THE CREATIVE POWER OF THE MASULCINE MIND seems to have culminated in the making of huge fortunes by the patience and ambition that once belonged to the artist and the philosopher. In human nature there is a certain amount of creative energy, and no more, and the truth is men have expended their vitality in such a way that they have now come to the limit. Material fortunes have occupied most of the forces of the world during the last forty years, leaving spiritual things in the hands of a few persons whose influence is only felt among a small body of people. In the creation of huge fortunes men have shut out intuition and imagination. Concentration on material objects took the place of intellectual culture. Men thought of money from morning till night. At first, the wives of money-seekers were content to remain idle, wear fine clothes, and let the men exist in a world of their own making. But while they were living a life apart from that of women they were at the same time slowly preparing the way for woman's rule. While the husband was at the money mart, the wife was engaged in talk on art, literature, music, the drama, or she was busy taking part in the doings of her club, of which the husband knew nothing. While he was thinking of the rise and fall of stocks, she was thinking of how best to curb intemperance, to legislate for women and children workers in factories, and twenty other things ignored by the husband. Thus it has come about that executive power is shifting from men to women. No man can long keep up any kind of dominion founded on wealth. Money creates nothing. It can only produce conditions out of which certain elements are developed. It has never produced brains, never created a single man or woman of genius. Power is shifting from the side of men to that of women because men in politics and commerce have ceased to show any signs of that psychic vision which women are now displaying in different parts of the world, especially in America. American women have already begun to distribute the wealth amassed by some of the millionaires.

I have seen the serfs freed in Russia, the negroes freed in America, and the political freedom of women in many of the leading Western States. In 1848 I witnessed the preparation for the War of Secession, and heard the Lincoln-Douglas debate, which sealed the doom of the old order, and, when living in Paris in 1869, I assisted at the last fêtes of Napoleon's dying empire. Thus I saw the fall of one Empire in France and the rise of another in Germany. But of all the changes and innovations I have witnessed, the greatest is the rise to power of American women.

I am old enough to remember the tidal wave of psychic power that swept over the world on the
Women's political influence began with the Abolitionist Movement, and was closely followed by the movement for the emancipation of women, and their work in the world of intellect and will has been so regular and progressive that but few people in England realise what it is or what it means. For instance, Conservative women in England have no notion of its real history. The things discussed in Mrs. Humphry Ward's novels were discussed by American women before Mrs. Humphry Ward was born. It would enlighten that lady if she would read the history of the Women's Movement in America.

English women who think that reading society novels will give them that outlook on life which is essential for vital interests to-day can have no influence on the minds of men who know the world, and what is going on in it. Just as foolish is it to take Mr. Wells' later novels as serious material for minds seeking enlightenment on any great question of life or death. Most of our men novelists write as if they were sawing wood. They seem to think a plot is an argument. They are under the illusion that great books can be written without experience. The absence of psychic vision and the want of a large worldly experience make most of their novels fall flat when it is a question of any vital intellectual movement. Cultured women see farther than intellectual men. It is their wide outlook on things which is giving them power over people who are trying to get through life on a compromise between gout and golf.

Even our most frivolous society leaders are never so fatigued as men. The typical rich business man of our time is an old and tired animal at forty. The "too old at forty" cry was never raised by a woman. Miss Anna Gould has recently declared that she has remained single because she cannot find the right kind of a man for a husband. Miss Gould is a practical woman, and she is doing far more good now than she could by marrying a golf fiend, or a society poseur, or a professional politician. As a matter of fact, neurasthenia is much more common among prominent men than among prominent women, and a well-known director of a sanatorium in America is kept busy attending to his neurasthenic clients, who are all of them rich men. Most of these victims are found to be incurable, and the number of such patients is rapidly increasing; so that before long women will have to manage the business affairs of the men as well as their own. The bane of the masculine mind to-day is the narrow groove of the specialist, and the more the merrier.

THE ATLANTEAN.

His look was lowly; but his shining eyes mirrored the sea on which his spirit sailed, and cast strange influence, that other souls stirred in this earthly slumber, thrilled in dream; but, sense-blind, turned in trance their misty sight, gave themselves to glamour of reflection. The Atlantean said: "These sail with me in the same ship, amid sublimity. Their eyes are holden, and their ears are stopped." His face was strong beyond the strength of man's, fairer than woman's, fairer than a child's. He might have marshalled nations, gained the world, such power he had, and mastery to enthral. The will, and sway as one a multitude; only the blind aspire to lead the blind.

* * * *

His ship sailed for Atlantis of the Blest. None saw the glory; for her set sails flashed, dazzling the sun to pitchy darkness.

E. H. VIsIaK.
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

The State and Freedom.

I T would be difficult to find any fifty years in English history which have been so potent to reveal the nature of government as have the six years since the General Election of 1906. Political fetish after political fetish has exploded, and the common man is coming to believe that politics is the region of untried experiments, and that, moreover, experiments in human affairs are dangerous things to try. At the same time, while he is concluding that politics are humbug, and that the State is a myth, he is pinning his last hopes to the party which holds the State as everything and politics nature's own. Matters have worked to anti-climax. Contradictory theories are rubbing shoulders together, and with one voice asking for a like solution. Like theories are at each other's throats, and demanding solutions poles apart. If ever there was a moment in English political history when clear thinking was urgent, that moment is now. If the forces which call themselves "progressive" are not to be scattered in impotent contradiction and confusion, a definite idea of the tendency of progress must be found. Individualist, communist, capitalist, liberal and labour man (poor beast!), uniting together to make common cause, make inevitable the anti-climax which presents to 1912. Understanding and a little sharp thinking might make the situation clear. If we examine it, we find three main elements: the existing régime, against the badness of which there is raised no disclaiming voice; opposed to the existing régime there are two ideals, the mere setting out towards either of which would have the merit of leaving existent conditions behind. The one ideal is that of a Perfectly-conditioned State; the other is that of a Perfectly-conditioned Individual. The mistake of the sincere "progressives" in England has been to imagine that these two ideals are one, and no small amount of sophistry has been used to prove them one. The result has been that the advocates of the second ideal have for a good century lent their energies to further the first, and wakened to reality to find their own ideal nowhere. They promptly raise the alarm, sincere if belated. "Servile State" is their indictment—none too happy a description. For, to be accurate, it is not the State which, under this conception of human affairs, is going to be Servile. It is very clearly to be the State Almighty. A Servile People is nearer the mark—what we have to do is to get the sum total of servile, obedient, negligible little individuals united together under the Mighty Aegis of the State. There can be no least shadow of a doubt about the matter. Individual autonomy is disappearing at such a rate that in fifty years we shall be a people in chains. The State is going to regulate who shall be born, whether we are fit to live in the community when we are born, and whether we shall reproduce our kind; the State regulates our education, our status, and our work; the State is going to settle our wages; and will clap us in its prisons if we refuse to accept them, and will shut us up in segregation-wards if we refuse to work; it is going to doctor us when we are sick, and keep us when we are old (that is, if we leap the hurdles put in the way of our living when we are young). It is going to take the land and the "instruments of production"; that is, it is going to hold the pass to life. Holding these, the means of life to all, at its disposal, it naturally exercises the lesser sway over initial entry into and departure from life. If segregation is not sufficient, the lethal chamber will shortly be at its disposal. We are a happy little people, and yet as nothing compared with that we shall be. What a happy land is England, all kept so nice and tidy by the police and law! Jolly little people, saved from the temptation of going wrong by a legal compulsion to go right; kept safely from the cradle (and before) to the grave by the almighty, beneficent State—that is, by the politicians (paid) to make the laws; by the judges (paid) to administer the laws; by the policemen (paid) to execute the laws; by the gaolers, segrigators, hangsmen, and all that mighty body of clerks (paid), who embody the majesty of the law, and compel respect for the State.

The thing becomes increasingly clear. We have arrived at the parting of the ways. If the battle of opinion be waged now between the communists, collectivists, statists, on the one hand, and the individualists, on the other, between the parliamentarians and the libertarians, it will save a harsh battle, maybe waged in another sort, later. In any case, it is high time the individualists found their tongue, with their defence and creed, and the spirit to fight for their own. Individualistic thought in England has made but a poor stand. Timid, and apologising itself out of existence, it has left the field clear to the collectivists and communists. The early hold which the mechanistic theory laid on England has affected its very vitals. The stunted individualism of the Manchester School, too timid to trust its own creed, is all that the English seem able to comprehend of individualism. Anarchism has produced no great exponent in England since Godwin. To an Englishman anarchism means bombs, and—communism, of all things! It has never occurred to him that it means nothing if not a belief in his own soul.

And this is where we have arrived at the present time. We are faced not only with the problem of ridding ourselves of capitalist control. We have to dodge the proffered alternative, that of State control. We stand between the Devil and the Deep Sea. There can be no more common ground between State Socialists and Individualists than there can be between Capitalists and Individualists. The temperament of the State Socialist is complementary to that of the Capitalist. He thinks his own soul, his own individuality, his own free-will is
of little account; the Capitalist thinks the same. The State thinks the same. The Individualist thinks differently. He thinks his own individuality is of supreme importance—to him. By dint of imagination he realises that, with a better sort of neighbour, his neighbour's individuality will be of supreme importance to him. But that is his neighbour's affair. The first duty of man is towards himself, and, therefore, his paramount responsibility is to gain such conditions that no other will shall be able to come between him and his power to realise his own will. Any effort directed towards the restoration of free-will to man has, therefore, to bear in mind the nature of man. We have already pointed out that man is the animal with tools. The man bereft of tools is barely a man. A poor man is not a man. A wage-slave is not a man. He has slipped back on the sub-human level. And, moreover, because man is unable, unlike Mahomet's coffin, to remain suspended in air, without means of support, he is helpless when divorced from the land. Each man and woman, therefore, must have free access to land. Given that, they will create their tools. It is quite clear to what conception of society this belief in the fundamental necessity for free-will in man leads us. It leads back to the land. Back to freedom.

