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MOS PRO LEGE IN NEW YORK.

"For as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law."—Rom. ii. 12.

TWO questions are just now being asked of every citizen of the United States that happens to be out of his own country:—

"Are the present revelations of New York police-crime true?"

"If they are true, why does such crime exist?"

Of the particular instance I know nothing. I was not in New York when Rosenthal was shot. Indeed, if my memory serves me rightly, I never met either Rosenthal or Becker. But, for reasons that I need not here go into, I do know something concerning the conditions that so inevitably brought about the Rosenthal murder. I know enough not to be surprised by the crime. I know enough to be surprised by the fact that the truth about the crime was revealed.

Not that I have made what our financiers call "a corner" in the knowledge of these conditions. For years most Americans have, among themselves, tacitly admitted the existence of such things in most of their cities. A few Americans have even written about them, I among the number. In order not to be called extremists, we told a quarter of the truth—and were called extremists. Now the Public Prosecutor of New York, District Attorney Whitman, is telling half the truth—and is being called harder names.

Nor is New York unique.

In Philadelphia (population about 1,550,000) I have sat in a house conducted for prostitution and opium-smoking and there talked to the landlady and her lover; the lover shared the profits, and was a member of the police force.

Within the past twelve months:

The Vice Commission of Chicago (the population of Chicago is about 2,200,000) has reported that "temptations have assailed officers in high control," and that "some have fallen;"

Detroit (population about 500,000) has unearthed a worse state of affairs;

So, in the recent trial of its Director of Public Safety, John M. Morin, has Pittsburg (population about 535,000);

In a lesser city an alleged "Southern gentleman," aided by the local municipal authorities, has tarred and feathered a woman because his full-grown son had been living on that woman’s earnings as a prostitute;

Mayor Pearce, of Tallapoosa, another small city, has called out a fire-engine and turned the hose on a woman labour-agitator;

During several months the police and "prominent citizens" of San Diego, California (population about 20,000) have arrested hundreds of labour-agitators without warrant, imprisoned them without trial, inflicted on them tortures that the law forbids me to mention in print, and have been editorially commended by the local Press;

The official reports of the army have shown that one in every five of its men is infected with a venereal disease;
The chief of the Bureau of Investigation of the Federal Department of Justice at Washington has declared that no woman in the country is safe from the so-called "white slavers";

Revelations concerning two common-pleas judges have barely prevented their elevation to the federal bench; and

Similar revelations have forced two full-fledged Federal judges to resign.

I wonder if other countries, under any other form of capitalistic government are very much better off. I don't know; I am merely wondering.

During the month of July last New York averaged one known murder a day. Known murders, I am talking of, and murders officially so described. Of course, there is something to be said of murders not officially so described, but not here and now. Does the average startle you? Be calm.

Commissioner of Police Waldo has produced figures to show that this is an improvement, and that his men have attained to a greater degree of efficiency in 1912 than that which they so ably maintained in 1911.

In spite, however, of an apparent easy acceptance of things as they are in the United States, we have really tried to better matters, and New York offers an excellent example of the result. Some years ago New York was shocked by finding that conditions in its police force were what they have now once more been found to be. The law-abiding people of the city determined to stop it. They seized upon the "good man" and "businesslike administration" ideas. With considerable trouble and at considerable expense they managed to elect a genuinely good man for mayor, and this good man proceeded to administer the city's laws, appoint his appointive officers, and conduct his affairs "on a business basis." After the experiment had been thoroughly tried there was another investigation, and this investigation proved that corruption was further advanced than it had ever been before.

In most of the cities of the United States men are appointed to the police force by a supposedly competitive examination conducted by a Civil Service Board, and the full-fledged policeman is thus, theoretically, a sort of brass-buttoned competition wallah; but the competition is more sopposititious than real. A man wants to be "on the force"; he goes to the "boss" of the controlling political party in the voting district in which the candidate lives. This boss carries the request to the Examining Board, which is composed of certain of his lieutenants, and, when a vacancy in the force demands an examination of candidates, the candidate favoured by the city boss is given the winning marks.

Now, you cannot get something for nothing in the United States, any more than anywhere else in the world. The district boss secures favours because he controls enough votes in his district to "swing" all elections in that district the way that the city boss wants them swung. Consequently, the candidate for the police force can secure the favour of the district boss only by being able to offer him the control of certain votes in the district, or, if the candidate has previously "delivered the goods," then by an assurance of holding the delivered voters in place at the next and all future elections.

If, after he is appointed, any of his voters rebel, or if the policeman in any way offends his master, any one of a dozen offences that the Civil Service rules punish with dismissal will be proved against him, for he will be tried by a police court composed of men equally dependent on the bosses, and he will lose his job.

In proportion to the cost of living and the "position" that he is required to "maintain," every police officer's pay is small. The policeman is necessarily a robust man, but in the United States he is generally a member of that faith which is most strenuously opposed to the practice of neo-Malthusianism. The salary of a police captain does not meet his expenses, nor does the lieutenant's, the sergeant's, the patrolman's. Upon all, moreover, the party organisation and campaign funds make constant and inordinate, but imperative, demands. If you don't pay, you leave the service.

Since the Civil Service rules forbid civil servants to make direct contributions toward party maintenance, the contributions are secured by forcing policemen to join political "clubs." These clubs are scattered thickly throughout a city. A club may occupy only one room at a low rental and yet have 200 or more dues-paying members. The wide margin between the expenses of the club and its receipts goes to the party organisation.

Do you wonder, then, that the patrolman taxes the prostitute and the gambler, that the sergeant taxes the patrolman's tax receipts, that the lieutenant taxes the sergeant's, and the captain the lieutenant's?

Magistrate House, of New York, is what is known as "a party man." Consequently he is a pessimist, which is to say that he is short-sighted. But he had some glimmering of the half-truth when he recently declared:

"You can't eradicate the corruption. It's in the very system."

It is in the system. It is in the system of society of which we are a part. To change it we must revolutionise society. Business, as we now know it, supports society. Society supports the police. And—"business is business."

REGINALD WRIGHT KAUFFMAN.

THE LEGEND.

There was a little demon dire,
Who loved to play with hell-fire.

He burned his fingers, scotched the cat
(When cats are black, 'tis all through that!) On this, the Devil, very waxy,
Kicks him out through Cotopaxi.

So, with a shriek of fiendish mirth,
He sets 'em all a-playing with fire.

(If men were wise, he'd take his hook!) He came to plague the sons of earth.

Cupid was the name he took.

(If men were wise, he'd take his hook!) He sets 'em all a-playing with fire.

They're wise below, if we're up higher.

E. H. VISIAK.

The signature to the Open Letter to Mr. Lloyd George in last week's issue should have read Lucy Thoumaian, not Thomason, as printed. In the letter of E. M. Watson, the sentence, "Talk ... are simply a perversion of language," should have read, "Talk ... is simply a perversion of language."—EP.
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

Conscription.

The views which were expressed in the article entitled "The Slave," in our last week's issue, and which saw in the arming of the Trade Unionists the way out from wage-slavery to freedom, have received some criticism from a quarter which we consider the best equipped to judge. A prominent Syndicalist said, "No. Firstly, the plan is too expensive; secondly, we should be stopped; thirdly, conscription is coming as surely as to-morrow's dawn, and conscription itself will arm the worker to the trade Unionists how they can use conscription." This sound reasonable enough, but while it is reasonable, it is nevertheless wrong. Its psychology is bad, for while it is practically certain that conscription is coming, it is equally certain that it will come on a wave of war-fever. It is becoming increasingly clear that the capitalists mean to engineer a war, a war that will not only be European, but will be world-wide, and which will probably occupy the greater part of the twentieth century. And there is nothing in the intelligence of the working classes upon which to rely as an antidote to the war-fever. They will, as in the past, be charmed by its charms, they will be hypnotised by the inspired effusions which will issue from the capitalist Press; they will, again, as in the past, be hoodwinked by the foreign patriots into believing that the interests of a handful of cosmopolitan money-lenders are the interests of England. They will pour money out like water, and life too, and the few remnants of their liberties they will hand up to become conscripts in an army which is maintained for, and put in motion by, Jews and Germans. They will even rush to do it. England is a far too terribly miserable country to live in, for the charms of jingoism to be made light of. The feeling for the romance of war is a factor to be reckoned with, and the first party, capitalist or labour, which invokes it for its own service stands

The Moralist's Dilemma.

