

THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW.

The ANTI-SUFFRAGE REVIEW is published by the National League for Opposing Woman Suffrage, and can be obtained through any bookseller or news-agent. Annual Subscription, 1/6, post free.

The OFFICES of the LEAGUE are at 515, Caxton House, Tothill Street, Westminster, S.W.
Telegraphic Address: "Adversaria, London."
Telephone No.: 1418 Gerrard.

No. 86.

LONDON, DECEMBER, 1915.

PRICE 1d.

THE NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR OPPOSING WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Executive Committee :

Presidents: THE EARL CURZON OF KEDLESTON; LORD WEARDALE.

Deputy-Presidents: THE COUNTESS OF JERSEY; LADY ROBSON.

Chairman of Executive Committee: E. A. MITCHELL INNES, Esq., K.C. *Hon. Treasurer:* J. MASSIE, Esq.

Honorary Vice-Presidents: The Earl of Cromer, Mrs. Moberly Bell, Mrs. Burgwin, Mrs. Greatbatch, Lady George Hamilton, Charles Lyell, Esq., M.P., Earl Percy.

Hon. Secretary: MRS. JEYES.

Assistant Secretary: MISS HELEN PAGE.

MISS G. LOWTHIAN BELL
MRS. LAURENCE CURRIE
MRS. FREDERIC HARRISON
MRS. GAMBLE
MRS. G. MACMILLAN.

MRS. MASSIE
MISS G. S. POTT
MRS. HUMPHRY WARD
LADY WILSON.

KENNETH CHALMERS, Esq.
LORD CHARNWOOD
HEBER HART, Esq., K.C.
W. G. W. HASTINGS, Esq.
LORD HAVERSHAM

A. MACCALLUM SCOTT, Esq. [M.P.]
A. MACONACHIE, Esq.
ARNOLD WARD, Esq., M.P.

AT HEADQUARTERS.

The Assistant Secretary reports:—Miss Dormer Maunder has been paying a short visit to England, in connection with the establishment of another Belgian Military Hospital. As many members of the League will be anxious to render her such assistance as is in their power, I cannot do better than give publicity to the following letter which I have received from her:—

"It is such a pleasure to be over for a few days, and meet you all, and to see and thank you for the splendid work you are doing, without which we on the other side could not continue to relieve the intense sufferings as we do, which as time goes on do not lessen, but become harder to bear; for the 'strain' is an added difficulty we have to cope with.

"The Belgian Military Authorities have asked me to organise, equip, and direct another large Military Hospital, this making the third I have organised, equipped, and directed for them. This is all well in hand, and I hope to be ready in about four to five weeks. At the same time I am having a *National Christmas Day* at the Bourbourg Military Hospital, and I should be so grateful for assistance with *holly* for 50 wards, also small Belgian and British flags and ribbons to decorate the wards, puddings and iced cakes—on the latter 'A Happy Christmas to our Ally, Belgium,' in pink lettering on the white icing—and small Belgian and English flags to stick on them. I do not know whether you would be willing to assist, but I shall doubly appreciate it if you do, as a token of our 'United Service,' past and present.

"Yours in Service,

"BEATRICE E. DORMER MAUNDER.

"P.S.—New Zealand is taking a Christmas ward entirely, also Italy has taken one, and Scotland has taken one also."

THE DAWN.

Oh! that the touch of ancient Bard
Might strike a stirring chord,
Prelude to some great martial song,
To lift with one accord,
Those who are faint, in heart and faith,
In this our land to-day,
Doubting the might of England's strength,
The while they watch and pray.

Dark is the hour before the dawn,
Bleak with an icy chill,
Yet will the sun arise again,
Lighting each shrouded hill—
Rise in effulgent splendour soon
Over each land and sea,
Where our brave manhood fights to set
The "Lesser Nations" free.

Many the women left at home,
To mourn this Christmastide,
Yet they shall see the guiding star,
And in their faith abide,
For in the world once more to-day,
Christ will uphold the right,
And we shall win in His dear Name,
The great uplifting fight.

G. L. M.

The Assistant Secretary will be very glad to receive socks, shirts, mufflers, etc., for airmen and minesweepers, and also socks and shirts for the 3rd Battalion, Rifle Brigade. She will also be glad to hear of any members who would undertake S.S.F.A. visiting in Dulwich, or various London districts.