Away back from the petrifying noise and ugliness of the towns. Back from the great factory. Back from machinery. Agriculture is the basis of free society, and, as long as men have bodies, it must remain so. If a man must have, above all other necessities, food, shelter, and clothing, then it is the sale of birthright to hand over control of these to others. This is the solution of the difficulty of the wage-slave. Wages—and it matters little what we call wages—imply an immoral bargain. They imply the sale of a man's self to another for pay. They have to arise the same fastidiousness in respect of the loafing-out for hire of a man's or a woman's working capacities, as there is already regarding the loaning-out of a woman's sexual capacities. It is the same thing in kind—prostitution in both cases. The two things differ only in degree. The capacities of a human being cannot be let out on hire, beyond the control of the human being to whom they belong. If a law of necessity exists which tends towards such hiring out, then that law has to be examined in the light of the destiny and dignity of human life, and ways and means have to be taken to break through it. For it defeats the purpose of man. It is a consideration such as this which has to be brought to the inquiry into the merits of the industrial system—and this, apart from all considerations of capitalist exploitation. Industrialism itself requires examination.

Machine-production must be brought to the bar of human development and answer for itself. Does it tend to make man greater? Does it develop his faculties or quicken his divination of the soul of things? Does it make him more an artist, or does it make him less? Does it increase beauty, or does it destroy it? For the main question for humanity is not whether man has more. The supreme question is whether man is more—greater in himself. It is not a question of possessions. It is a question of capacity. In the face of such an examination, the machine system would have no defence. For it is to be noted that we do not speak of machines. Mechanical contrivance has done much to assist man, and has given him considerable insight into the material side of things. A mechanical appliance, specially devised to serve a man, to assist what he designs individually, is a most valuable thing, of high worth, as his servant. But in the machine-system, that is, the industrial-system, the factory-system, the machine is master. The man serves the machine. His work is to tend it. The supreme contempt that the factory-system has for men! The Luddites were, indeed, prescient people, and resented the human insult. They lived to see the insult grow, in spite of their efforts. All the faculties of men con­demned for the sake of machines! Their ears offended with its clang and clank, their eyes with its ugliness, their nostrils with its stench, their souls crushed under its uniformity. When, therefore, men turn to seek freedom in the Normal Social life, as Mr. Wells designated the life of man in its natural setting (he designated it so to criticise it, not to bless, unhappily), they will take with them the machine as a Servant. The reign of the machine as Master has been brief. But it has been absolute, and its cruelty has been in proportion. It has broken in the spirit of man; made him not merely serf, but a willing serf. It has left as the task of this generation the work of reviving in man the sense of his own greatness, the comprehension of his destiny, the restoring of impieryousness to the voice of his own soul. If there is religion in the land, we need it now; not empty phrases, worn-out creeds, but affirmations of man's immortal soul—of God, no less. For the immorality of the oppression of the poor means just this, that it is the oppression of the God in man. This lack of beauty in life which is reflected in the faces of men is just the obliteration of the image of God, in which man was created. It is the effacing of that intuitive knowledge of his high existence. No wonder men shrink from believing that they bear the God within them, when they find themselves forced to become the bought slaves of machines! There is little to make them believe the earth is their footstool! Well, then, when all things appear in chaos, it behoves us to seek guidance at the source of things—in the nature of man himself. A knowledge of what he is elemental, and that he needs of necessity, will be the only sure guide among such diverse outpouring of tongues. Ideas of society must be based on religion, and for religion there is this to be said: it is always individual. Any truly religious society of itself generates a true, individual morality. Only, however, when religion is self-conscious, aware of its own requirements, does it of necessity create a social morality. Now, we have got not merely a religion, but a self-con­scious religion. We are, therefore, sure of our morality, individually and socially. Individually, therefore, morality forbids the letting out of the will into bondage: either into the bondage of external personal force, or the bondage of internal sensual desire. Socially, morality forbids interference with the free-will of another, or the making of arrangements which will tend to negate the free-will of another. Such a morality will alone make impossible the exploitations of Capitalism and the paternalism of a State socialism.
Strindberg—The English Gentleman.

Writers on the subject of August Strindberg have hitherto omitted to mention that he could not write. His vain face, with the hot, angry eyes, the little lustful mouth, the rumpled forehead, and sharp, peevish chin, proclaims that he had neither the strength nor the humour to become an artist. The following moving quotation conveys his literary atmosphere: “In the course of the evening I recited Longfellow’s ‘Exscelsior’ to her. Genuinely touched by this beautiful poem, I fixed my eyes on her, and as if she were hypnotised her face reflected every shade of feeling expressed on my own. She had the appearance of an ecstatic, a seer.” His economics are the crudities of the British Socialist Party, delivered with the languor of the Fabian Society. His religion has the wistful ingenuity of theological speculations carried on in bed by a tired child: he believes this earth to be a hell, in which we suffer for former sins, and from which we struggle to rise to salvation. One very blatant defect in his plays is the lifelessness of the minor characters, which contrasts with Ibsen’s vivid realisation of his smallest parts. The engineer in “Little Eyolf,” and little Hilda Wangel in “The Lady from the Sea,” live as intensely as Rita Allmers or the Man from the Sea. In Strindberg’s greatest play, “The Father,” besides himself and his wife, there is not one living character. Various puppets come on and give information with the accuracy and crispness of Bradshaw, even the little girl over which Strindberg and his wife quarrel till he goes mad speaks like an automaton. But, of course, Strindberg’s plays are bad by necessity of his style: one cannot create great drama out of ugly phrases. He tries to paint the battle of emotion between nobility and sensuality, and one cannot paint strong emotions as ugly, because only weakness is ugly. Because he failed to realise this, his plays are un­speakingly horrible. His confession is not beautiful and purifying, like the confession of Sir Aglovale de Galis. One feels humiliated and de­nounced that the value of his works is purely moral and not artistic.

Strindberg, who was neither a good nor a wise man, had a stroke of luck. He went mad. He lost the power of inhibition. Everything down to the pettiest suspicion that the dog had been given the leanest mutton chop, poured out of his lips. Men of his weakness and sensuality are usually, from their sheer brutishness, unable to express themselves. But Strindberg was mad and articulate. That is what makes him immortal.

“The Confession of a Fool” is the triumph of his artlessness. It is the story of his first marriage. At the age of twenty-six, when he was a poverty-stricken Court librarian, he met a middle-aged Baron of gross life and his Baroness, a beautiful and refined Madona, who yearned for the stage. Gradually the Baroness and the young librarian become lovers. Finally, as the Baron has a liaison with a younger woman, he agrees to divorce her. For some months they have an illicit relationship. Now that she is released from the restraint of her social position, she shows clearly that she is a woman of evil disposition; she has a taste for strong drink and light love. But, bestially infatuated by her physical charm, he is still her lover. He forces her to bear a child, whom he legitimatises by marrying her. After that he perceives her, and she as the sea. She becomes a drunkard and an adulteress; she is dirty in her personal habits and financially dishonest. She loves the company of rakes and prostitutes, and develops the blackest perversities. But for ten years he not only submits to, but insists on the embraces of this unpenalised member of the criminal classes; he makes her the mother of his children. They persist in this offensive marriage for ten years, after which time they consented to a divorce.

The main fact of Life which he grasped in the clairvoyance granted him by thisappalling experience is that Love is a miracle. It is the only miracle that ever happened. It is the only successful alchemy, since it transuses the untransfusable. That Loves makes two one is the only pledge we have that the religious passion, the desire of the individual to become the universe, is not an illusion. The ecstasy of Love is permanent, like the ecstasy of Art. It is only rarely that the sculptor feels at one with his marble or the poet becomes his poem. The ecstasy is so tremendous that Life could not endure its permanence. Besides, differences of experience would each soul so different from all others that each one knows itself an Ishmaelite and fears its brother. They may be united for a minute, but for eternity they are divorced by their differences of temperament. As Yeats says, far more forcibly than Strindberg could ever say anything, because he uses beautiful language:

“I think that all deep passion is but a kiss
In the mid-battle, and a difficult peace
Twist oil and water, candles and dark night,
Hillside and hollow, the hot-footed moon;
And when cold, sliding, slippery-footed moon;
A brief forgiveness between opposites,
That have been hatreds for three times the age
Of this long 'stablished ground.'

It would be difficult to credit it, but Strindberg actually regrets against the impermanence of Love. He is perpetually crying out because after Love has gone there comes Hatred. It does not if the lovers turn to the contemplation of either of the two other impermanent good things of the earth—Art and Childhood; but it does if the lovers are sensual persons infatuated with the pleasure of sex. Strindberg’s style is so grossly material that the mind refuses to recog­nise the perception of a spiritual truth as the cause of his agony, and seeks for a material explanation. Europe has found that material explanation in his madness, and thereby has not enjoyed the value of his confessions. His lack of inhibition made him reveal his psychology with insane frankness. But his psychology was quite sane. It was that of the ordinary English gentleman.

To show how like an English gentleman Strindberg was, we may take a few examples of the effect of passion on him. “Taciturn, morose, not at all pretty, the Baroness left the conversation entirely to me, and since she made no replies, it soon
The Cause of Financial Panics.

II.