Mr. G. Bernard Shaw has been communicating to the Press his views on forcible feeding. Most people who have thought seriously on the subject will acquiesce readily in his conclusions. From a digest of his communication one can make half a dozen main points:

1. He points out that forcible feeding is a disgusting business, which soils all who are connected with it.
2. He points out that the dilemma in which Government is placed is unconnected with any question of criminal status, and is only confused by question thereof;
3. That while a government is considered responsible for the provision of food for the persons it takes prisoners, it cannot be considered responsible for making anyone eat. Therefore, forcible feeding is not its province; it is a gratuitous undertaking of a repulsive and unnecessary office;
4. That if a prisoner with food within her reach elects to starve, that is the prisoner's business, and the Government is not responsible;
5. That, therefore, Mrs. Leigh and Miss Evans, since they have embarked on serious "crime," and not mere "ructions," if they will not eat during their merited imprisonment they must be allowed to die.

This argument is as clear as daylight, and one might have expected it to rest there. Mr. Shaw would thus have provided Government with a clear course out of a difficult situation. But he does not stop there. In fact, after making it quite clear that the Government should take one course of procedure, he goes on to point out that they would be damned if they did so. Hence, if the Government overcomes a rebel by inflicting bodily violence on him, instinct recoils and declares the Government damned; and if Government allows rebellion to run its course and reap its natural consequences in death by starvation, they are equally damned. Therefore, whichever way Government moves in respect of the absolute rebel, according to Mr. Shaw, it puts itself in the wrong. There is, however, a third course which the Government might take, but which Mr. Shaw, in company with many others, rigidly vetoes, i.e., the setting free of the rebels. Let us grasp these three courses, any one of which lies open for the Government to take:

1. To feed the prisoners by force.
2. To let them die of starvation.
3. To set the criminals free. (The prisoners become criminals when there is talk of setting them free.)

We have had advocates of each of these, as well as advocates of dodges to get round them. Mr. C. H. Norman, who, to our mind, grasps the essence of government more clearly than many others, declares bluntly for forcible feeding. He appears to realise that at bottom government is no gentleman's job, and its executioners cannot be too mealy-mouthed in their dealings with resisters. Obviously, therefore, unless government is to nullify itself it must show itself, as long as life remains in its prey, powerful enough to counterfoil resistance. He also
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has a prescient understanding of certain foibles of human psychology. He knows that though the populace will allow the setting up of law, which of itself implies an executive to enforce that law, it is unreasonable enough to turn and rend the executives merely for carrying into effect that which it itself tacitly has set in motion. He realises that though the law would suggest that a prisoner who persisted in starving should be allowed to starve, it would not forgive the government or the member of the government which allowed it. Therefore, says Mr. Norman, if we are convinced of the worth of government, let us have the courage of our convictions and back up the unfortunate officials upon whom a repulsive but necessary duty devolves. We gather that Mr. Norman, if he believed in capital punishment, would feel that fastidious scruples regarding the office of hangman would be as cowardly and as unreasonable as they would obviously be in regard to the office of judgeship. As readily, therefore, as one would mix in the society of judges one would move in the society of hangmen.

Believing in government, which is coercion, he believes in facing the coercition business boldly. At least Mr. Norman's governmentalism is as clear of hypocrisy as his logic is clear of confusion. To quarrel with him one must quarrel with his belief in government.

Miss Mary Gawthorpe, with whose petition we regret to say we disagree in almost every particular, to our mind seeks to evade the problem rather than to solve it. She would endeavour to persuade the Government to offer Mrs. Leigh a bribe in the shape of reduced sentence and "first-class treatment" in order to induce Mrs. Leigh to change her attitude. Miss Gawthorpe offers no solution for the Government's problem in such a case as that of certain Manchester prisoners, who entered prison with the fixed intention of refusing food, even though "first-class treatment" were granted. Miss Gawthorpe does not face the question.

Moreover, we are convinced that the "purity and honesty of motive" attitude in this business has been in no small degree overdone. There is something painfully priggish about it. Purity of motive ought to go, like a woman's modesty, without any proclamation. Moreover, there is no case for its special establishment which would stand an honest examination. The vast majority of women in our prisons is made up of young women who have gone out in search of life, and have been brutally caught up in the life-trap which gapes to trap them by virtue of all that is softest and most alluring for women. Their motive is pure enough. The least that a suffragist, in a society which is built up on a prostitution basis, of men as well as of women, can do, when faced by the knowledge that owing to kindler fates she is not as one of these, is to be silent about purity of motive.

But to return to the Government's dilemma. Mr. Shaw, like Mr. Norman, faces the issue. A personal fastidiousness apparently weighs with him, and is effective in preventing any tolerance of the physical assault solution. Like Mr. Norman, Mr. Shaw understands that the Government which lets Mrs. Leigh die of starvation will be ruined, yet this is the course he counsels. Conscious of a hitches in his own argument, he falls back on a consideration outside the question. The apparent paradox sees the Government's damnation in its doing what it "ought" to do is to be explained, according to Mr. Shaw, in the light of the fact that there is some-thing else which the Government might have done and did not do. It might have given the women votes. Like Miss Gawthorpe's special plea for favoured treatment, Mr. Shaw's demand for votes for women, which he uses to let the Government know that, although he says "Let them die of starvation," he really means "Don't," is nothing better than a dodging of the issue. It just chances that, almost without doubt in this case, a promise to give Mrs. Leigh the vote would induce her to take her food; but it is merely a chance. Suppose Mrs. Leigh were an anarchist and had denied the Government in the same manner because she disapproved of government, what would Mr. Shaw have Government do then? Pass a self-denying ordinance nullifying itself? Yet only the woe of the rebel be satisfied. The question remains, in spite of Mr. Shaw's logic and clarity, exactly where it was, because Mr. Shaw has failed to take into account the immoral nature of government in its very essence. "The Rebel versus Government." This opposition has existed since governments were elaborated. It is the type of rebellion, since its elaboration, that is, since tyrannies and slaveries were elaborated. It will exist as long as the absence of balance—which is, the absence of free conditions—rules in societies. As long as one group of men may govern, i.e., command and coerce, other men, so long will the opposition last. And the instinctive veneration, even of unfree ages, has gone with the rebel and never with the government. On the scaffold, on the rack, at the block, in the fires, and in the prisons, the rebels have perished, and the populace which has suffered their death has exalted these rebellious ones into the symbols of a free spirit which has been and will be again. This explains the otherwise inexplicable paradox, i.e., why the timorous multitude, fearfully seeking protection and government, almost always allows the rebel to be done to death. The rebel is strange and terrible to them. He comes like the ghost of a murdered Self. They feel easier, as slaves, when he is put out of the way. But dead, the rebel lives. Alive, he was feared; dead, he is worshipped, and small mercy has the populace for the unhappy miscreant who has ministered to its fear, and in so doing has slain its holiest instincts. Which explains why Mr. Shaw, believing in government, truly says that, while the proper thing for government to do is to let rebellion be, such a "letting" will, nevertheless, involve government's damnation—a contradiction for a moralist, surely.

Now, if Mr. Shaw's cold logic can be enmeshed in a confusion like this, it is clear that arguments are being made on assumptions which steady reasoning reduces to absurdity. Many persons, and particularly women, will reply that they need not be reasonable: it is enough if they stand by their intuitions. "It is certainly enough, must be enough, if we cannot do better. But the intuition-faculty itself can easily be worked to absurdity. In fact, it offers itself as an ever-present excuse for loose thinking. We think that it would be fair to say this about intuitions: the intuitions (of honest people) are the conclusions arrived at by subconscious reason, which is able to make use of observed and unobserved factors which exist subconsciously, but which have not yet sprung into the plane of the conscious. But intuitions demand solutions; with a well-exercised mind, they act as an irritant until they are attended to. The subconscious factor begins tapping at the doors of Mind, explaining to Intellect, which is the door-keeper in the House of Conscious Mind, who and what it is. "Oh, I see.
Now you can come in and make yourself at home," says Intellect, which has the dulled intelligence of the heavy-weight. And it is well Intellect is not too strong or too weak; for, after all, the devil of Mind is Truth. There are cheats and swindles which prey on the soul—tempt the soul because it, too, is slow; its offspring 'but slowly in Time—and the cheat plays on its impatience, and is sent forth as a true child when it is only a parasite. Intellect has become so sceptical of these emanations of Sou! that it must decide to take no notice of further tapings. "Let us make out with the ones we have already got inside," he whispers in the ear of Mind. "We shall so at least be honest and keep cheat out." Hence the present poverty-stricken household of Mind and Intellect, which makes observers perceiving call out, "Let us seek Soul again," at which all the little cheats laugh and foregather.  