THE ORGANISATION OF WOMEN.

Sixteen months of war have caused many theories to be revised, many methods to be overhauled. With an undoubted genius for improvisation the country set about to cope with the novel set of conditions brought about by the war. Enthusiasm went a long way, and for some time the nation was able to persuade itself that it was doing remarkably well. But the war continued, and improvisation either broke down under the strain, or was gradually replaced by more scientific procedure. The munition problem affords the best instance of the change; but there are many others, ranging from the question of Allied War Councils to that of rations. Even now it would be premature to say that improvisation had everywhere given place to expert organisation, for the country still clings to the belief, only partly challenged by the appointment of the War Committee, that the machinery that serves the State well in peace time is necessarily adequate to war conditions. In the majority of the spheres affected, however, complacency has yielded to recognition of the fact that improvisation makes a poor substitute for scientific preparation. Mistakes are honestly admitted, and a conscientious effort is being made to benefit from present experience. If men's affairs suffered from lack of organisation, it is no reflection on the women of the country that they too should have been found unorganised at the outbreak of war. This is true of them as a general rule, but exceptions were provided by certain organisations for political purposes, which in the enthusiasm of the earlier moments seemed to supply the very thing that the nation required. In the light of all that has happened it would be difficult to contend that any kind of organisation whatever is not preferable to no organisation at all. Women's societies were able to set to work with a minimum delay, and in those days no help was to be despised or rejected. But as the war drags on its terrible length, there has been time to take stock of women's methods as well as men's methods of improvising work which can only be satisfactorily done on lines of careful scientific preparation, and there is nothing to choose in point of merit between the two. But while men realised for the most part what they must aim at, it must be admitted that women did not always set out in the right direction.

The existence of the women's organisations may have been responsible for mistaken efforts. Their constitution was based on political warfare, and when real warfare broke out they were irresistibly attracted into military spheres. Fortunately there were many points in which they could not go wrong; in regard to hospital and Red Cross work, in providing for Belgian refugees, they were on safe ground. The venture became more questionable when it sought to imitate the military training of men. No one will be found to depreciate the work done in the early days, but it is a matter for speculation whether in the absence of those organisations which tended to give a quasi-military turn to women's activities, women, finding themselves wholly without organisation, would not have sat down first to consider the purposes for which they should organise. As things were, they set to work without adequate forethought, with the result that it has taken them a long time to find out that organisation is concerned just as much with the question of what has to be done as with that of how to do it. Their maximum effort would have been secured, if, instead of feeling a call to enter man's sphere, they had set to work first to

organise their own, and then had left the surplus women free to make good deficiencies in man's sphere. But it is not too late now to make a fresh start. It is all to the good that mistakes have been recognised at last. Just as men have had to return from the trenches for munition work, so women may have to leave what is known as war work in order to take up women's work, if the nation is to be enabled to put forth its maximum strength.

The nation not unnaturally has been inclined to pride itself on the splendid way in which women have risen to the occasion at a time of national crisis. From munitions work to tram-conducting, through the whole gamut of likely and unlikely employments, women have lent a hand, and though their record is to their honour, we refuse to subscribe to the view that it is in any way a matter for surprise. But as the country settles down to war conditions, and begins to realise that a fight for the national existence, of the intensity that marks this terrible struggle, opens up more problems than that of carrying on from day to day, the question arises whether it is after all woman's mission to do man's work. Misgivings have forced themselves from time to time upon the more thoughtful members of the community lest women in their anxiety to do war work should neglect other work, which also has to be done, if the nation is not to suffer, and which they alone can do. A step has now been reached when it is seen that these misgivings have been only too well founded. The infant mortality rate of this country has undergone a considerable increase. In the six months from September, 1914, to March, 1915, over 50,000 infants died—the highest figure reached for the past four years. This state of affairs is attributed to two causes—the increased employment of mothers, and the withdrawal of sanitary inspectors, nurses, health visitors, and others into direct war work. Unless drastic steps are taken to remedy this evil, posterity will have harsh things to say of a generation that allowed its women to do men's work to the neglect of the duties which nature and the nation's interests alike called upon them to perform. Even now, when an appeal is made to the Government to make use of the National Register, it is with a view to supplying women to take the place of men summoned to the colours. But if the need for organisation be now admitted, let it be carried out scientifically. The first call on women ought to be for women's work. When its requirements are satisfied, then let the surplus of women workers available be drafted to take the place of men. Three million or more men have been taken from their ordinary avocations for military purposes. We are by no means prepared to admit, without further evidence, that, even with the transfers carried out in the case of women who were workers before, there are enough women to spare to replace all these men without detriment to women's work. It is more than probable that the country will have to tide over the shortage of men by readjustment of work as well as by the substitution of women. But just as maximum efficiency is not secured by sending skilled munition workers into the firing line, so it will not be secured by taking women from indispensable service which they alone can perform, for work which others, who are not needed elsewhere, can do quite as efficiently. Men have been able to graft organisation on to improvisation, because they knew their direction when they set out, but if women are to organise, let them start at the beginning, which is concerned with what is essentially women's work.

