tools and utensils were entrusted to his skill and probity by the person who is called his employer.

Then, again, when merchants start a promising young man on credit in a store or workshop of his own, their operation is analogous to the above. In each of these cases the worker could produce nothing unless tools and materials were entrusted to his skill and probity by the person who is called his employer.

The hoarding of wealth does not produce a fictitiously enhanced value, either for itself or for any other wealth. On the contrary, its influence is diametrically the opposite of this. Stores of wealth mitigate dearness, and the increase of the volume of capital lowers the rate of interest.

July 26th, 1912.

[We advise a re-perusal of our correspondent's previous letter and our note to it. We think that should be sufficient incentive to the writer of this, to whom that was the "Ethics of Interest." The point which we made was not that the accumulation of wealth was wrong (in fact, it is obvious such accumulation, as far as the nature of wealth is concerned, affects society for the better), but that it is disburshed in order to mitigate dearness or to provision future enterprise, but that "the hoarding up of money" (i.e., limited currency) in order to create a fictitious value with a view to hiring it out at a profit (i.e., interest), was ethically wrong. This is what we said, and nothing that Mr. Fysher has said has had any bearing on our remarks. We would point out to Mr. Fysher that hoarding would have no motive or effect if money were plentiful, if, in fact, money corresponded in amount to actual wealth. It would be hard to persuade a person of the value of a premium would be placed upon it, and therefore no charge could be exacted for its productive use. Mr. Fysher's own observation, "that the increase of the volume of capital lowers the rate of interest," goes to prove this. Should it increase still further, interest would disappear altogether. Financers, recognising this, when bank-rates are low, raise them by the simple device of sending money out of the country. Break the money-thrall, therefore, and we break the financiers, their impositions and their powers. The fact that financiers have made it clear that such accumulation, as far as the nature of wealth is concerned, affects society for the better, but it does not affect the point I am endeavouring to add that I am quite aware that the monogamy is almost entirely legal in theory, but it has very little influence on facts. This is a matter of common knowledge, but it does not affect the point I am endeavouring to make.]
To return to our Eugenists. They will have to face the possibility of legal selective fertile polygamy and occasional fertile polyandry as well, if they are to have the intellectual courage of their convictions. It will cost them their clerical allies, both within the Establishment and in the Higher Nonconformity, but it will at least be an attempt to tackle realities. And in connection with the evolution and disintegration of permanent marriage as a fundamental social institution, the Eugenists will also have to face the unmarried mother. They have been adept at ignoring her hitherto, except from the point of view of the "rescue home"; at least, I have come across no Eugenist publication that acknowledged the existence of a huge surplus female population, and of the disappearance of parthenogenesis as a means of propagation among the lower classes. And the "rescue home," that has been the supreme importance (sometimes the sole importance) of the maternal function ("wifehood and motherhood") in the drawing-room phrase is reiterated constantly! Mr. and Mrs. Whetham recommend that every form of indirect pressure and compulsion be used to compel able and healthy women to bear children in marriage, regardless alike of the individuality of the woman, of the importance of the child to that it should be loved and wanted, not merely accepted and put up with, and of the increasing difficulty which men in the upper middle class experience in supporting themselves, not to speak of a family. Have these persons never known the neurotic child—cursed with self-sympathy or defence. All women are not par excellence mothers? Eugenists who can find no words strong enough to express their repugnance to the idea of sexual reproduction outside of marriage in which the sexual contact inspired only a more or less acute distaste in the wife and mother? Do not Eugenists regard marriage as a social institution of sexual constitution, tastes, and temperament among women? That all women are not par excellence mothers? Eugenists who in speaking of marriage in which the sexual contact inspired only a more or less acute distaste, have not considered the fact that the sexual instinct is beside the mark. Eugenics, or race regeneration, has been taking up to-day a moral idealism that is a logical demand of the woman who is objecting to the marriage contract is merely the public aspect of individual relations; it is at once a social recognition of them and a means of enforcement adopted by the community for its own protection. The reproduction of the race is a matter so vital that it cannot be ignored by society, and there is no evidence can be brought forward justifying your assertion that betrothals, parentage, and consequent family life exist only as "contracts," to be dissolved as irregularities, which in savage communities met with much more drastic treatment than is usual to-day.