This is a digression, but it is meant to make clear that an intuition which persists and grows old as an intuition may well be questioned. As likely as not it is a cheat. A true intuition is an uneasy thing; a bee in the bonnet. So this intuition of the people which curses the officials who do the deed, even while it says that according to the wording of the case the deed should be done, has now ceased to be an intuition: was too uneasy to remain such; it has become a truth comprehended by the intellect. Intuitively the people have grasped the fact that all government, good or bad—whether it keeps within the rules of its game or not—is wicked. Government is our collective immorality. If, therefore, moralists have anything to say to government, it should be that it annuls itself; which is what it obviously will do, if it allows its methods of coercion to be evaded. For government is coercion, and nothing more. Hence the fit and proper "petition" for a moralist to sign would be one demanding that prisoners go free. What, prostitutes and thieves and debtors? Yes, empty the prisons of their entire population, which government calls criminals. But government has made them into criminals. Let it, as some small act of power, make them free. If government exist to guard monopoly, there could be no criminals. Government manufactures them with every passing second. Take the new recipe for their making which is being put in force with wanderers and homeless. Police on night duty are armed with tickets, which they present to the wanderer. This he must accept and present himself with it at a registry-office, where he is duly registered. From thence he is sent to a casual ward or charity shelter until other accommodation is found; in return for which accommodation he must engage in "some healthy occupation"—stone-breaking and oakum-picking being among those suggested. "Those who do not pur the ticket are put to the risk of being arrested under the Vagrancy Act." "Need we say more?" asks the Eye-Witness. We, for our purposes here, need not. This illustration serves our purpose, which is to show how government makes criminals. But prostitutes and thieves? Should these go free? Did not government guard monopoly, the money monopoly, and the marriage-monopoly, women who need love would not be driven to seek prostitution. The desire for love is, surely, a motive sufficiently "pure." But thieves? Did not government protect the arch-thieves, the petty thieves would not exist. But criminals of passion and cruelty? Did not government guard a state of society which renders a spiritual religion impossible, morality would do all that can be done to restrain such offenders. If morality cannot enforce restraint, certainly government cannot. Prisons are swollen, asylums are crowded, workhouses teem, and yet government governs more feverishly than ever before. And suffragists? Even suffragists, though their motive, the desire to share in government, to take a hand at coercion, is the least "pure" of any, these also should go free. Their motives can be forgiven because of their great spirit. They have united against the force which has sought through the ages to crush all the vindicators of individual freedom. They have balanced the weight of a single spirit against the sum-total of the weapons of material coercion, and by the strength of their spirit they win or lose here and now.  

The more the situation created by the Real Miltants among the suffragists develops, the more plainly ironical it becomes. The measures they are taking to win the power to vote, are such as to tear down the veil which has for so long hidden the iniquity of voting and what it implies from the common man. Mrs. Leigh, the warrior who will have the vote, and that at any price, herself has forced a situation upon the people which is only break when men have understood that to have a vote is to offend against spiritual law. By the time Mrs. Leigh gets a vote, honest men and women will be refusing to be mixed up in the offence. For it is to be noted that governors since they let out voting rights to the populace have thrown off moral responsibility. Before the discovery of this happy device, the governors, who were recognised as tyrants had to behave somewhat seemlily. Now, governors' tyranny is worse in the exact degree that they can shift the burden upon the shoulders of the people. For do they not govern "by consent of the governed"? Votes for the people, indeed, have secured the situation for the governors. For the sake of the vote the people have bartered their powers to govern themselves, and likewise their powers to quarrel with the situation. Hence, it follows naturally that the only persons in this unhappy community who are showing any signs of acting as possessors of power, are not the ones who have been refused the vote. Hence, it is the persons who have received no votes, and who have therefore retained something of the instinct to government themselves. And these are spilling out their lives, spending the force which is bred of freedom, in order to be permitted to abrogate their at least nominal right to self-government, and to lend their countenance to the system of coercion—government—the tender mercies of which they are even now sampling.  

"It is a mad world, my masters."
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have been protected by a vitality that bared its teeth at weakness and ugliness in fierce fastidiousness, she was seriously thinking of marrying Will Magnet, the humorist, "a fairish man of forty, pale, with a large protuberant, observant grey eye—I speak particularly of the left—his face a face of quiet animation warily alert for 'the wit's opportunity.' But she was willing to do it, her life being governed by gluttony and laziness. "After Oxbridge, unless she was prepared to face a very serious row indeed, and go to teach in a school—and she didn't feel any call whatever to teach in a school; she had an invincible objection to work of any kind—she would probably have to trap silver foxes, and set the men they do know and now knows himself to be a commercial prostitute, and has sought the clean snows of Labrador. There, he thinks, he can clear his mind of the lies and sympathy that blasphemy is the one crime that all men commit before they die. And women have taken for themselves the right to claim worship, by virtue of the suffering through which they pass to bring men—selves of sideboards—although a casual glance at the worshippers might show them that they had done it carelessly and without exclusiveness—and of the beauty of their lives. There is no end to their hunger. They want research," he moaned when delirium overtook him in Labrador, "and that still, silent room of mine again, that room, as warm to Hartstone Square and share Daffy's room again and assist in the old, wearisome task of propitiating her father. . . . Marriage was escape from all that; it meant not only respectful parents, but a house of her very own, furniture of her choice—that was the real attraction to Marjorie—great freedom of movement, an authority, an instance. For the moment she was going to be a commercial prostitute, and beggared it. She wanted "things"—old Dutch clocks and wonderful dinner-dresses and Chippen—dale chairs. And she claimed them from him because she was his wife and the mother of his child.

There is something sinister about a figure such as the great Christ who hangs on the cross at the Westminster. The blood about His brow, the distortion of His mouth, the tension of the body, the changeless attitude of pain, convey at last the sense of an eternal hunger. The lights of a thousand candles, all the incense of the pious, the daily worship of millions, have whetted Him to the remorseless acceptance of the lives of men and the reason of nations. Not till the roof of the world falls in will that hunger cease from feeding on the creatures of the earth. And in the midst of all that, can we possibly imagine a God impatiently making a new world of worshippers? Perhaps it is because of this harsh lien on the world's love and sympathy that blasphemy is the one crime that all men commit before they die.

And women have taken for themselves the right to claim worship, by virtue of the suffering through which they pass to bring men—selves of sideboards—although a casual glance at the worshippers might show them that they had done it carelessly and without exclusiveness—and of the beauty of their lives. There is no end to their hunger. They send men they do not know into the snowy wastes to trap silver foxes, and set the men they do know working at barren, profitless muddles to buy the pelts. For in particular they demand material, inessential things. And they get them; but also they get hatred and curses that are the inevitable offerings to divinity.

Trafford had a genius for scientific research. "I want research," he moaned when delirium overtook him in Labrador, "and that still, silent room of mine again, that room, as quiet as a cell, and the soil that led to light. Oh! the coming of that light, the uprush of discovery, the solemn joy as the generalisation rises like a sun upon the facts—floods
them with a common meaning. That is what I want. That is what I have always wanted. . . .” Marjorie began his attack on his soul by disparaging his work and putting a background of domestic dispeace to the splendid foreground of his laboratory. “He went home about half-past five, and found a white-faced, red-eyed Marjorie, still dressed, wrapped in a travelling-rug, and crumpled and asleep in his study armchair beside the grey ashes of an extinct fire. . . . ‘Oh, where have you been?’ she asked almost querulously. ‘Where have you been?’ But, my dear! he said, as one might speak to a child, ‘why aren’t you in bed?’ It’s just dawn.’ ‘Oh,’ she said, ‘I waited and waited. It seemed you must come. I read a book. And then I fell asleep.’ And then, with a sob of feeble self-pity, ‘And here I am!’ She rubbed the back of her hand into one eye and shivered. ‘I’m cold,’ she said, ‘and I want some tea.’ ‘That repulsive desire for tea is a masterly touch. It reminds one of the disgust one felt as a healthy schoolgirl when one saw the schoolmistresses drinking tea at lunch at half-past eleven. It brings home to one poignantly how disgusting the artificial physical weakness of women, born of loafing about the house with nothing to do for company, must be to an ordinary, vigorous man.