NOTES AND NEWS.

Women Patrols.

An article on Women Patrols which appears in this issue will, we feel sure, be read with interest by many. As with a number of other schemes which owe their origin to the war, there has been time to gain experience, and to pass from improvisation to sound methods. The secret of the good work that the Patrols have in most cases been able to do lies in the appreciation of a fact emphasised in the Central Women's Patrol Committee's report, that "the importance of starting quietly, without public meetings, has been realised everywhere. As one organiser reports: 'The more quietly we can get to work the better.'" When the scheme was launched at public meetings, and with fierce denunciations, we could see little chance of its serving any good purpose. Fortunately other counsels prevailed, and we may hope that the determination to work quietly out of the limelight will hold to the end, and that the Committee will set its face against supporting any demand that seeks the limelight under the guise of an official status.

The American Elections.

Woman Suffrage in the United States has received a significant defeat at the hands of the electorates of the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and, a few days before, New Jersey. It might have been thought that the Americans, profiting by their freedom from a ruinous war, and with a strong leaning towards pacificism, would seek to clinch their hold on peaceful development by accepting the Suffrage doctrine. What seems to have happened is that they have read into the European war unmistakable proof of the fact that moral force is not likely to prove an adequate substitute for physical force until the world is appreciably nearer the millennium than it is at present. Moral force has oozed from every sentence in President Wilson's Notes, but the fate of the "Arabic," the "Ancona," and many another vessel, is eloquent of its value. The two forces would also seem to have clashed in Bulgaria and Greece, where the Kings, relying on the support of their armies, have been able to flaunt the electorates. Misfortunes, it is true, ought not to deter us from striving for the ideal, but when the national existence is likely to be compromised by insistence upon a false ideal, it behoves good patriots to readjust their views and abandon their agitation.

Political Activities v. Propaganda.

Perhaps we ought not to lay too much stress upon pledges these days. In any case the truce which was supposed at the outbreak of war to cover Woman Suffrage and other political questions has been so strangely interpreted in Suffrage circles from the very beginning that the latest developments ought not to be a matter for surprise. At the Council Meeting of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies held last February, a resolution was passed confirming the action of the Executive in suspending "the ordinary political activities of the Union," but a number of speakers made it clear that it was proposed to draw a distinction between "ordinary political activities" and "propaganda work,"

for, in the words of the *Common Cause*, "there was evidently a strong feeling that Women's Suffrage propaganda must not be allowed to lapse, even at the present crisis." As Woman Suffrage is a political question, for it can only materialise, in common with Home Rule, Tariff Reform, and other political questions, in the arena of politics, most people would find it difficult to explain how the "ordinary political activities" of a political society do not include propaganda work. But the mental reservation of the Council Meeting served as a compromise, and at the moment only concerned those who made it.

The "Truce."

As the war continues, it is becoming evident that even the questionable observance of the political truce, hitherto in practice, is becoming irksome to the Union. The Manchester Society has either been able to satisfy itself that a deputation to a Member of Parliament "in connection with the question of Woman Suffrage" does not come under the head of "ordinary political activities," or it is guilty of a breach of the Council's resolution of last February. As an indication of the way the Suffrage wind is blowing, attention may be called to the following editorial footnote appended to a letter in the *Common Cause*, of November 26th:—

"We hope it has been sufficiently clear to readers of the *Common Cause*, week by week, that Suffrage work has not been suspended. The resolution passed by the Executive on August 6th, 1914, and confirmed by the Council, that 'ordinary political work will have to be suspended during the war,' did not, of course, apply to propaganda work, which is always being carried on, but to political agitation which has been in abeyance."