May I point out that there is nothing in the prevalent forms of marriage and of the marriage contract in the sense of attaining or maintaining her economic independence? That she in very many cases does not do so is due to a general recognition that it is both more convenient and more economical for the husband to produce and the wife to distribute the family income. In fact, it is merely a particular instance of the general principle of the value of specialization of function.

But I allow that in theory it is possible to approve of the institution of marriage, and yet desire to abrogate all and every form of contract that either is not the result of attained or maintaining her economic independence. There is, of course, a great deal to be said for anarchy as a far-off ideal, but it is clearly quite incompatible with the existing wage system and capitalist industrialism. We must consider the alternatives to our present marriage system as they would embody themselves here and now. It has been suggested that a woman should assume the responsibility for, not only her own, but for the child's maintenance. This may be magnanimous, but it is not practical.

Again, state endowment of maternity is often advocated, and the complete state carriage with which the state endowment of parenthood—the antisecession of individual selection. We fall back upon the far-off vision of an equal distribution of maternal necessities to every man, woman and child. But even then, to be "splendidly liberal" and unscrupulous, a child will need, not institutional treatment, but the individual care and love of (as I think) two parents, involving the family instinct, which is strong, and supersedes the sexual limitation, and home life. I suggest that the contract is for the present a necessary corollary. Yours faithfully, HELENA HADLEY. July 28th, 1912.

Surely to maintain that one contract is bad does not entail that no good contract could be made. Indeed, vow-making, with and without public declaration, is one of the most deep-seated and sacred of human instincts. The distinction has to be drawn between good and bad vows between vows which can be kept, and vows whose keep-
ing will always be dubious. For instance, to vow always to obey another is to alienate the power to maintain one's free-will. But to vow to protect a child until the child should be old enough to protect itself is to vow a possible and a right thing; and upon a basis of such mutual vows a contract could very well be made for the protection of free-born children.—Ebd.]

CHILD MARRIAGES.

MADAM.—Mr. Woods defies me to find anything in his article on marriage reform which could be construed into an advocacy of child marriage. It is true there is no definite demand for child marriage, but as it is also true that he regards self-restraint in sex matters as incompatible with human nature, I contend that I very reasonably concluded that Mr. Woods would permit boys to marry directly they experienced sex desire, and, though I accept Mr. Woods' denial of any desire for child marriage, I would point out that he cannot both forbid boys to marry and also deny them self-restraint.

My most serious quarrel with Mr. Woods is in his desire to abolish self-restraint in sex matters, and thus hurl us back to the brute. His absurd and utterly false reasoning that there is no conflict between self-restraint and another woman's, a desire to change human nature make him an impossible person to debate with. I deny that self-restraint in sex matters is incompatible with human nature; the man or woman of sexual self-control should be walking about on four legs, and not on two, because lack of self-control is incompatible with human nature. To quote Dr. Forel, "only that man is truly free (and I would add truly human) who has become the master of his lower instincts."

Mr. Woods evidently Declines to believe that any wise power to be free from the embracement of his husband, that she ever desires to be alone, or perhaps he doesn't think about it at all, but holds that access to a wife's body at any and all times is a man's indisputable (or divisible) right, which thus makes marriage intolerable and impossible for any woman of decent and refined feelings. It is the prevalence of this disgusting and im moral idea among men which has made the better women so averse to marriage. I can only hope that Mr. Woods is ignorant and unconscious of the thousands of women whose lives are made wretched and shameful, and whose health and nerves and temper are ruined by the excessive sex indulgence of their husbands. It is appalling to realise that in the bond of "holy wedlock," which is sealed by law, is nothing but a union of mutual scandal and to ignore, there is infinitely more immorality, shame and degradations than can ever exist outside this bond.

But I am anxious not to be misunderstood in this matter. Mr. Woods is not the only man in favor of semi-detached marriages, not for a few years, as Mr. Woods advocates, but for always; people should be taught the wisdom of reserve, and the absolute necessity of his lower instincts."
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