A little later he discovered that to furnish her house daintily with Bokhara hangings and brass-footed work-boxes she has spent every penny of his income of six hundred and frittered away a thousand of his capital. She avoids discussion by evading that necessity ?” she meditates sentimentally. “Suppose the community kept all its women, suppose all property in homes and furnishings and children vested in them. . . . Then every woman would be a princess to the man she loved.” The cheek of it! The mind reels at the thought of the community being taxed to allow Marjorie, who could steal her lover’s lover’s money and barter the brightness of his soul for brass-footed workboxes, to perpetuate her cow-like kind. I can see myself as the one rebel in this humourless State going forth night after night to break the windows of the barracks or Yoshiswara where Marjorie was kept in fat ease, and going to prison month after month until—

But “all women!” “So suppose the community kept all its women . . . .” He suddenly rebelled. He takes Marjorie away to the heights of his soul. “Look at this room,” cries Trafford in despair, “this litter of little satisfactions! Look at your pretty books there, a hundred minds you have pecked at, bright things of the spirit that attracted you as jewels attract a jackdaw. Look at the glass and silver, and that silk from China!” He suddenly saw what it is to be a woman . . . . We’re the responsible sex. And we’ve forgotten it. We think we’ve done a wonder if we’ve borne men into the world—and I’m a little out of it. I’m like one of those fishes that begin to be amphibian. I go out into something where you don’t follow—where you hardly begin to follow. . . .” So they go home in a very good temper. And Mr. Wells agrees with them. That is the terrible thing, for there is no author who has a more religious faith; nor one who speaks his gospel with such a tongue of flame. His first sin lies in pretending that Marjorie, that fair, fleshly being who at forty would look rather like a cow—and the resemblance would have a spiritual significance—is the normal woman; and the second lies in his remedy, which Marjorie discovers in a period of spiritual turmoil brought on by debt. “A woman gives herself to a man out of love, and remains clinging parasitically to him out of necessity. Was there no way of evading that necessity?” she meditates sentimentally. “No author who has a more sensitive way. Although she knows that his work is being cut out of his life as one might cut a living heart out of his breast, and that its place is being taken by popular lectures to the scientifically-minded of Pinner and such parts, she continues to ruin him by buying post-impressionist pictures and hoarding up bills. Finally she shatters his spirit by having another baby.

So he drops research and takes up the manufacture of synthetic rubber. For nine years he runs this business and plays tedious games with rubber shares, while Marjorie lets herself go with the price of his perdition in a great, beautiful house filled with the most precious and rather pretentious way. Although she knows that his work is being cut out of his life as one might cut a living man’s heart out of his breast, and that its place is being taken by popular lectures to the scientifically-minded of Pinner and such parts, she continues to ruin him by buying post-impressionist pictures and hoarding up bills. Finally she shatters his spirit by having another baby.
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It is worth trying. Not only because men ought
individually to the spectator. They created their
birth to the greatest repertory movement. I see
general design while communicating themselves
own form of expression instead of swallowing a
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The Philo-Thespians.

The most pressing need of the moment in art,
drama, and literature is intelligence—not
intelligent nonsense. There are four symbols of human
thought and action, the Circle (Life), the Pyramid
(Death), the Pyramid within the Circle (Death
tyrannising Life), and the Circle within the
Pyramid (Death exterminating Life). The Circle
within the Pyramid is the symbol of the present
age, and its full interpretation has yet to come.

An illustration of this figure may be found in
that purely local movement known as the Repere-
tory Theatre Movement. This movement is now
being surveyed by Mr. Frederick Whelan from the
crow's nest afforded by the Daily Chronicle. Mr.
Whelan is a great believer in the future of the
movement. To him it represents a live expansive
movement, whence will spring the vital drama, the
vital theatre, served by equally vital intelligences.
He feels that the future of the writer's theatre is
assured. For Mr. Whelan the earth, in fact,
abounds with pregnant possibilities of what I will
call philo-thespianism. "Nothing can now stay
the progress of the repertory theatre," he
exclaims. "Alas! Mr. Whelan is looking through the
wrong end of the telescope.

Assuming that Mr. Whelan were equipped to
look through the right end of the telescope, what
would he see? I say assuming advisedly, for Mr.
Whelan is at best but a capable business man who,
dike other capable business men, has his own
reasons for dabbling in the theatre business. As
a business man he has seen and planned on busi-
ness lines. One feels that if only Mr. Whelan had
been an artist as well as a business man things
would be different. Then he would have had a
relative value to the vital circle necessary to ex-
press thought. If the theatre is to be art there must
be top decorators, and so forth—as well as a com-
prehension of their individual values. And then,
looking through the right end of the telescope, he
would have seen the sign, "Let there be Light—
not Words!"

With this vision before him I can imagine Mr.
Whelan rewriting his articles as follows:—"Now
that my sight is fresh, I can see the repertory
movement with new eyes out of a great and vital
purpose. Historically, it is represented by three
symbols. The first is an unfettered sweeping
circle. This circle is a picture of the Commedia
dell' Arte. The name was given to a group of
creative players who broke away from the dead
formalism of the Italian theatre of the sixteenth
century, and succeeded in giving the drama a new
expression through freedom, creativeness, and
spontaneity. These actors were so intelligent that
given a creative scenario they could fill in its
general design while communicating individually
to the spectator. They created their
own form of expression instead of swallowing a
foreign body and ejecting it over shocked audi-
cences, as is now the case. Here was a group
which appealed to the intelligence, and which gave
birth to the greatest repertORY movement. I see
now that revolution is the great thing. To most
reformers revolution is devolution in disguise.

The years creep on apace, and these vanguard
revolutionists invade all Europe, firing many a
creative group as they go. They come to Eliza-
abethan England, where players learn from them
what it is to be free to see and do what they like.
At this point the second symbol becomes apparent.
Keeping step with the march of time, many English
comedian wander to the German Royal Courts,
where they encounter the brain with a maggot.
The creative intelligence falls into the hands of
culture, the free players sell their birth-right for a
mess of old conventions. The Pyramid invades
the Circle of Intelligence, which, receding, leaves
the drugged players clinging to the tomb of the past,
and babbling in dead tongues. Thus is
founded the endowed theatre in Germany. And
thus the free light of the theatre is coloured by the
royal effigies, whose motto is, "There is one thing
better than eternal creation, and that is tradition,
out of which artistic death takes its rise."

The character and meaning of the third symbol
is now apparent. The endowed theatre system
begins to spread, and during a long period of time
culture is seen adulterating the purity of the
creative artist, who gradually passes under its
supreme control. Once the circle of adulteration
has passed within the pyramid, it begins to con-
tract. So I arrive at the modern repertory move-
ment as it sweeps through Germany, and is touched
in turn by Schiller, Goethe, the Saxe-Meiningen
Court Company, the Endowed Theatre—Court,
State, Municipal, People's, and Private—by Ibsen,
Brahm, the Freie-Buhne and Max Reinhardt—
sweeps on adopting many and varied reforms,
naturalistic, realistic, symbolic, the ensemble,
cultured speech and acting, but throughout main-
taining its claim to be literary and moral.

Next, I watch the repertory movement emigrat-
ing from Germany to England. The Freie-Buhne
(Stage Society) movement having infected one or
two able minds reappears first in the form of Mr.
J. T. Grein's Independent Theatre; next as our
own blessed Stage Society, fathered by myself.
The infection spreads, and with it arises a
theatrical reform movement deeply stamped with
"The Example of Germany." Crude imitations
and parallel stupid revivals of old forms appear on
all sides. The latter are seen in Village Drama,
Morbidity, Pageant Play, Folk Song and
Dance movements, while the former are embodied
in the Court Theatre and the general repertory
theatre movement. In the latter I see nothing but
the contraction circle, imitation of the German
artistic movement, the search for the tragic,
literary and moral drama, the mechanical reform
of speech and of acting in the ensemble and
crowds. In all this there is nothing living, vital, or
spontaneous; only a whisper from the dead."

Here the imaginary Mr. Whelan breaks off in a
deaf swoon produced by the above-mentioned
appalling discovery, and I accompany the real Mr.
Whelan on his round of self-imposed inspection.
Inspector Whelan proceeds in turn from repertory
theatre to theatre, from the Independent, Stage
Society and Court theatres to their provincial off-
shoots. Everywhere he reveals a glorified stock
theatre titillated with the old ideas coming from
Germany. The theatre itself retains its obsolete
form, and since the new authors are expected to adapt themselves to this form, there are, of course, no new authors. On pointing out this obvious want a writer's theatre, a theatre that shall be a parade some of them for your inspection. Here in possession of every repertory theatre. Let me indeed formed a syndicate of writers, most of whom have drunk deeply at the cesspool of society, but for the moment I will turn to the Central Labour College for men. Even in the Labour and Socialist world, large numbers of people are still ignorant of the objects of the Central Labour College—its location, its origin, its purpose—and to these people some information will be, perhaps, useful.