UNDER our present system dollars and pounds are commodities, and are influenced by the laws of supply and demand. When the supply of dollars is constant and the demand increases, the purchasing power of dollars increases, and vice versa. When the supply of dollars, which is determined by hoarding or by "cornering" gold, the purchasing power of dollars increases. Now, money, being a species of credit, the artificial restriction of the supply of money naturally tends to bring into use personal credit. The natural wants of mankind are not to be suppressed or confined by any artificial restriction, such as a "specie basis," or a "legal tender" Act; hence, through the limitation of that which should be unrestricted, a substitute is adopted and "enormous amounts of credits are piled up." The effect of this substitute is the same as an increase in the volume of money, and its tendency is to lessen its purchasing power. Further, the destruction of credit, which occurs every now and again, is precisely similar in its effects to the destruction of the "cornering" of money, the purchasing power of which instantly rises. The result is analogous to that which would occur by discovering a substitute, demand and supply be increased to enormous amounts of credits are piled up. The objects of one competing commodity with another. But the commodity merchant always regards his competitor jealously and with impatience. He is ever ready to place obstacles in his path. Not so the commodity money merchant; he looks ahead. He will even assist in "the piling up of these vast amounts of credit," notwithstanding that his interest is temporally put down by doing so. So long as these credits are built upon the specie, he knows that, as surely as the sun rises, they can be swept out of existence as completely as if they had never existed. The greater their amount the greater the disproportion between the actual supply and the money demand, and consequently the greater the harvest will the money merchant reap when the crash comes.

These credits, being redeemable in specie, are found too enormous for redemption. There is not enough specie in the world to redeem them with. And now the operation of driving the camel through the eye of the needle begins. All that does not pass through the needle's eye falls into the hands of the drivers.

The makers of credit find themselves in the position of the Israelites, who were compelled to make bricks without straw. They are driven to despair. The holders of specie carefully put it under lock and key, thereby increasing an already enormous deficiency. The demand remaining what it was when credits were

thousand millions of dollars is as disastrous to commerce and industry as the loss of that amount of money! Statesmen worry when gold leaves the country, but regard the contraction of credits with but little anxiety. The great concern of Governments appears to be to facilitate the importation of gold in order to increase the volume of currency; but they are stupidly unconcerned when that which fills its place, and which is, after all, the main factor in facilitating exchange, is reduced or impaired.

It will be convenient at this place to point out the manner in which personal credit, although apparently a competitor with money, is made "its partner and associate in crime."

We have seen the effect of variation in supply and demand upon values. The greater the demand and the more restricted the supply, the greater the purchasing power. The demand having increased and the supply suddenly decreased, the effect is enormously augmented. For instance, suppose the demand for an article, at one time, to be represented by 100, the supply being also 100; and suppose by means of an artificial substitute, demand and supply be increased to 10,000. Now, by suddenly cutting off the artificial substitute, the supply is at once knocked down by 10,000, the demand still remaining at 10,000!

The appreciation in the purchasing power of that commodity can be better imagined than described!

This is precisely the effect of credit upon money. Credit is the artificial substitute for money. (Of course refer now entirely to our present monetary system. Under a scientific system, money and credit would be synonymous.)

The demand for money is always far in excess of the supply; hence, its substitute is called into existence, the first and immediate result of which is to lessen the demand for money. Interest is less, prices are raised, and the effect similar to that of one commodity on another. But the commodity merchant always regards his competitor jealous and with impatience. He is ever ready to place obstacles in his path. Not so the commodity money merchant; he looks ahead. He will even assist in "the piling up of these vast amounts of credit," notwithstanding that his interest is temporarily put down by doing so. So long as these credits are built upon the specie, he knows that, as surely as the sun rises, they can be swept out of existence as completely as if they had never existed. The greater their amount the greater the disproportion between the actual supply and the money demand, and consequently the greater the harvest will the money merchant reap when the crash comes.

These credits, being redeemable in specie, are found too enormous for redemption. There is not enough specie in the world to redeem them with. And now the operation of driving the camel through the eye of the needle begins. All that does not pass through the needle's eye falls into the hands of the drivers.

The makers of credit find themselves in the position of the Israelites, who were compelled to make bricks without straw.

They are driven to despair. The holders of specie carefully put it under lock and key, thereby increasing an already enormous deficiency. The demand remaining what it was when credits were

...
in existence, the supply is cut down to less than that existing before the substitute was created.

The effect of credit is, therefore, to greatly increase the purchasing power of money whenever credit is shaken.

Credit is the fertiliser that serves to ripen the fruit which the money monopolists shake into their own hands. But of which money alone could never produce. Credit changes the value of the denominator to an enormously greater degree than specie could possibly do.

Take the credits of Great Britain, estimated at from five to six thousand millions of pounds, whilst the legal tender in circulation is only about 120 million pounds. Supposing that only 10 per cent. of the credit is redeemable in money. There are then 600 million pounds of credit, and but 120 million pounds, or one-fifth the amount required, to redeem it. Now, so long as credit is unassailed and remains intact, everything works smoothly. Credits are redeemed with credits, extensions given, and a small amount of money serves to do a vast amount of work by circulating rapidly and by making credits redeemable at different times. But let the public lose confidence, let credit become shaken, fear become general through some cause, no matter how trivial, and there is an immediate desire to have credits redeemed. Instead of redeeming them with credits, or granting extensions, every creditor insists upon cash redemption. The demand for money, heretofore satisfied with credit, is now centred on gold, and will be satisfied with nothing else. Gold rises enormously; multitudes of persons are obliged to sell their goods at a sacrifice. Down come prices. Industry is paralysed, and Parliamentary and Congressional committees are appointed to inquire into the causes of the disaster. Those whose system is the cause of all the trouble are consulted. With learned ignorance they propose such theories as "over-production," "over-trading," "abuse of credit," "State-bank currency," "reduction of the tariff."

Their theories are seriously considered and acted upon. The country pulls itself together, and once more commences its Sisyphean task of building another gigantic pyramid with its apex for a base. Such, in brief, is a synopsis of the financial panics which periodically afflict the world, and which have puzzled legislators for the past two centuries, as completely as Haley's comet puzzled Popes Callixtus and Pius II.

Such results are wholly attributable to building industry upon an insufficient and false foundation. Panics are not the results of "over-production," nor of "over-trading," nor of the "abuse of credit." Panics arise because the gold basis is too narrow and too contracted on which to build the world's industries. The building becomes top heavy. It is pushed into a position of unstable equilibrium by those who control the base, and down it comes. To say that there is general over-production or over-trading is to say that people have more than they want, and that they are trading for amusement. Human wants are the cause of trading, and, because of the insufficient supply of the medium of exchange, men are actually compelled to make industry top heavy and unstable.

I have shown that money is, from the scientific standpoint, circulating credit, and credits that are not circulating are termed stationary credits. Now, the channel of circulation is filled with these forms of credit, and, in order that trade and commerce should be facilitated, it is essential that the material with which the channel is filled be kept in circulation.

Like blood in the human body, it must circulate freely and unhindered to keep trade in a healthy condition.

The effect of legislation restricting monetary issues, by taxation or otherwise, is to increase the amount of that class of credit which may be termed sluggish or stationary. It is circulated slowly and with difficulty. The demand for money being greater than the supply, recourse is had naturally to the medium of personal credits, which are essentially sluggish. Hence the channel of circulation becomes choked, and circulation is hampered or entirely stopped.

We have thus a further illustration of legislation defeating its own ends. Ostensibly, legal tender acts and specie bases are for the protection of society; to provide the people with what the newspapers are fond of terming "honest" money. In suppressing State and private bank issues by taxation the Government compels society to have recourse to a system of credit far more precarious than any State or private bank systems that ever existed. The loss occasioned by a sudden shrinkage of public credit results in much greater evil and misery than any mere over-issues of bank-notes would produce.

The end to be sought by those who would prevent a repetition of the financial and monetary disasters of the past is to free money from the artificial and burdensome restraints with which it is encompassed; to allow the people to attend to and satisfy their own wants in regard to money as with everything else. The more plentiful the money supply, the less a baseless credit system will be used, until, with an adequate supply, the system finally disappears. The solution is not to make the industrial and commercial structure less bulky, but to broaden the foundation; to make the base proportional to the edifice. To use our former illustration, we must stand the pyramid on its base if we would make it stable. Those who control the apex may then do their worst; they can never overturn business. Commerce thus assumes its rightful position and becomes absolutely safe.

ARTHUR KITSON.

Reprinted from "The Money Question," by kind permission of Mr. Arthur Kitson.

Will Men Govern when Women have the Vote?

The one attractive feature about women suffrage is that it is a revolutionary change; but even revolutionary changes, to be useful to the progress of the world, must have some basis in reason. As a matter of democratic form, they should be submitted to the country. Women suffrage has never been submitted as a defined issue to the country. The disinclination of the Suffragists to submit their case to a direct referendum of men and women is due to the circumstance that there is no real electoral majority for the proposal. Moreover, there never has been a majority of the House of Commons in favour of women suffrage; but merely a majority of those present and voting in the House of Commons.