As the letter to which this footnote is appended contains the naïve admission:—

"It is only a few weeks since we circularised our M.P.'s in connection with Women's Suffrage,"

it would seem that the action of the Manchester Society was in no way an isolated instance. But in regard to political "agitation," the official organ of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies would have the country infer that the Union would never countenance such a proceeding "at the present crisis." On that point, at least, we know where we are—provided we do not read further in the *Common Cause*. For lower down in the same column we find Miss Catherine Marshall, who has held high office in the N.U.W.S.S., and ranks as one of the leading Suffragists, writing:—

"If the text of the Bill (Parliament and Registration Bill), when published, gives any ground for anxiety, all Suffragists should write *at once* to their members, urging (1) that if the question of changing the men's franchise arises on the Bill, the question of including women should be raised also; (2) that if the Bill is drafted in such a way as to make this impossible, it must be withdrawn and re-introduced in another form. Probably only a few days will elapse between the introduction of the Bill and its Second Reading. There is not a moment to lose."

Although we had been proved wrong in our interpretation of "political work," we thought that we could recognise "political agitation" when we saw it. Again, we must be wrong. It remains to be seen whether the "political agitation" recognised as such by the N.U.W.S.S., which really is in abeyance, reduces itself to the old stone-throwing, Minister-baiting activities that were carried on for them by repudiated proxies.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN THE UNITED STATES.

With no war to interfere with the ordinary course of politics, the question of Woman Suffrage continues to be violently agitated in the United States. In the United Kingdom, it is true, the subject is not allowed to be altogether forgotten, and it is for that reason as well as for purposes of record that we have to follow in these pages what is happening in America.

Last month it was pointed out in the REVIEW that the contention of Suffragists that the United States were rapidly passing over into the Suffrage camp was not borne out by facts. The defeat of the Woman Suffrage amendment in New Jersey by a large majority was a fresh indication that the Eastern States were far from being enamoured of the constitutional experiments of the West. But on November 2nd a still more decisive setback was given to the Suffrage movement, when the States of New York, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts recorded overwhelming majorities against it. These four States, together with Ohio, which voted on the question last year, were regarded as test cases in the Suffrage movement. Writing in October, 1914, the chief Suffrage organ in America, the *Woman's Journal*, said: "Ohio is going to win. If Ohio wins, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Massachusetts will come in in 1915, and the country will have been carried for Suffrage." Ohio had defeated Woman Suffrage in 1912 by a majority of 87,455 votes; two years later, in 1914, the majority against it was 182,905. But by 1915 the Suffragists had picked up heart again, and were once more to sweep the board in the four big States. As the event turned out, they have been decisively beaten, in New York by an estimated majority of 190,000 votes, in Pennsylvania by about the same number, and in Massachusetts by 115,000 votes. In New York only four out of 61 counties returned a Suffrage majority, and the voting for the whole State represented a 6 to 4 majority. In Massachusetts every county voted against the Suffrage amendment, which was defeated by a 2 to 1 majority.

Thus, in 1914 and 1915, no less than nine States—Ohio, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts—have rejected Woman Suffrage on a referendum. In Illinois, it will be remembered, the Suffragists succeeded in passing through the legislature a modified form of suffrage, which was not obliged to be submitted to the electors. The same experiment was tried this year in five other States—Vermont, Michigan, Indiana, Nebraska and Rhode Island—but in each case it was defeated. So that this year, in one way or another, fourteen States have decided against Woman Suffrage measures of one kind or another. There is little in this record to support the theory of a "landslide" in favour of it.

It is necessary to examine the details of Woman Suffrage in America in order not to be misled by the results achieved by the movement. At first sight it may seem a satisfactory record that twelve out of forty-eight States should have declared for equal suffrage, while another State—Illinois—has a modified form of equal suffrage, and Suffragists make much of the fact that the area of these twelve States is equivalent to 49 per cent. of the territory of the United States. But in point of population, these same States can claim only 9 per cent. of the total of the United States. Massachusetts, which

was one of the four States to reject Woman Suffrage this autumn, has a larger population than the combined populations of the six Suffrage States of Wyoming, Arizona, Idaho, Utah, Montana, Oregon and Colorado. The States of New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and New Jersey together include nearly a quarter of the total population of the United States. In each of these the defeat of the Suffrage movement has been decisive.