It will, no doubt, be known that the Central Labour College, at 13, Penywern Road, Earl's Court, is an institution founded in 1909 with a view to providing a genuine Workers' College, at which Ruskin College, Oxford, had proposed to undertake. Into the details of the story of the betrayal of the workers by Ruskin College it is impossible, and needless, here to enter; suffice it to say that the worker-students of Ruskin College, in course of time, discovered that this "Labour" College was only a pretext for presenting partisan capitalist views by its teaching, and that the control and management of the college were undemocratic. Ultimately the students went on strike, and, failing to get their demands satisfied, a large majority of them broke off all connection with Ruskin College, and, supported by Mr. Dennis Hird, the dismissed principal, and others, set on foot the movement that resulted, at the close of 1909, in the formation of the Central Labour College. The college "is founded to train men and women for the industrial, political, and social work of the organised Labour movement, under the supreme control of the Labour organisations in the United Kingdom, and to assist in the establishment of similar institutions elsewhere," and its control is as genuinely control by the workers as its objects are for their interests. I quote from the standing orders the following: "The Board of Management of the Central Labour College shall consist of directly elected representatives of Trades Unions, Socialist and Co-operative Societies providing funds for scholarships, the Warden of the College, one resident student, and one ex-student." At present there are representatives of both the South Wales Miners' Federation and the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants on the Board of Management and Board of Trustees, and it is the Trade Unions who completely control the management, through their representatives.

The Warden is appointed by the Board of Management (here again we see the further extended control pyramid), and is responsible to it, as are also the lecturers. The college course normally consists of one year's residence, but it is possible to enter for a shorter period, as also to extend the course to a period of two or even three years. The cost of residence, covering board, lodging, and education, is £52 for the college year, the monies being raised from Trade Union funds, in some cases supplemented from the students' own private resources. Courses are given in economics, history, sociology, logic, rhetoric, evolution, etc., and though there is the "progressive" theatre will undergo a wonderful transformation. At present it is a panorama for the students stand Messrs. Shaw, Barker, and Whelan, with drawn swords. They are guarding the tiny atrophied spot in the centre, thus making the target of stupidity for that of intelligence.

The Working Women's College.

It is to be hoped that the readers of THE FREEWOMAN are now aware of one of the most interesting projects of recent times, a project which will, in the long run, improve the quality. The proposed Working Women's College is best described in the words of its hon. organiser, Mrs. Bridges Adams, to whose zeal and capability its inception is owing. It is to be a college "which, as in the case of the men's college (i.e., the Central Labour College), will have an atmosphere frankly Socialist, in connection with the Central Labour College," and that its objects will be fourfold. I propose to deal with those objects in detail, but for the moment I will turn to the Central
latter is to be in close co-operation with the Central Labour College; the financial basis will be similar.

For funds, an appeal will be made to sympathisers and to the Trade Unions, especially those in which women are organised. The controlling body will be, at the beginning, a Provisional Committee responsible to the Central Labour College Board of Management; ultimately, the Provisional Committee shall give place to a Board of Management, representing the Trade Unions and Socialist organisations directly. The warden and lecturers will be appointed by the Provisional Committee. The college fees and courses will be very similar to those of the men's side, and the staff of the men's side will take a part in the work of lecturing.

There will, obviously, be differences. A woman's college must, and should, have its own distinctive features, and, since this will not be after the pattern of the "older Universities," it will be saved the necessity of aping in slavish fashion every feature from its brother. But, before I speak of its special characteristics, I should like to point out that, in its general principles, here is a movement which must assuredly win the support of every sincere person who is seeking to help the cause of the workers. For this experiment, if it fulfils its aims, will have at least, certainly, the chance of obtaining valuable knowledge of the conditions of industry, of the causes which have produced such conditions, and of the possible means of dealing with them. When once the workers can grasp the facts that their conditions are not inevitable, that much of the present-day system is of comparatively modern growth, that in the past men have found successful methods of fighting and displacing tyranny, that there are good and bad modes of conducting revolutions—in other words, if they will learn some of the lessons of history and economics and sociology—they will be in an infinitely better position to wage their own warfare, whatever form that "warfare" may take. Some may object that "book-learning" will not do much to help the workers, but this is surely a mistaken idea. The intelligent grasp of facts—in other words, the getting of wisdom—may be partially gained from books; not, of course, by substituting books for life, but by supplementing life-experience (which the students of the Working Women's College will have before they enter) by books. Moreover, it must be kept in mind that the fundamental object of the college is to equip the students for the industrial struggle against capitalism (let us put aside once and for all the vain notion that there is "no such thing as a class-war"), or, in the excellent wording of the advertisement which has appeared in the Press, "to train, in a co-educational scheme of the new experiment, so I should like to suggest as substitute "Women Workers' College")—is absolutely desirable, and, more than that, it must for the Labour movement if it is to reach to full development.

As I have already said, this women's college, though so closely akin to the men's college—indeed, each is but an aspect of the other—will have its own special characteristics. If we turn to the fourth object, as set forth in the programme, we read:

"Object 4.—To provide a link between the Labour movement and the most forward spirit of all classes in the Feminist movement."

If the Working Women's College can do this, in the right sense of the words, then it will, truly, fulfil a very large purpose and by supplanting books for life, but by supplementing life-experience (which the students of the Working Women's College will have before they enter) by books. Moreover, it must be kept in mind that the fundamental object of the college is to equip the students for the industrial struggle against capitalism (let us put aside once and for all the vain notion that there is "no such thing as a class-war"), or, in the excellent wording of the advertisement which has appeared in the Press, "to train, in a co-educational scheme of the new experiment, so I should like to suggest as substitute "Women Workers' College")—is absolutely desirable, and, more than that, it must for the Labour movement if it is to reach to full development.

It is these people who will learn wisdom if they can be brought to learn with and from the workers, and in their turn they can give assistance through their financial position to the Labour movement. Besides, we may no longer endure this absurd division between the "educated" woman of one social sphere and the supposedly less educated in another. If the woman worker of any grade or kind is in earnest about the "emancipation" of the workers she will join hands with all who labour for that end, and will be waiting, willing to get an opportunity so to do. This opportunity the new women's college will afford, by supplying facilities for women who can pay their own fees to enter as day students or evening students—or, if accommodation be sufficient, as residential students on exactly the same conditions as the others—unless, of course, some Labour or Socialist organisation desires to pay their fees.

Yet another distinctive feature of the new college will be the attempt to develop the social side.
Not only shall one department of life be recognised, but it shall be a large and important part of the college course to give the students pleasure, entertainment, and, as far as possible, delightful surroundings in which to live. It may be said that a large claim is made in this article on behalf of the new scheme; that a year, or even three years, is a mere bagatelle of time in which scarcely anything can be essayed. I venture to differ. I believe that those who come to the college will be the fine souls, capable, full of power and enthusiasm, who will achieve things perhaps impossible to those of lesser calibre. The Central Labour College is doing a very wonderful work, often hampered by lack of funds and other difficulties. Why should it be doubted that the women workers will rise to the same level? But, let it be clearly understood, money is essential to the beginning of this enterprise, and it behoves all who have belief in the value of the experiment to give, as far as lies in their power, support of every kind.

For further information please address, Mrs. Bridges Adams, 64, Prince of Wales Mansions, Battersea Park, S.W.

B. L.

The New Order.

IV.—THE NEW RELIGION: COSMIC HARMONY IN HUMAN CONDUCT.


I.—WHAT IS RELIGION?

WORDS, spoken or written, are but the artists’ colours wherewith our thought pictures are presented to the mental eye of our fellows. Hence all constructive thinkers are lords of the words they use, and yet they must deeply consider how best to interpret new ideas to other minds by a skilful blending of new and old, and all reasonable explanation when using such words as have been the source of disputation, misunderstanding, or abuse in our own or former times. The word Religion is emphatically one of these, and it is, therefore, essential to establish the interpretation here put upon it before seeking to develop, in their relation to the New Order, the conclusion appropriate to this aspect of life. By religion is here meant that functioning of the higher faculties in which intuition becomes blended, on the one side, with scientific analysis, and, on the other, with philosophical synthesis; or, in the words of the plain man, feeling and thought are reconciled and held in perfect balance. It is a significant fact that, among all founders of the great world religions, without exception, this blend of faculty is found. They all transcend the dividing lines drawn by theologians and scientists, artists and practical men, moralists and metaphysicians, and so on. Their eye embraces the Universe, and man only in relation to that great whole. The poets and sages of all lands and times—wherever found, whether at the plough or in the pulpit—maintain this tradition, and cherish it, that which can be secured by law to oneself and one’s “heirs and assigns forever,” on the one hand, and it must follow, as the night the day, thou canst not then be false to any man” (Shakespeare).