The relative economic position of men and women should be briefly touched upon. Men are compelled by law, under pain of imprisonment, to support their wives. There is no similar legal liability upon women. Capt. Haines, the Governor of Brixton Prison, gave some interesting testimony on this point before the Select Committee on Im-
prisonment for Debt. He took 21st May, 1908, as a typical day in enumerating the number of persons incarcerated in Brixton Gaol under debt committal orders. On that date, there were 138 such prisoners, of whom 38 were men imprisoned under orders for wife maintenance. These figures show the severity of the legal remedies which a wife has against a defaulting husband. Of the 25 per cent. of the prisoners committed for debt were husbands; so that the reality of legal disabilities upon married men cannot be seriously disputed. The grave position under "man-made law" of any husband who has a vindictive wife has been shown by the case of Rex v. Richardson and others, reported in The Times Law Reports, 13th July, 1903. The case was excellently summed up in a letter of Messrs. Young, Son and Ward to the Home Secretary: "We venture to bring to your notice the following circumstances connected with a matter in which we have acted professionally. On the 1st November, 1898, Charles Edward Sherry was adjudged by the Penge Justices to have been guilty of cruelty towards his wife, and an order for separation was made. Our client being directed to pay to his wife the sum of £20 per week. On 11th October, 1908, our client was arrested for non-payment of arrears of alimony, amounting to £2 8s. 6d. costs of the proceedings expired he was served with a summons for failing to pay the sum of £2 8s. 6d. costs of the proceedings before the Justices. Sherry left Brixton Prison, and he was then arrested on a warrant for payment of £12 arrears of maintenance, which had accrued while he was in prison. The bench committed the defendant to prison for six weeks, although he offered to pay the amount by instalments if the bench would give him time. On the summons for payment of costs amounting to £2 8s. 6d., the defendant was also committed to prison for fourteen days. We are not now acting professionally in this matter, but we consider it our duty to lay the facts before you, inasmuch as they amount to what we respectfully suggest is nothing less than a public scandal. While the defendant is in prison his earning power will be again suspended, and when his time shall expire, he will doubtless be re-arrested. That this course is contemplated is clearly shown by the enclosed copy letter which has been sent to a relative of the defendant. Apparently, therefore, the defendant will remain in prison for the rest of his natural life at the dictation of his vindictive wife."

The letter referred to by Messrs. Young as written by the solicitors for the wife, wound up thus: "We need hardly add that at the end of the present term we shall reluctantly be compelled to repeat these steps." A habeas corpus was moved for in the King's Bench, but it was refused, the judges being of opinion that the law of England enabled a wife to carry on such proceedings as these against her husband ad infinitum. The headnote of the report represents the lengths to which the law has been pushed for the protection of married women: "When an order has been made under the Summary Jurisdiction (married women) Act, 1895, that a husband should pay a weekly sum to his wife, such order may be enforced by an order of the Queen's Bench, without a bill of spe­ cial bail, without proof that the husband had the means to pay the sum in respect of which he has made default." This case has been dwelt upon at some length, to meet the false agitation founded on the alleged oppressive character, so far as women are concerned, of the law. The passage of a Woman Suffrage Bill might enable women to withstand, with some success, owing to the complexity of the issues, any effort to ease or modify the strain on married men. Female labour, in the competitive market, is cheap or "blackleg" labour. Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, in his excellent work on Women in the Printing Trades, has incorporated in a note on page 47 some striking figures: "In Edinburgh, women's piece rates for composing average about two-thirds those of men. At Warrington, women do machine-ruling for prices ranging from 15s. to 20s., whilst men are paid 32s. for the same work. A Manchester employer estimated that a woman was two-thirds as valuable in a printer's and stationer's warehouse as a man, and she was paid 15s. or 20s. to his 33s." On page 46 the same tendency is noted: "Women were introduced into Warrington newspaper offices early in the decade beginning with 1880. . . . The women compositors are paid one-third of the men's rate. Here it was definitely stated that the cheapness of women's labour made it unnecessary to introduce linotypes." On page 50 the advantages of the woman worker from the employer's point of view are set out: "(1) That she will accept low wages; she usually works for about half the men's wages. (2) That she is not a member of a union, and is, therefore, more amenable to the will of the employer as the absolute ruler of the workshop."
The rate of male wages is based upon a family standard of life, aided by the economic combination of the men in their trade unions. The rate of female wages is roughly calculated on the assumption that the worker has only herself to support. Women have comparatively little aid in the industrial conflict from the collective bargaining of the Trade Unions, as not many women workers are members of a Trade Union. Undoubtedly great hardships flow from this economic standard, which is the price of their employment, and has been imposed upon women by economic tradition.

This is the position. There is a heavy (and necessary) legal maintenance burden cast upon men to maintain their wives. There is an excess of women over men, which, under a system of monogamic marriage, is driving more and more women into the labour market. The rate of male wages is based upon a family standard of life, aided by the economic combination of the men in their trade unions. The rate of female wages is roughly calculated on the assumption that the worker has only herself to support. Women have comparatively little aid in the industrial conflict from the collective bargaining of the Trade Unions, as not many women workers are members of a Trade Union. Undoubtedly great hardships flow from this economic standard, which is the price of their employment, and has been imposed upon women by economic tradition.

The New Order.

SERIES II.

I.—THE NEW EDUCATION: FREE INITIATIVE AND LIFE-LONG CULTURE.


I.—"CHILDREN OF A LARGER GROWTH."

In no field of social effort have the seeds of revolution been more ardently sown, or the fertilisers of various kinds of change more boldly applied, than in the world of Education. From the days of Pestalozzi and Froebel down to the establishment of the latest Montessori centre, where the teacher is expected rather to study the child, than to engage them in study the child, than to engage them in

Emerging from the fetters of discipline, education is also released from the system of grading according to occupation, or class, or sex, or economic importance. Subject to the one universal rule, that every member of the New Order is trained from childhood to the performance of the minimum details connected with his own primary needs, the only recognised guide in education is found in considerations of human development, nor need any necessarily continue to follow an occupa-

heretofore outside his purview altogether. Many besides Pestalozzi and Shelley have asked themselves how privileges thus suddenly acquired can be sensibly or beneficially exercised, and, conversely, why the human race should be deprived of the outflowing of those early and unspoiled efforts of the child to enact its fresh impressions, those flashes of young insight which, as Wordsworth so well says, "are the very life of all our seeing." The effect of this continual sacrificial offering of the past has been to rivet the chains of previous habit, and to enslave the mass of mankind to the irksome bondage of industrial and commercial routine. To such a pitch had we come in the last century that a noted educationalist and poet of the time, Matthew Arnold, wrote:—

"For most men in a brazen prison live,
Where 'neath the sun's hot eye
Their heads bent o'er their toil they ceaselessly
Dreaming of naught beyond their prison wall."

The habit of performing "unmeaning taskwork," so early acquired in childhood, is never shaken off in later life.

Under the inspiration of the New Order, its enactors seek to avert these results by regarding the education problem as a whole "from the womb to the tomb." The child lives and moves and has its being in an atmosphere where freedom of initiative is held in respect and limited only by the requirements of fair play all round. By the recognition of the fact that sense of responsibility is acquired, since it is a natural human instinct, even in the young, to accept responsibility for the results of action freely taken. By the New Order training which gradually equips the child for the production of its own food supply, on the other hand, there is more and more fully developed, as manhood approaches, that wider sense of responsibility which recognizes what is due from the individual on account of his relation to the whole human race, of which he is a part. Previous Tracts in these series have shown how these two principles are safeguarded for adults by the interaction of security in the subsistence minimum—expressed in land areas—for all who live, with unfettered freedom of all who produce. By the allied land and money systems, which co-ordinate these two fundamental characteristics of a truly social life, the New Order sets out to secure the fullest possible measure of spontaneity and self-direction. Surrounded as we are by the contrast of existing institutions surviving from the era of dominance, relics of the rule of class by class, sex by sex, people by priests, the have-nots by the haves, New Order groups must work like the little leaven which leavens the whole lump, nor need any be discouraged if so great a change, whereby the human type emerges into the air and sunlight of freedom, setting in action the play of natural fellowship and spontaneous mutual aid, should be slow of accomplishment and faced by obstacles of every kind; yet the forces of growth and futurity are with the New Order, and if the fundamental principle be adhered to nature is always and everywhere true to her own logic.

II.—REVOLUTION IN OUTLOOK.
tion after mastering its essentials, both scientific and practical, so long as he can find scope, in free organisation, of some kind elsewhere. The one paramount occupation, in fact, is the production and perfecting of men and women, and the output of material accessories, however ingenious, will no longer be permitted to engross, as they do now, the whole working activities of a majority of the people. Educators in the New Order will not lose sight of the need for implanting desirable habits in the young, but such habits must subserve the fundamental ends of life, and the adoption of narrow grooves of thought and action, or the mere reiteration of the dictates of unthinking custom, cannot be allowed to become, as too often now, the autocrats of the mind and consequent arbiter of the fates of men.

The argument of the previous chapter has brought us up against one of the most startling paradoxes of the old order. The coming of age, which sets the human adult theoretically free to follow his own bent in life, or seek such fields of work as he may deem best suited to his all-round development, finds him or her in the vast majority of cases bound within strict limits of necessity to secure by systematic effort—a niche in the material, commercial, or professional struggle going on all round, and that foothold, as a rule, once secured he dare not quit, lest he should fail to find another in the social chaos of to-day. Thus it happens—thanks to the zeal of educational reformers—that the child, even in the disciplinary stages of his school life, has a better chance of safeguarding his development than the callow youth of the Old Order who has his means of life to obtain. Even the privileged or possessing classes, moving in the seeming artificial freedom which money induces, still fail to secure continuity of spontaneous development, sometimes through the delusion that they have completed their education, sometimes through the contagion of specialisation which they catch from the machine-ridden industrial world.

Here the fact must be brought into strong relief once more that the basic condition or ruling principle of the New Order—that which secures to each the subsistence minimum in terms of land areas—revolutionises the whole outlook for the education of the youth. At the close of the Old Order, man was faced with an end to the life and death struggle with his fellows for a foothold, which the wage system inexorably and inevitably implies. The thoughtful educationalist already quoted once wrote to a revolutionary friend:—

"Nor shall the day dawn at a human nod, When, breaking through the barriers superposed By selfish occupation, plot, and plan, Lust, avarice, envy—liberated man, All difference with his fellow mortal closed, Shall be left standing face to face with God."