Having faced the inexorable truth that the free starting-point is realised, must imply the right to live in conditions and environments wherein not only subsistence but also development is open alike to all, it becomes the aim of the free organisers to make towards this ideal with the least possible delay. Setting aside for the moment the question whether this be practically attainable, the challenge may here be thrown out: Can there be anything more religious in conception than this spirit or tendency? Can any lesser criterion of duty to our neighbour or to Nature satisfy the awakened soul of to-day? Once an honest NO be given to this query, it is seen at once, as by a search-light, that the old order which encumbers us nowadays, with its perpetual interferences with freedom, its dominant minorities, its gangs of disciplined and dis-inherited toilers, is in violent conflict with this in-sistent idea. In this great world-struggle, which must win, the new religious ideal or the old economic error? All who respond to the cosmic harmony of the new religion have ceased to doubt the issue; in face of every material and human obstacle, like Galileo of old, they still maintain that they “feel it moves nevertheless.”

The inevitable connection between property—in the wider sense of monopoly—treasure laid up on earth, as Christ phrased it, or, as the lawyers style it, that which can be secured by law to oneself and one’s “heirs and assigns forever,” on the one hand, and the enslavement of one’s fellows, on the other, has been clearly seen by the great religious teachers in all lands. Dimly the recognition of its truth is dawning amid storm and conflict in the workers’ world to-day. The step out of monopoly into the world of free and harmonious social use may be hard, it may be long, but it has to be taken. For it is the step from death into life. The long struggle of the idea against the old forms was in the mind of Christ when He said, “I came not to bring peace on earth but the sword”—yet this sword, then as now, was the sword of truth and reality, not forged of steel. “My Kingdom is not of this world, else would my servants fight.”

The outstanding feature of our ruling social system to-day is that the primary occupations of intelligent civilised life take the form of sacrificing human supplies, intellectual no less than material, in the supposed interest of human needs! To such a pitch have we come in this respect that the brightest and most observant economic writers of
the hour take a pride in pointing out that more expense and trouble is incurred nowadays in "holding up the market" to obtain the price desired than in all the processes of production put together. Yes the air is full of the vain murmurs of custom, accustomed as they are to the sound of the wider cosmic harmony, do these apostles of the old order fervently reiterate that the Church has nothing whatever to do with politics, that religion and economics belong to different compartments of the mind, that the love of your neighbour brings upon human needs and occupations, fresh categories are set up in the domain of morals and criminology. The old schedules of jurisprudence are no longer fixed by vital and spiritual laws, freed altogether from the complex considerations which sway the new spiritual life-force is breaking down their artificial barriers. The keen intellectual analysis of the cosmic sense persists in restating human values in the new religious terms, pointing out that so long as the social system depends upon making things scarce by the twin monopolies of land and capital, so long will prices, rents, and profits continue merely to ring the changes between the ever-varying groups of monopolists, always reacting against the patient wage-earner, whose share, nevertheless, in the result is the most indispensable factor in the supply of human needs.

The ideal of freedom and fair play is thwarted at every turn, and no amount of so-called benevolent readjustment can restore the lost balance of human harmony, or lessen the deadly havoc wrought in both spheres by the creation of artificial scarcity, on the one hand, and pampered superfluity on the other.

The practical philosophy of the New Order consists in reversing the method of the old system in order to revolutionise the result. In the New Order groups, access to the vital needs of subsistence for all, apart from luxury, is held to be the first claim on the land they control; the more vital the necessity, the stronger the claim. Other wants follow in their due degree of importance, standards being fixed by vital and spiritual laws, freed altogether from the complex considerations which sway production and exchange in the old money world. This means nothing less than the daily exercise of the cosmic sense in all avocations of life.

III.—RESETTING OF THE MORAL CODE.

By the entire revaluation, along cosmic lines, of human needs and occupations, fresh categories are set up in the domain of morals and criminology. The old schedules of jurisprudence are no longer operative. "Thou shalt not steal" is a maxim outworn in a community where all reasonable wants find individual satisfaction. "He that eateth not, receiveth that it may be a crime against their own and the interests of society, and he who would be classified by the law as a thief; and one man’s fault is another’s opportunity, and an individual’s self-respect to work at all under the conditions imposed by their masters. What does "direct action" mean but the duty to work only on one's own terms and conditions, and not on those exacted by the pistol of starvation levelled at one's head?

In Tract 1. of this second series ("New Maids for Old") a similar restatement of moral values is shown to be taking place through the vital changes which the New Order inaugurates and sustains in the position of women and in their relations with men:

"The old order changeth, giving place to new,
And God fulfils Himself in many ways;
Lost one good custom should corrupt the world."

W. ALLAN MACDONALD.
HELEN M. MACDONALD.

Women Inventors.

Are women inventive? The question has often been asked many times, and often been answered in the negative, and even recently Sir Wm. Ramsay, the eminent scientist, gave an opinion in this direction, apparently forgetting the able assistance given by Madame Curie to her husband, the late Professor Curie, in the discovery of radium, for which they both received such full recognition from the French Academy.

Undoubtedly, women are inventive, and probably it has been from lack of business ability that they have failed to obtain proper recognition in the world's work in this direction. They have no doubt suffered under the disadvantages of not having sufficient constructional knowledge to obtain the manufacture of their invention in such a form as to bring commercial success, but with their gradual development in a business career they will be able to obtain the services of the manufacturer in a manner difficult for them to get in former times, and so both these important drawbacks to their advancement will be removed.

Probably the beginning of the race of women was the earlier inventor than man, for he kept to the chase for food, and warfare, to maintain existence against the wild beasts and his brother man, and that no doubt it was woman who first planted the seeds and grew the corn for future food; and, again, she would be the only one to weave a few rushes together to make a bed for her babe, and fashion a lump of clay into a vessel to hold water, and afterwards to cook food therein over a fire. Clearly men would not trouble with such "trifles," and indeed his hands were full in defending his family and providing them with flesh food. The needle and use of thread is much more likely to have come from the brain of woman than of man, and for ages the art of cooking was almost entirely in her hands. With even such primitive references it would be idle to deny the right of women to being recognised as inventors.

It is only, however, of recent years that she has taken advantage of the Patent Laws to protect inventions; but in this direction there has been a phenomenal advancement in her progress, for a few years ago a woman's name seldom ranked in the records of the Patent Office, but last year over 500 patents were applied for by ladies in Great Britain alone, showing an average of over ten per
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Correspondence.

To the Editor of THE FREEWOMAN.

THE CASE FOR CONSTANCY.

MADAM,—Mr. d'Auvergne's rejoinder fills me with horror at the extent to which an unpractised writer like myself is able to make a mess. He tells me, for instance, that the horrible custom of arranged marriages, which I deny, and many successful patents taken by men who have made improvements in articles with which they are brought into regular contact, and latterly they have figured as patentees in even such ambitious subjects as motor-cars and preventing telegraphy. Some years ago Mrs. Wood invented a composition to which she gave her name as "Woodite" for coating the panels of ships and preventing incrustation, and a company was formed to take over the patent; also an American lady, Mrs. Harding, of Vermont, is stated to have received $1,000,000 as her one-third share in a horse-shoe for which she was a joint patentee. I cannot believe that any man thinks he is doing better service to society than by devising kindly and intelligent improvements in machines which they work, and in laboratories where they study, and it is a great question of the day how a woman may earn her living, it is certain that there are many who could improve their position by using their intelligence and powers of observation to improve many articles of daily use. G. H. RAYNER

THE TRAGEDY OF THE STREETS.

By A. ARTHUR READE.

This is not a novel, not a gutter book, but a serious book dealing with a serious question which concerns the individual, as well as the State. It is a collection of real life dramas, relieved by interludes of personal anecdote, legal, social, and philosophical. It is the first attempt ever made to embody in a short volume some facts as to the treatment of women. These facts are drawn from official records, local history, and personal observation, and extending over the last forty years. To the student of social science this book is a treasury house of facts bearing on the social evil, as well as to every man who takes a real interest in the welfare of his country. It has involved months of hard labour in selecting, out of thousands of reports, typical illustrations of cruelty to women.