The New Order itself is the outcome of earnest and persistent determination to put an end to that "difference with his fellow mortal" which Tennyson called the "life of the New Order"—a condition to which he applied the term: "The goal of human life is to secure the freedom of the highest and widest sense (or, as religious folk would phrase it, freedom to pursue the will of God on earth)—by the substitution of security of living and freedom of exchange for the chaotic struggle for life as an end in itself, which the Old Order had brought into the world. When by continued struggle man has achieved the New Order, then the goal he has set himself is secured, and all that remained to be done was to make the New Order a reality."

The New Order is surely, the critics will say, to make the mistake of probing into the unknowable, where the subject demands that a line should be drawn at the known or, at most, the knowable. Here another paradox appears (revolution is the maker of paradox), for in the light of the New Order things which once appeared to be the most knowable—the hard facts of practical experience, as men say—become unknowable, or, at least, unfit to be known, and with the clearing away of these from the foreground of the mind, the horizon opens, and the discovery of new worlds of knowledge and experience proceeds apace.

The educational processes of the New Order at the present stage are thus resolved into three: (1) the clearing away of the false knowledge surviving from the past; (2) the formulation and habitual practice of the new philosophy so far as understood; and (3) the pursuit of new tracks of discovery along lines first rendered possible by the adoption of new methods of life.

In each field of knowledge there are portions to be set aside ("segregated" as unfit to survive!), for example: in history, all survivals, direct and indirect, of the class war, or those relating to the old political economy and statecraft, except the minimum equipment sufficient for occasional dealings with the old money in the group or outside: in language, all differential teaching derived from or tending to perpetuate class distinctions: in history, all studies calculated to inspire the worship of economic heroes, thus obscuring the great human issues which they exemplify, all those in ethics, all survivals, direct and indirect, of the class war, or

* The emancipators of the slaves in the United States, for instance, believed that they really were securing freedom to the Negro by lifting him into the money world, but herein they were deceived by appearances (see Series I., Tract 4."

† See Richard Jefferies, "The Story of my Heart."
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feudalism, and all morals derived from false and exploded money values, or the obscuration of vital human rights by the ascendancy of property.

A wholesome outcrop of new faculties will rapidly spring up, as all three departments grow more and more alive with the enthusiasm of the new ideals, the glory of the escape from the money thraldom. The recent great discoveries touching the natural forces of steam, electricity, etc., hitherto poisoned in their use by the embittered economic struggle, will yield an abundant fruitage to the higher faculties thus set free.

Along with this goes the regaining of that comradeship with the elements so nearly lost to man by the age-long errors of the economic era. The balancing of the bodily organism amongst its climatic surroundings forms an important part of the New Education (Series II., Tract 3, "The New Hygiene").

More than one generation may be required before the reconstructive force of new ideas can remedy the neglect of land culture, which has reached such a pitch in Western Europe that its peoples are mainly living on food stuffs grown elsewhere. Perhaps the greatest obstacle in the way of the New Order is the reluctance of the average town-dweller to undertake even the small effort of tillage shown to be due from him. Not till the basic connection of land with the solution of the social problem is realised will a true science of agriculture become possible, other occupations including all handicrafts appropriate to the simple life being harmoniously adjusted thereto. A scientific system of afforestation, meanwhile, will gradually complete for the natural expression of the brute, song-bird, relieved from the old slavery, will burst forth in spontaneous rhythmic utterance, aided by the new linguistic sense born of the higher unison and wider harmonies of the free world.

IV.—CHILD LIFE IN THE NEW ORDER.

The barracks school, which now daily imprisons large masses of child life, will some day be looked upon as a nightmare of the past, when the unnatural severance of the teaching caste from the rest of humanity shall have yielded to saner and more human methods of group life; for the New Order, while it delivers the adult from his economic bondage to a life-long repetition of the same task, also frees the child from this form of dependence on the mere professional teacher, which in the present day sets both child and teacher in a world apart from the actualities of life to the spoiling and artificialising of both.

There will be in the New Order groups, besides the purely pioneering and exploring minds, some who have special skill in marshalling facts and presenting them with the due fruit of the human face, others, who, though weaker in this respect, have the superior art of winning the attention of the child by charm of manner or instinctive sympathy with its natural temperament. Each and all these influences will be brought to bear in due degree upon the growing child who, sharing with adult life the balanced activity of head, heart, and hand, will harmoniously co-operate in production, handicraft, or invention towards the one end, the development of each by all and all by each. Groups and sub-groups of learners will cluster around each form of activity, children and adults of varying ages alternately teaching or learning from each other. The springs of art will be set flowing in ever-new forms and directions, as the joy of cosmic harmony, shared hitherto only by the unspoiled child, the poet and the seer, spreads far and wide among the races of men, at peace with themselves and with nature.

W. ALLAN MACDONALD.
HELEN M. MACDONALD.

The Social Value of Women's Suffrage.

O PPOSITION to the feminist movement reduces itself to three questions, an answer to which will go far toward leaving that hostility inarticulate or unreasonable.

These questions are: Do women really want the vote? Even if women want the vote, can they use it? Even if women want the vote, and prove their fitness for suffrage, would not political activity better be left to men?

I.

The importance still attributed to the first question is evidenced by the vigorous efforts, both of partisans and opponents, to provide specific data covering this point. Such efforts, whatever their ultimate significance, locate the problem entirely within the volition of individual women. A referendum, according to this point of view, would settle the question by all the logic of the situation. The point of view itself, however, is utterly inadequate. It does not include the permanent forces at work, the forces which can be averted by women as individuals, but which are irresistible in their action upon women as a social group. It undoubtedly contains some truth, but an order of truth valid for the movement only in its contemporaneous cross-section. It does not recognise the fact that the really vital forces working in a social organism, as in a plant, are longitudinal, extending through the generations, and only conspicuous when the organism is considered as a whole. As a point of view its fatal inadequacy grows apparent when we adopt a similar point of view for any better-understood social force, such as the voice, and would locate the problem of education within the volition of any particular child? Even when education was felt as having only a personal value, the modern State accepted its obligation to provide this personal value, on a compulsory basis; how much heavier the obligation falls as we learn to appreciate the social value of education, and to consider intellectual discipline not only the means to individual livelihood and pleasure, but as the nervous system by which the social body may co-ordinate every limb and organ into a self-conscious, effective instrument. The franchise, similarly, represents a social value transcending the immediate desires of any individual or group. The movement to extend the franchise to women, indeed, is merely the latest phase of a social process as definite in purpose and as irresistible in effect as the process which has made education a recognised function of State. Our political evolution has neither meaning nor authority, save as it expresses such a process in action. The process itself may be formulated as the effort on the part of society to assimilate more and more extensive and more and more diverse areas of population into the function of government.

We need not go back over more than a century of English politics, indeed, to isolate this process as a distinct line of advance. By examining the condi-
tions under which men themselves have acquired the vote, we discover how small a part the conscious desire of individuals, or even of groups, has actually played. The driving force has always been supplied by society itself, in the form of special economic pressure directed against some particular area of population. Economic pressure in itself, of course, is constant and universal, but the development of society periodically redistributes the pressure in such a manner that some particular area of population, at any given time, registers its severest demands. A state of tension consequently arises within the exposed group and creates group-consciousness, which focuses upon a necessity, increasingly felt, to acquire some degree of political control. Since this process is gradual, whatever be the proportion of women actually repugnant to suffrage at the present time, there has been a point in every struggle for political rights at which the same proportion of the men concerned were equally indifferent. The responsibility thrust upon the group, however, invariably increases the state of tension to such a degree that a majority, at least, demand enfranchisement for the entire group, and thereafter it is only a matter of time until the existing electorate accepts this demand as a jus fatu uttered by supreme authority.

The true answer to the question whether women really want the vote is, therefore, that society itself absolutely requires their enfranchisement, and is preparing as rapidly as possible the environment in which women can be enfranchised on terms favourable to themselves and to the whole social order, and in which the ultimate purpose of women's suffrage will be plainly disclosed.

Such an answer, of course, merely throws the question farther back. It disposes of one problem by allowing it to a problem more complex. A discussion of the second and third questions stated above, however, will lead us into the heart of the situation.

II.

If women were unanimous in their demand to exercise the function of suffrage, this fact, together with the fact that so many women have already proved their fitness for political activity, would constitute a sufficient reply to the second question. So deep a repugnance still exists, however, that one is forced to conclude that women themselves do not generally feel that their sex possesses a political faculty at all comparable to that of men. While, then, one can rightly point out that more and more women are proving their ability not only to vote with discrimination, but also to hold office efficiently, an honest opinion still remains unconvinced, and merely shifts its base of argument when each position in turn becomes logically untenable. Its last refuge lies in the supposition of some permanent intellectual differentiation between men and women. Without concluding superiority for either, it prefers a masculine and feminine type of mind in which a real and permanent distinction exists. Clinging to this conception of type, it prefers the elements that distinguish the sexes to those that identify them, even on the intellectual plane; and its idea of a typical feminine mind remains unshaken by the success with which any number of women may "deviate from type" and cultivate the masculine faculties. The only argument that can fairly meet this opinion will be grounded in psychology itself.

The distinction between the masculine and feminine mind is popularly expressed by the old saying that, while men think in terms of ideas, women think in terms of people. Granting that the statement is based on experience, we must determine how far each type is fixed, and to what extent each mind is confined to only one method of thinking. In the case of the typical—perhaps one had better say the traditional—woman, the faculty of "thinking in terms of people" actually seems to exclude the exercise of reason. Her mind gives to people a full-length value, in which judgment is displaced by overwhelming consciousness of sheer personality. In proportion as individuals are important to her welfare, they converge to themselves the ulterior considerations always kept distinct in the masculine mind. This fact is characterised by the utter unreasonableableness of women's loyalty. Their loyalty is instinctive, based upon personality without regard to principle. In any situation presenting a conflict between love and duty, a solution has always been easier for women than men, not because men possess a weaker power of attachment, but because their loyalty is divided between individual and principles, which either do not exist for the feminine consciousness or are completely identified with the individuals.

All these facts, however, can be more satisfactorily explained by the assumption that the difference does not lie between the feminine and the masculine mind, but between that particular area of mind which has developed itself in the domain of women and that area chiefly developed by the experience of men. Instead of admitting two different orders of mind, we need only perceive two different manifestations of mind itself. This latter view permits us to explain the "masculinisation" of the modern woman, and also the operation of a certain intellectual mind-set among women, between whose faculty at all comparable to that of men. While, however, one can rightly point out that more and more women are proving their fitness for political activity, would constitute a sufficient reply to the question farther back. It disposes of one problem by allowing it to a problem more complex. A discussion of the second and third questions stated above, however, will lead us into the heart of the situation.

III.

We have now gained a perspective from which the third question, why women should vote at all, may be considered in its double relation to women and the whole social order.

The social process, as we have seen, extends the suffrage by enfranchising successive homogeneous areas of population. As each group acquires consciousness and enters the function of government, we find that it reacts some particular value which operates for the general stability or harmony of the State. The enfranchisement of the labouring classes, for example, which feudalism had submerged beneath the surface of administration, has
made articulate the necessity for a new economic justice whose beneficial results permeate the entire social integument. The experience by which this necessity was intensified into action could not have accumulated within the consciousness of any social group, since every group derives its experience from a contact with the social organism peculiar to itself. No responsible person could now conceive of disenfranchising any section of the labouring class, it being obvious that such an act would so readjust the social order as to bring about another condition as inflexible as feudalism, and perhaps even more hostile to human liberty.

Though each area of population thus contributes a particular influence indispensable to civilisation, a certain fundamental similarity exists between the values contributed by the constituent groups in a masculine electorate, even when their experience has accumulated from widely different contacts with society. For in all men that area of mind is chiefly developed which is best fitted to deal with relations. On every plane and under every condition men reveal a common power to discover and apply the laws controlling the relations between facts and things. The development of physical phenomena into the science of biology, the arrangement of economic relations into the department store, and the co-ordination of social relations into the military system, are manifestations of the same property of mind. So important to success has been the result obtained by its use that we give our greatest rewards to those in whom it is highly developed, even if we do not consider it the superior intellectual faculty. In stating that men think in terms of ideas, while women think in terms of people, there are few, perhaps, who do not feel that men hold the advantage thereby. In its more aggressive development, nevertheless, the rational faculty discloses fatal limitations. When un-checked by the authority of other faculties, it invariably elaborates an ideal of method and efficiency in which people, as individuals, are subordinated to people as systems, and to the impersonal machinery by which systems are maintained. Once organised, the system creates a situation whose logic appeals irresistibly to the masculine mind. The result is that department stores and armies are maintained with an efficiency highly admirable upon the rational plane, which as such is not concerned with the human lives involved. The organisation can operate at its maximum precision only by using its units at a certain level of production. It has no use for a unit at the lower levels to which individuals must occasionally fall, nor even at those higher levels to which even an overburdened human nature instinctively seeks to rise. Unless, then, a decided change takes place in the movements of the masculine mind, or some new and equally authoritative influence permeates the social order, our department stores will continue to be driven so "efficiently" that they furnish a strong impetus to the forces releasing prostitution, sweat, and other spectres from the underworld, while our armies and navies will develop into more and more effective instruments, despite the terrible resistance the modern military system makes to progress in the practical application—even more, the inner experience—of religion, science, and the arts.

So intent does the "masculine" mind become upon the mere relations between things that in every situation it tends to locate its ultimate values outside personal experience. Justice, as men have made it, consists in determining individual cases by fixed principles, under which the individual, whatever his temperament or condition, receives a categorical sentence. Even in religion, as the recurrent Cal-

vinistic interpretation every revelation falls into proves, men sacrifice personality to law.

But the "feminine" mind, fortunately, is not so dominated by the logic of the situation. Indeed, as we perceive the limitation inherent within reason, the feminine instinct to exalt people above principles seems to be founded upon some superior logic of its own. That area of mind whose activity in women bestows a unique valuation upon the individual has been developed, we must remember, by the experience of child-birth and the following years of personal ministration. Its operation, then, bears an authority against which we can quote no higher source. Since, therefore, feminine loyalty is directed not only irrespective of the principles which men have formulated from the logic of the situation, but often diametrically opposed to them, we must accept in this opposition the grounds for suspecting the really vital and permanent value of the principles themselves. The situation makes one series of relations logically inevitable, but women teach us that the inevitability of the logic does not apply to the situation. By avoiding the logic they come into closer contact with reality. Whenever the existing social order, by its legal or economic necessity, condemns an individual as pernicious or unfit, we may be certain that at least one woman condemns society itself no less implacably, and by her passionate vision transfers the guilt from the human being to the environment whose larger perniciousness and unfitness actually moulded the individual after its own image. To dismiss this act as being "emotional" rather than "intellectual" is to confess one's fatal ignorance of the nature of mind, whose creative power is entirely emotional. Indeed, this feminine characteristic, of "thinking in terms of people," is not merely quite as intellectual as reason—it is intel-
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lect functioning at a much higher level. It is intel­lect dealing with people in relation to that spiritual possibility which cannot be rated by the changing currency of environment.

It is possible, of course, for a certain number of women to become intellectually unsexed. It is possible for a few to withdraw themselves from the experience of maternity and, by concentrating upon a profession, to cultivate the "masculine" area of mind as exclusively as the most worshipful philo­sopher or financier. The antipathy against enfran­chisement felt by many women arises from their recognition of the possibility and their instinctive dislike of its result. The fact remains, however, that marriage and maternity, reconsecrating the majority to that tremendous experience which sets women for ever aside from men, and justifies their "unreasonable" devotion, will prevent them from being so unsexed. The crisis of child-birth, and the visions born from the personal ministration of helpless children, by which human life is made for ever precious and significant, will continually renew and intensify in women the "feminine" mind, how­ever their social experience widens so as to develop, in addition, the faculty once typical of men.

Woman's sufrage, then, contains a unique social value, not available to the race through any other medium. It should not be considered merely as a programme of reform. Programmes of reform have always existed. It is rather the intensity by which programmes are realised. It is a motive force, a sheer impulse that cannot be sterilised, and as such it represents the maternal passion applied to make knowledge creative and Governments humane. For what is this "society" by which all men and women are hampered in their best desires, this relation of the all to the one by which our collective powers nullify our individual force? Is it not merely that something has grown into a misshapen manhood, fitted for the visions born from the personal ministration of helpless children, by which human life is made for ever precious and significant, will continually renew and intensify in women the "feminine" mind, how­ever their social experience widens so as to develop, in addition, the faculty once typical of men.

Woman's sufrage, then, contains a unique social value, not available to the race through any other medium. It should not be considered merely as a programme of reform. Programmes of reform have always existed. It is rather the intensity by which programmes are realised. It is a motive force, a sheer impulse that cannot be sterilised, and as such it represents the maternal passion applied to make knowledge creative and Governments humane. For what is this "society" by which all men and women are hampered in their best desires, this relation of the all to the one by which our collective powers nullify our individual force? Is it not merely that something has grown into a misshapen manhood, fitted for the visions born from the personal ministration of helpless children, by which human life is made for ever precious and significant, will continually renew and intensify in women the "feminine" mind, how­ever their social experience widens so as to develop, in addition, the faculty once typical of men.
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these types are rare. The vast majority of scientifically trained men are, as far as their science is concerned, followers. When the exceptional type occurs, it is likely that orthodox conclusions from data outspread are about to be swept away by some simplifying generalisation.

Simplifying generalisations have, of late years, been made by men and women here and there regarding the true nature, that is to say the actual position in the context of reality of such chronic infectious as cancer and tuberculosis.

In the teeth of the increasing armies of orthodoxy, of the increasing acreage of hospitals and appliances, of the enormous sums of money devoted to research, they have maintained the falsity, for anything beyond diagnostic purposes, of looking at cancer and tuberculosis as things in themselves. They have, metaphorically, swept away the imposing paraphernalia of the bacteriologists, they have used and not been used by the science of bacteriology, and, undaunted by its mass of curious detail, have declared simply that these diseases are by-products of alimentary digestive errors, and must be treated via the nutritional function. I have chosen these instances because they are, now, comparatively flagrant and familiar. But this same "scrapping" of the deductions of orthodox medical science, both theoretically and practically, is taking place under our eyes to-day with regard to "feminine ailments."

Rational practice in this matter has been spreading sporadically over our civilisation for a couple of generations, and the simple underlying generalisation is reaching out feelers now into the very precincts of orthodoxy, and rescuing here and there a medical practitioner who has preserved his mental flexibility in spite of the schools. While orthodoxy is adding an extra week to the time a mother must remain in bed after the birth of her child, and become wiser and wiser as to the phenomenon known as "change of life," and its mental and moral accompaniments, independent common sense is maintaining the absolute controllability of the whole series of feminine ailments and disturbances.