Subscription price five shillings. Orders, with remittance, to be sent to the Author and Publisher, Wilmslow, Nr. Manchester.
who fall in love with goodness, practise it excellently, and gain great happiness thereby. St. Francis might be a saint, even with the prospect of annihilation at death. If it was merely the fear of hell and the hope of heaven that drove him to holiness, how is it that the rest of the world did not follow his example? I mean it was not regarded as a necessary condition of passion. Perhaps it really was enjoyable, just as fresh morning air is enjoyable, in spite of the fact that it is not loaded with scent. I must explain that when I speak of asceticism I mean to be within, not outside the world, doing good and impossible as this, or silly as to marry him. (If Mr. d’Auvergne does not know a disagreeable person when he sees one, I am sorry for him. I do.) When I talked of embracing pain I meant pain of such a nature that to experience it would be no degradation. Penelope could endure the pain of being a woman, but she had no fancy for martyrising herself by submitting to the embraces of men she did not like. (I don’t know, by the way, what my New Oxford Dictionary means when stating that a journeyman is a journeyman.) Mr. d’Auvergne on pity is lucid and interesting. It would appear that when I fish a fly out of the milk-jug my motive is the calculation that the fly will hitherto, in consideration of my conduct, refrain from buzzing round me on hot days. I am mortified: I thought it was sensibility of heart. But perhaps Mr. d’Auvergne means that I am likely to be moved either by pity or by some other feeling, and there may be something in that. Only, how does he account for the fact that I should do so just the same if I were on a desert island, without possibility of release before death? The truth is, the fly’s situation worries me, just as the idea of having destroyed a fellow-creature’s happiness would. Regarding the relations between pity (or any similar feeling) and love, I shall have something to say about that in my next letter to the Editor.

If I have a fancy for loving like St. Francis, why is it so impossible to marry himself? (or charity) and chastity, may I refer Mr. d’Auvergne to the works of Georges Sorel, evidently distrusts reason and intelligence; but if man is not to be guided by these, I cannot for the life of me see by what he is to be guided except by his instincts; and this Mr. Lewis objects quite as strongly. He leaves us in a parlous plight. It may be true that “scarcely anyone knows why he does or what he is,” but the purpose of my article was precisely to suggest that when he does put checks on his own instincts, he might pause to consider, once in a way, why he is doing it, and if it will increase his happiness. When all the workers come out on strike, as I understand Mr. Lewis wishes them to do, I presume they will declare themselves to be moved either by reason or instinct; nay, more, I do not think Mr. Lewis will persuade them to do it unless he holds out some vague hope that their happiness will ultimately be increased thereby. Surveying our social institutions and also certain measures proposed for their alteration, I am, however, compelled to agree with your correspondent, that “scarcely anyone knows why he does.” That is why we are all in such a wretched mess, and why so many of us are so miserable. The laws of England must certainly have been framed by men in the state of mind which Mr. Lewis considers natural, if not proper, to man; and no exaggerated regard for (other people’s) happiness inspires the legislators of to-day. But if your correspondents do not think Mr. Lewis’s instinct is essentially a rational instinct, they must plead with them to let others of us pursue it in our own way, and not seek to frustrate it by upholding restrictions on our freedom in the most intimate of human relationships.

THE CASE OF PENELlope.

MADAM,—On referring to my original article, Mr. Lewis will note that it was professedly written from the standpoint of one who could see no better object in existence than happiness, and that I recognised the existence of various categories of persons who disavowed that object. Amongst these, it seems, I should have enumerated charity? He probably meant that man is fundamentally a rational being, and, like his master, Georges Sorel, evidently distrusts reason and intelligence; but if man is not to be guided by these, I cannot for the life of me see by what he is to be guided except by his instincts; and this Mr. Lewis objects quite as strongly. He leaves us in a parlous plight. It may be true that “scarcely anyone knows why he does or what he is,” but the purpose of my article was precisely to suggest that when he does put checks on his own instincts, he might pause to consider, once in a way, why he is doing it, and if it will increase his happiness. When all the workers come out on strike, as I understand Mr. Lewis wishes them to do, I presume they will declare themselves to be moved either by reason or instinct; nay, more, I do not think Mr. Lewis will persuade them to do it unless he holds out some vague hope that their happiness will ultimately be increased thereby. Surveying our social institutions and also certain measures proposed for their alteration, I am, however, compelled to agree with your correspondent, that “scarcely anyone knows why he does.” That is why we are all in such a wretched mess, and why so many of us are so miserable. The laws of England must certainly have been framed by men in the state of mind which Mr. Lewis considers natural, if not proper, to man; and no exaggerated regard for (other people’s) happiness inspires the legislators of to-day. But if your correspondents do not think Mr. Lewis’s instinct is essentially a rational instinct, they must plead with them to let others of us pursue it in our own way, and not seek to frustrate it by upholding restrictions on our freedom in the most intimate of human relationships.

EDMUND B. D’AUVERGNE.

September 13th, 1912.

FIDELITY.

MADAM,—May I echo the prayer of E. M. Watson? From the “natural” man, good Lord, deliver us. The very thought of him raises indeed a nightmare too horrible for words. Probably Mr. d’Auvergne and a few others would like to revoke the law which makes rape and criminal assault on girls and women a punishable offence?
Fight the Good Fight
For Right is Might.
And Scorning Fear,
Our Dawn is Near:
When all shall see the Light.

THE DAILY HERALD

is fighting the good fight for labour with all its might. Its triumphant progress is a splendid indication of its power for good.

The magnificent tributes received every day from its readers always spur it on to greater efforts towards the achievement of its *raison d'être*—the demand of justice for the workers: the bread-winners of our country.

Readers of “The Freewoman” cannot afford to be without “The Daily Herald” if they are to keep in touch with the most advanced section of the progressive movement.

No great donations are asked for, but just the benefit of their intelligent support and one halfpenny each day.

THE DAILY HERALD
IS LABOUR’S ONLY GREAT DAILY

Readers of “The Freewoman” should send halfpenny stamp for a Specimen Copy of “The Daily Herald.”

Address: THE PUBLISHER,
“THE DAILY HERALD,”
VICTORIA HOUSE, TUDOR STREET,
LONDON, E.C.
But if the "natural" man is to be encouraged, and if he is to roam at large in Society with his natural instincts and desires ungoverned and uncontrolled, may I suggest as a woman that all girls and women be taught the use of firearms, which should be carried as regularly as a handkerchief?

I don't think that many would need to be riddled before other "natural" men became civilised and self-controlled.

KATHLYN OLIVER.

September 16th, 1912.

"THE FREEWOMAN."

MADAM,—I notice that some of your correspondents, as a substitute for subscribing, are undertaking to continue regular purchasers of THE FREEWOMAN. This, while not bringing in so much money as subscriptions, will give you equal security.

I have bought THE FREEWOMAN from its first number, and I shall continue to do so. If you found it needful to double the price I would still buy it.

I disagree entirely with your attitude towards the W.S.P.U. and the militant suffrage movement generally.

But that doesn't matter. Life papers are too rare to be let die.

F. SHEEY SKEFFINGTON.

September 14th, 1912.

[While we appreciate the expressed support of our correspondent, we would point out that subscriptions even for short periods are just over three times as helpful and I shall continue to do so. If you found it needful to double the price I would still buy it.]

I am sorry to see that in your issue of August 15th there is an attack on Eugenics by F. W. Stella Browne. Mrs. Browne evidently thinks that there is some connection between Eugenics and coercion. There is absolutely none, either etymologically or historically. Some very superficial persons have advocated State interference, but all Eugenists of first-rate ability, with the solitary exception of Plato, have believed that Eugenics should be based upon absolute freedom. The modern Eugenics movement originated in America, and nearly all its ablest advocates have lived there. Every one of them has been an unflinching advocate of individual freedom. The first publication which used the name "Eugenics" was the American Journal of Eugenics.

EUGENICS IN AMERICA.

MADAM,—I am sorry to see that in your issue of August 15th there is an attack on Eugenics by F. W. Stella Browne. Mrs. Browne evidently thinks that there is some connection between Eugenics and coercion. There is absolutely none, either etymologically or historically. Some very superficial persons have advocated State interference, but all Eugenists of first-rate ability, with the solitary exception of Plato, have believed that Eugenics should be based upon absolute freedom. The modern Eugenics movement originated in America, and nearly all its ablest advocates have lived there. Every one of them has been an unflinching advocate of individual freedom. The first publication which used the name "Eugenics" was the American Journal of Eugenics.