The finest results in this direction have so far been attained by the fruitarians—i.e., those who base their dietary on raw fruit and salads. The food reform press of Europe produces, as I have pointed out elsewhere, every month increasing documentary evidence as to the immunity of fruitarian mothers from the disturbances and most of the unsightliness of pregnancy, the pain of childbirth, and the succeeding exhaustion, testimony as to the fineness of the children born, the easy persistence of ample natural nourishment for them, their freedom from tooth troubles, from those infectious disorders which are generally considered part of the programme of childhood, the disappearance of difficulties in relation to the arrival of maturity in girls, and to the cessation in women of the special functions. Very significant in this connection is a book recently published on the Diseases of Women by an orthodox gynaecologist, who is not, however, a dietetic faddist. It is significant in three ways: First, as confessing in its preface that a leading scientific authority has pointed out ever so clearly that the orthodox positions have been largely arrived at by inductive and not by logical, as well as by common sense reasoning and by the personal experience of Dr. Rabagliati and his associates.

Orthodoxy is not Odious nor Outworn, that Cleverness is not Confined to Cranks, and that Christian Conservatism will indubitably Conquer.

The Review will henceforth present itself to the public at the price of 1/- Net.

STEPHEN SWIFT & CO., LTD., 16, King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.

"Continues to be a handsome and substantial publication."

—CHURCH FAMILY NEWSPAPER.
Correspondence.

NOTE TO CORRESPONDENTS.—While quite willing to publish letters under names de plume, no one can entertain the notion of publication that the name and address of each correspondent should be supplied to the editor.—ED.

To the Editor of The Freewoman.

MONEY, CAPITAL AND INTEREST.

MADAM,—Much needless waste of time and energy might be avoided if correspondents would carefully read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest (provided their digestive organs are fit) the subjects they wish to discuss before rushing into print. Mr. Arthur D. Lewis hesitates “to argue with Mr. Kitson,” because he feels “that dealing with subjects that present real difficulties he (Mr. Kitson) has got his mind going on a road which leads him to a lot of unnecessary complications.” Mr. Lewis thinks that the plain, crude Socialist, who says that under State ownership of all the means of production, interest would cease automatically, is “arguing far more clearly and straight-forwardly than Mr. Kitson.” This reminds me of the man who proposed to pull down and rebuild his house in another locality, because of the offensive odours arising from a dead cat which some boy had thrown into his backyard. When a neighbour advised him that it was perhaps cheaper to remove the cat than the house, he rejected the suggestion with scorn on the ground that it was neither “clear nor straightforward.” Mr. Lewis speaks of “Mr. Kitson’s perversely ingenuous attack on the legal privilege conferred on gold coin,” and sympathises at the same time “with Mr. Kitson’s attack upon interest,” which is about as logical as advocating the legal right to own serfs whilst denouncing slavery! If Mr. Lewis understood this subject half as well as I am told he understands “Syndicalism,” he would know that the legal privilege conferred upon gold is at present the main cause of interest.

I strongly and respectfully urge Mr. Lewis to continue “to hesitate to argue” on the subject of private ownership, and to make provision for his future by saving up money. It is whether he should be permitted to prevent others from creating and exchanging wealth until they pay him an annual tax! What right has the State to grant privileges which enable individuals to exercise such despotic power? What justice is there in compelling the public to employ a certain costly medium of exchange, which they would instantly reject without any use whatsoever, apart from society. On the other hand, gold is a commodity, and the subject of private ownership. Hence, when the State confers exclusively upon gold the privilege of serving as a medium of exchange, it is quite within the bounds of possibility to create a monopolistic artificial monopsony as our gold currency system.

This sort of “reasoning” is schoolboyish, in an elementary degree. And I would also strongly and respectfully urge him to take a course of reading over the works of P. J. Proudhon. The pith of the interest question is not right now, nor for some time, to make provision for his future by saving up money. It is whether he should be permitted to prevent others from creating and exchanging wealth until they pay him an annual tax! What right has the State to grant privileges which enable individuals to exercise such despotic power? What justice is there in compelling the public to employ a certain costly medium of exchange, which they would instantly reject without any use whatsoever, apart from society. On the other hand, gold is a commodity, and the subject of private ownership. Hence, when the State confers exclusively upon gold the privilege of serving as a medium of exchange, it is quite within the bounds of possibility to create a monopolistic artificial monopsony as our gold currency system.

ON INTEREST.

MADAM,—It can hardly be doubted that the hoarding of money would have no motive or effect if it were plentiful. Extremely plentiful money would be cheap, and would therefore have small value. It might require a bushel of it to buy one’s breakfast, and the hoarding of it would be as useless and as ineffective as storing fresh country air in leather bags.

This excessive cheapness may be supposed to be entirely unavoidable by the qualification that the entire volume of money should correspond in amount to actual wealth. But why should it, and how could it? It would be quite as feasible to insist that the value of all the silver in the world should be an exactly even number of bushels of wheat, or that the value of any one commodity taken at random should agree with the aggregate sum of that of all the rest as to ask that the value of all the gold should be equal in amount to that of all the other actual wealth of the world. Gold, that is to say, the most actively commercial nature, and before long to be the money of every country in the world, is by several degrees the most saleable of all commodities. There are, it is true, certain large and populous areas where silver is the money of the market, and where for internal trade it is actually more saleable than gold. But all this and other circulation of non-gold moneys is in relation to the important commerce of the world to be regarded as provincial, while the circulation of fresh country air as useless and as ineffective as storing fresh country air.

In this case the pocketh of the humblest would contain gold, and this metal would be far more frequently applied to industrial uses than as a medium of exchange. The law of non-gold commodities do not become lawful tender in fulfillment of the promises of really mighty merchants, nor capable of liquidating important debts, because all borrowing is based on the assumption that the holder of gold on conditions of repayment of the same commodity. He who borrows horses must of necessity find it very difficult to repay his creditor with cows or even donkeys. But the plentifulness of money, if it has any value at all as a loan, would have no effect upon the rate of interest. Suppose gold were ten times as cheap or ten times as dear as it now is. In the first case a sovereign would only pass for two shillings if silver and the promise of the Government remained as they now are, but altered simply in proportion to the difference in value of gold. In this case the pockets of the humblest would contain gold, and this metal would be far more frequently applied to industrial uses than as a medium of exchange.

Extremely plentiful money would be cheap, and would therefore have small value. It might require a bushel of it to buy one’s breakfast, and the hoarding of it would be as useless and as ineffective as storing fresh country air in leather bags. But the plentifulness of money, if it has any value at all as a loan, would have no effect upon the rate of interest. Suppose gold were ten times as cheap or ten times as dear as it now is. In the first case a sovereign would only pass for two shillings if silver and the promise of the Government remained as they now are, but altered simply in proportion to the difference in value of gold. In this case the pockets of the humblest would contain gold, and this metal would be far more frequently applied to industrial uses than as a medium of exchange. But the cost of borrowing anything useful could be about the same percentage as it is to-day. Most cases, where the owner of fixed or circulating capital was asked to alienate it from some useful purpose for which it could be used to-day would never lend unless he were paid for his sacrifice. If private ownership and liberty mean anything, the man with something which someone else wishes to borrow must be allowed to fix the reserve price per week, etc., which he will accept or refuse the loan. The cost of borrowing anything useful could be about the same percentage as it is to-day. Most cases, where the owner of fixed or circulating capital was asked to alienate it from some useful purpose for which it could be used to-day would never lend unless he were paid for his sacrifice. If private ownership and liberty mean anything, the man with something which someone else wishes to borrow must be allowed to fix the reserve price per week, etc., which he will accept or refuse the loan. The cost of borrowing anything useful could be about the same percentage as it is to-day. Most cases, where the owner of fixed or circulating capital was asked to alienate it from some useful purpose for which it could be used to-day would never lend unless he were paid for his sacrifice. If private ownership and liberty mean anything, the man with something which someone else wishes to borrow must be allowed to fix the reserve price per week, etc., which he will accept or refuse the loan.
bility might displace it as money. But the rate of interest would not necessarily be any greater even if gold did then continue to be the most saleable commodity. With both these different values of gold an increase in the volume of financial movements might take place, and its diminution would raise it exactly as it does now.

Financiers cannot raise bank rates by the simple device of creating more gold, for if the total amount of gold in the capital goes abroad almost exclusively as merchandise, machinery, and goods of all sorts when it is attracted thither by enterprise and promise of profits. Unfortunately, a great deal goes away from land and raw materials, and so is lost, and so is gold which are, however, not largely paid for in money on the balance, but by other commodities in which the traffic is many fold greater than in gold. This metal, however, pours into London from the mines by millions per annum.

Mr. Kitson is entirely wrong in stating that interest is a purely artificial system dependent upon force. It is in fact a voluntary payment by the have-nots to the haves. It might be said that property depends on force, but the force which would dispossess proprietors would surely be far more artificial than that which maintains it.

It is perfectly true that liberty andexpediency, rightly understood, demand the repeal of all such privileges as the Bank Charter Act. It would be freer and better for commerce if all commodities were for sale on barter, or on tokens, copper, silver, and gold coins to everyone willing to accept them. But this would have no appreciable effect oninterest. It was forced upon us by industry and enterprise in very many ways, but these would not include the perceptible lowering of interest. They might, indeed, be accompanied by a rise in the rate of interest.

Mr. Kitson is perfectly right when he enunciates the truism that interest is not a payment for risk. It is a payment for using one's owner's means, means which are paid for by others using them. In every case far more than any other pauper animal——it is necessary that he should procure food and clothing. In every case far more than any other pauper animal—then squander or consume them unproductively and without a thought of real supply and demand. They merely conform to the real supply and demand for gold pleasure which underlie the whole, and though hidden from most eyes are the real determiners of the rate of interest.

Every commodity is part of the currency, but gold is the most current of all. All commodities circulate, though none return on their course quite so often as the rate of interest.

The general movement in commodity prices is therefore much the same that of a whirlpool. Debtors may be said to be enslaved in the current of the rate of interest. If the Editor or he will be so kind as to answer these questions then your readers will have something definite to reflect and possibly misrepresent of it.

August 9th, 1912.

GREEZ FYSHER.

One such scheme has already been offered to the readers of THE FREEDODIAN. (The New Money, May 19th.) Unfortunately it elicited no criticism.—E. L.

WOMEN AND THE EVOLUTIONARY FORCE.

MADAM,—When Miss Willcocks wrote of the evolutionary force in the heart of woman, "it is our part to guide it," side your issue of July 18th, I do not think she can claim to have implied the meaning she attaches to her utterance. Her letter of May 16th. expounds it as being for "our guidance" of this force, as she wrote of it, I still think expresses fear of "the force," and implies mistrust of it.

I do not think I ought to ask for your space to argue the point with Miss Willcocks as to whether Mazzini guided the "force," or the force guided Mazzini, though I am inclined to think we are both wrong. I am unacknowledging that it was "the force" which guided. What "the force" working in Mazzini did by the co-operation of the same force working in others, I am inclined to think can only make itself manifest in the independence of Italy, just as it had done before in any of the great epoch-making ages with which the development of the human along the line of life is studded. This, I believe, it will do again and again, working and expanding from within, and whatever teachers or guides come, as Miss Willcocks says they will, those guides are "the force" realised and made manifest itself, so that whatever guidance there is, it is the force itself which guides the human who recognises its call, and not the human who attempts to guide the force.

I do not acknowledge as infallible Miss Willcocks' attempt to reduce her theories into the terms of exact science—we are touching "life," the most unknowable of all—and I for one would prefer to set out to sea trusting in the theories of the scientist are only deductions, and the most rigid and exact of to-day are often the foolishness of the future; and I for one would prefer to set out to sea trusting in the force within my heart to find the better or realisation of life again, than to seek to guide that force in order to attain certain definite ends. N. O'SHEA.

August 19th, 1912.

MADAM,—I see only one answer to Mr. Percy's agitated letters to the Morning Post, in which he accuses me of advocating immorality, when as a matter of fact I am advocating the suppression of it. His accusation proves him a cămion of sophistry. I have never missed the whole point of the argument. He speaks of men "who cannot find husbands." I spoke of women "to whom marriage fails to appeal." There are some of both sexes to whom sexual intercourse would be repug-
n pant, and its constant repetition unbearable. Yet there are some women who would bear the inevitable for once. Surely a loveless marriage is far more immoral.

August 8th, 1912. RICHARD TAYLOR.

[Mr. Taylors letter embodied the proposals of the Eugenists in a very frank manner, and, as far as the views, of course, are not ours, but we make no demur against them gaining a hearing.—Ed.]

MORE QUESTIONS.

MADAM,—What has happened to the Eugenists? Are they all "out of town and no correspondence will be forwarded"—to quote a formula often used at this time of year by that "general public on which depended a saving what unique reputation by occasionally diluting "Tariff Reform" with intelligence, but has not yet attained to the most primitive public school fourth form standard of honesty and fair play? Are none left to refuse the Editor, "B. L."

Let them take heart. THE FREEWOMAN is not a London Unionist paper of the first magnitude. It does not suppress inconvenient facts, nor "queer the pitch" for its opponents. It rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth.

Or are our arguments and inquiries of so disconcerting a nature that Eugenists are driven to ignore what they are so far unable to suppress?

I should like to add a couple of questions to my (possibly inconvenient) enquiries in the issue of August 1st. The first question arises from Section 4 in the memorandum on "The Eugenesian idea" attached to the October 4th number of the Editor of the Medical Times, and published in the current number of THE FREEWOMAN (Correspondence columns). Dr. Barker Smith draws attention to the increasing use in medicine of testicular and ovarian extracts, and strongly suggests that the whole question of "applied reproduction" be seriously considered by the profession. Now it is possible that the proceedings of the Eugenics Congress may have been very correctly and superficially reported in the Press, although great prominence was given to certain speeches. But I for one have been unable to find any mention of the Eugenic possibilities of applied—or, as I should prefer to call it, artificial—reproduction in any report or summary of the debates of the Congress, in view of the work of Poelh and Brown-Séquard, was surely worth attention. That it should have been ignored—if it has been ignored—and the question of the Eugenics Society, even in their chosen field of speculations.

I note that the question of the Eugenic value of Love was raised—none too soon! Let the Eugenists note that love is a very uncertain and incalculable factor, and cannot be transferred to another, without the will of the legislator. Also that love implies choice, and choice implies freedom. In short, I treat Eugenists to spend some time and their best mental and psychical energy in meditation on all the variables of power and freedom.

My enquiries so far have been very restricted—in fact, quite one-sided. As examples of problems which are not specifically sexual, may I suggest the occasional union of genius and deformity in the same individual? The close connection, biologically proved, between genius and insanity? The frequent association of genius and very high ability with either the consumptive or the rheumatic tendency?

MADAM,—Two clerical or printer's errors in my article last week rendered two sentences uneligible. Second column, third paragraph: for "In addition, being 'poor', women have no idea how to dress," read "At the time being, poor women have no idea of dressing." Second column, sixth paragraph, second question (second paragraph, p. 226) in the sentence: "Therefore, when creating or presenting a work of art, is it always a mistake to consider the intellectual standard of the public, a mistake, especially to despise it?" read the affirmative.

M. URIEL DOLKOWSKA.

August 9th, 1912.

MR. McKENNA AND FORCIBLE FEEDING.

MADAM,—Miss Gathorpe, skilful dewillus that she is, wounds and disarms at one stroke of her pen. I do not pretend to her grace; so I must play the part of the heavy villain as best I can.

Miss Gathorpe is confusing two quite different points. All I am urging in defence of Mr. McKenna is this: that, as Home Secretary, he must do what the general public expects from any holder of that position. The general public would not support Mr. McKenna (a) if he released the women who refused food; or (b) if he allowed the women to die of exhaustion. The only alternative for Mr. McKenna, as Home Secretary, is to authorise forcible feeding. He might certainly take the line of resigning (as he appears to do) in the event of reflecting on the public's susceptibilities. But these questions might be multiplied an hundredfold, and the question of the social and material environment of the majority still remains. Professor Loria and Professor Smith drew the attention of their conferees to it; have the latter no answer to them, and to the poor outsider who yet supplies the material for Eugenists' experiments?

We await answers with the keenest interest.

August 8th. 1912.

F. W. STELLA BROWNE.
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against the imposition of hard labour. Miss Gawthorpe has put a twisted interpretation upon it. There was no advocacy of first-class treatment in that letter; it was a merely general observation that "women who become mothers are condemned to a purely sexual life there the standard of tribe or state is low, and little, if any, intellectual or spiritual life is enjoyed by its women.

(2) The spiritual level, with all its marvellous and, at present, little developed powers.

(3) The spiritual level. Passion reigns uncontrolled on these two higher levels has given the world all it has of highest beauty.

There is a great lesson in the legend of the spiritual marriage of S. Catherine, and women have yet to learn the hidden meaning of the teaching that a "pure virgin is born the Saviour." W. H. A.

ILLEGITIMACY.

MADAM.—The omission of my address from my letter under this heading, published in your issue of July 18th, must account, I hope, for the exceedingly discouraging response to my appeal. I am loth to believe that the readers of THE FREEWOMAN are indifferent to the hardships inflicted on the children of those who have dis­regarded the legal conditions of sex union. To those who are anxious to bring about freer conditions of marriage, I would point out that great numbers of people are withheld from making such experiments at the present day solely by the fear of exposing their children to hopeless disabilities. Therefore, the injustice done to the children themselves does not move some of your readers, per­haps they will be willing to co-operate with me in re­moving a source of strength in the warfare of free sex relations. I should be sorry to think that all the discussion that has gone on in your columns is never to be translated into action.

I ask your readers to co-operate with me rather than with Mme. Stöcker (whose appeal is printed in the same issue), because illegitimacy is a matter of purely internal and domestic policy, and no international society, as such, can hope to effect any reform. The laws on the subject differ in every state, and can be discussed only by the citizens of each state respectively. Anything like international peace in the question was beyond the authority of the states concerned.—Yours faithfully,

EDMUND R. D’AUVERGNE.
18, Sheen Gate Mansions, East Sheen, 23rd, July, 1912.

[We do not see the force of Mr. d’Auvergne’s objection to International Federation in this matter. It is a different affair from an attempt to alter marriage laws. Many persons, on what to them would be moral grounds, would seek to end the present disabilities on those who had married without a legal contract, and in such a matter national prejudices and customs would have weight. But surely the most ardent supporter of the old morality would hesitate to penalise innocent child-victims, no matter what the supposed misdemeanours of its parents. This desire to do justice to justice merely requires quickening to be put into effect. It seems to us Dr. Holmes’ Park’s international efforts should bear fruit, as well as more localised efforts in the same direction.—Ed.]

A BOOK FOR MARRIED WOMEN.

By DR. ALLISON.

The information contained in this book ought to be known by every married woman, and it will not baffle the uninitiated to read. The book is conveniently divided into twelve chapters, or sections, and each of these deals with a definite subject, and the information contained in each can be easily assimilated. The book is invaluable for the married woman, and it will not harm the unmarried to read. The book is conveniently divided into twelve chapters, or sections, and each of these deals with a definite subject, and the information contained in each can be easily assimilated. The book is invaluable for the married woman, and it will not harm the unmarried to read.
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<td>S. G. Hodson</td>
<td>3s 6d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Doctor and His Work</td>
<td>Charles J. Whitby, M.D.</td>
<td>3s 6d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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