I had the honour of being one of its most frequent contributors. Every one of the writers in that publication favoured perfect liberty.

Clear-headed Eugenists say that in order to improve the race only one thing is needful. Every woman must be perfectly free to choose the father of her child. Such freedom would automatically improve the quality of the race, because the natural tendency of the average woman is to be attracted by strength and vigour more than by weakness. Most women prefer a healthy man to a delicate one, a lively man to a dull one, an optimistic man to a pessimistic one, a muscular man to a frail one, a clever man to a stupid one, and so on ad infinitum. The inevitable effect of freedom would therefore be to eliminate the inferior men from fatherhood, to a great extent at least, and to give a preference to healthy, strong, and able men.

I am well aware that the English Eugenic movement is in the hands of some of the densest blockheads in the world, who are totally incapable of seeing the above point. I strongly protest, however, against any association of the noble name of Eugenics with the vapourings of such asses.

R. B. KERR.

August 30th, 1912.

GIRLS OF TO-DAY.

MADAM,—May I draw attention to an article in the Daily Mail of September 10th, called "Girls of To-day," which I think would be useful as a subject for discussion in your, in many ways, admirable paper?

Also I shall like to point out to you and your readers the constant confusion and misapplication which some of your correspondents ceaselessly indulge in regarding the two words "sexuality" and "sensuality." The difference is not a very fine one, and therefore it is all the more strange that, in ordinary conversation even, one hears the two words so misused as being synonymous (which they are not) as one does.

MALE PEDANT.

September 11th, 1912.

CHILDREN'S SURNAMES.

MADAM,—Has it ever occurred to you that the present way of naming children is a great injustice to women? I suggest that, instead of all the children in a family carrying the father's name, the first child take the father's...
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name (or the mother's), the next child take the mother's name, and so on alternately. I also suggest that all such titles as Mr., Mrs., Miss, Esq., be suppressed. I suggest that we put this into practice at once in our dealings with each other.

Finally, I suggest that in marriage a woman continue to carry her maiden name. There is no reason why a woman should assume her husband's name. Laws and customs are contrary to these proposals, but now is the time to establish better laws and customs.

E. H. JAMES.

September 10th, 1912.

SPECIAL TREATMENT FOR SUFFRAGISTS.

MADAM,—If the question discreet—"Was the Government motive coercion of the women's spirit?"—be also innuendo, then I stick to the innuendo. Mr. Norman, September 12th, paragraph two, sentences three, four, five, and six, makes all the necessary admissions in proof of the truth and justice of both question and innuendo. Regarding Government methods the issue could not be more clearly defined. The physically strong and the physically weak alike released without forcible feeding in late summer, 1909, the Editor of The Free Woman among them; and there have been similar cases since then. This completes my last word on the "no alternative" question. I deny that according to the standard of the gentleman, Mr. Norman should, if Home Secretary, feed brave prisoners, men or women, by force.

The petitions on behalf of Mrs. Mary Leigh and Miss Gladys Evans are now ready. Large petitions are provided with followers for holding a number of names; small petitions for the followers, and hold about half a dozen names. Will your readers please apply to me at once at Struanlea, Shoreham, Sussex? I ask for 5,000 signatures within the next seven days. Enclosed is a list of part-messages from prominent sympathisers with the new movement. One of the most interesting letters I have received to date is from Mr. Allen Upward, who says:

"I am wholly against treating any prisoners, of either sex, or of whatever crime accused, in a manner that involves their personal degradation or physical torture. As a judge, I have sentenced men to death with a clear conscience, but I consider that the right of society ends there. It has a right to defend itself against attack, whether by banishment, imprisonment, or execution, but not to punish."

I should support to the utmost of my power any effort to revise our penal laws in accordance with the teachings of science and religion, but it seems to me difficult and dangerous to draw distinctions in favour of particular prisoners, who have more enemies than the unknown and wretched beings, victims of temptation and poverty and hereditary disease, whose fate these ladies have deliberately courted. I should very greatly prefer to see an agitation directed against the whole system under which such atrocities are possible.

With Mr. Upward's general position I am in full agreement; but it seems to me that that particular campaign provides a pressing task to hand for the specialised energy of such a public body as the Personal Rights Association, or the Humanitarian League, or both societies.

My own position has already been made clear to readers of your paper, who will realise that I am not urging a theory of special treatment for ladies. And truth to tell, Mrs. Mary Leigh (like Mr. William Ball and myself) is by birth a genuine child of The People; and all of us, and many more like us, had already a lifetime's record of self-support and hard work and realised knowledge of the country's crying needs behind us, prior to making any acquaintance with British prisons from the inside, as suffragist prisoners. We had had good reasons for being suffragists, and militant suffragists to boot! Then let us get Mrs. Mary Leigh and others, whatever their rank, out of those dark chambers of the forcible feeders now; and then let the Humanitarian League, and the Personal Rights Association, and Mr. Upward, and all of like mind, now on the ready soil of a roused public opinion if they will. The W.S.P.U. and the W.F.L. can provide enough first-hand material for an effective national campaign as soon as the machinery is ready to move. Meanwhile I ask for those 5,000 signatures this week as a beginning.

Part replies are as follows:—

REV. PROFESSOR T. K. CHEYNE, D.D. (Oxford), and MRS. EVELYN GIBSON CHEYNE.

"Most certainly, will gladly sign a petition regarding the two prisoners you have written about." ALBERT DAWSON, ESQ., Editor Christian Commonwealth.

"I gladly sign your petition. I agree with every word of your letter. And I would also join any committee you may form, if I could help in any way." SURGEON-GENERAL G. W. EVATT, C.B.

"Very glad to sign suggested petition." FRANCIS GRIERSON, ESQ.

"I agree with you that the undoubted courage of the prisoners, Mrs. Mary Leigh and Miss Gladys Evans, now in Mountjoy Prison, Dublin, who have sustained the trial of a hunger-strike, should be met by different treatment than feeding by force." PROFESSOR W. D. HALLIBURTON, M.D., LL.D., F.R.C.P., etc.

"You may add my name to any petition or committee set going on behalf of suffragist prisoners. I recently spoke against their treatment in a public meeting in Dundee.

MR. GEORGE LANSBURY, M.P.

"Yes, certainly add my name. I am doing and will go on doing all I can to rouse opinion. It is a cruel and cowardly business."

THE RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF LINCOLN.

"You may count on my signing the memorial you are about to send to me.

REV. DR. ORCHARD, Enfield.

"I am a poor believer in the Suffrage being granted to women. I am a profound disbeliever in the personal

WOMEN AS INVENTORS.

If you have an IDEA for an INVENTION AND PATENT, protect it at once and secure the full advantage.

There is an increasing number of successful Women Patentees. Full particulars and pamphlet of information post free from Messrs. RAYNER & CO., Regd. Patent Agents, 37, Chancery Lane, London, W.C.
violence tactics of some of the militants. The Dublin incident seemed to me to have only narrowly escaped bringing about a dreadful tragedy. Still, mistaken and even mad as I hold such tactics to be, I am bound to recognise the motives, and therefore I should be glad to sign a petition that the prisoners should be awarded the privileges of the First Class."

Professor E. A. Schafer, F.R.S., etc., President, British Association.

"I am ready and willing to sign a petition that forcible feeding of suffragette prisoners shall cease, and that they be accorded the privileges which are usually accorded to political or quasi-political offenders against the laws. I am also willing to join a committee to support such a petition—provided always that it is drawn up in such a form that I should approve. I am also in agreement with the opinion that the sentences inflicted on the ladies you mention are excessive."

E. H. Vistak, Esq., Author Buccaneer Ballads, etc.

"Your letter is capital; I agree with every point."

Professor James Ward, Cambridge.

"I shall be glad to sign your petition when it is ready."

Mr. Philip Snowden, M.P.

"I am quite ready to support a movement for securing special treatment for Mrs. Leigh and Miss Evans as political prisoners, and for a reduction of the sentence, which I think is outrageous; but I do so on the distinct understanding that I have no sympathy at all with the methods these women have thought fit to adopt. Forcible feeding is an abominable outrage, which ought not to be allowed."

Mary Gawthorpe.

FOREIGN.

FREEMASON.

Madam,—For many years the privileges and secrets of Freemasonry have been denied to women. Now, however, several members of the thirty-third and highest degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite, sympathising with the cause of sex equality, have obtained charters from the highest authorities in England and Germany to initiate women. Until the end of September, 1912, or further notice, the fees charged will be half those usually asked.

N. I. L.
BANDED