Another point to be remembered is that Suffrage victories have invariably been won on a small vote, and by narrow margins. California, for example, gave votes to women on the strength of a majority of 3,500 on a total vote representing only about one-third of the electorate. In Oregon the Suffrage majority was only 3,277, on a total vote representing a little more than half the electorate. The aggregate Suffrage majorities in the States in which Suffrage has been adopted by popular vote amount to only 96,283, or about one-half of the Anti-Suffrage majority in Ohio at the election of 1914. As *The Remonstrance*—an admirable quarterly, published by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts—points out, these results indicate "not a great popular demand for Woman Suffrage, but a lamentable failure on the part of a large number of voters to realise the seriousness of the question, and to take the trouble to vote upon it. Michigan furnishes a case in point. There the amendment came near slipping through, the majority against it in 1912 being only 760. But when it was re-submitted in 1913, the voters were aroused, and gave a majority of 96,144 against it."

As is known, the failure of the Suffragists to carry the States individually with them has prompted the attempt to carry through Congress an amendment to the Federal Constitution. So far the attempt has failed. The subtlety of it, however, may be gauged by the fact that in voting on such an amendment, the States count as States, without reference to population. Thus Nevada, with a population of 81,875, would be equal in voting power to New York, with a population of 9,113,379, or Pennsylvania, with 7,665,111 inhabitants. There are at least twelve States which, according to present indications can be relied upon for many years to come to vote against Woman Suffrage—New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Texas, Massachusetts, Missouri, Michigan, Indiana, Georgia, New Jersey, Kentucky, and North Carolina. The combined population of these twelve States is 47,255,333, while the combined population of the remaining 36 States is only 44,321,508. Yet in the case of a Federal amendment it would be possible for the States representing a minority of the population to override the wishes of a majority of the people. Suffragists have fastened on to this means of gaining their ends, because they hope to cheat the electorate and gain their object by dint of intrigue and lobbying.

As was to be expected, "explanations" have at once been put forward to explain the Suffrage defeat in New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts and New Jersey. "News of the campaign," says *Jus Suffragii*, the organ of the International Woman Suffrage Alliance, "has shown the union of corrupt politicians, the vice and drink interests, to defeat what all look on as a dangerous reform. The illiterate alien vote has been another determining factor." It is really only necessary to point out that, until the details of the voting are known, it is impossible that *Jus Suffragii* should be able to name any "determining factor." As for the other statement, it

has become the stereotyped explanation of every Suffrage defeat. It was freely used in explaining the defeats in Ohio, Wisconsin, Missouri, Michigan, and other States. There would be something to be said for the argument, if it could be shown that Prohibition and Woman Suffrage go hand in hand. But of sixteen Prohibition States, twelve have become so by the agency of male voters, and only four have adopted Prohibition since they secured Woman Suffrage. The State of Maine, which has had Prohibition since 1850, has defeated every attempt to introduce Woman Suffrage. In Ohio last year the questions of Prohibition and Woman Suffrage were voted upon simultaneously. Prohibition received a total vote of 1,092,508, the majority against Prohibition being 84,152. Woman Suffrage drew 853,685 voters, the majority against it being 182,905. If the Suffragists were to maintain that all the vices are against Prohibition and Woman Suffrage, while all the virtues are in favour of them, they will have to explain the defection of 170,000 virtuous voters who recorded their votes for Prohibition, but failed to support Woman Suffrage. But the "vice" argument falls to the ground in view of the fact that at each election the Suffragists of the United States make a definite bid for what is known as the "liquor vote." Thus the President of the Ohio Suffrage Association published an official statement early in the campaign, in which she said: "Let me explain that the Suffrage Association is not a temperance organisation. It has no connection whatever with the Anti-Saloon League." This announcement became in the mouths of the Suffragist orators simply a definite promise to their audiences that "Woman Suffrage would not take away their beer."

The truth is that Woman Suffrage is defeated because the great majority of people in the United States are opposed to it, both for State purposes and as a Federal measure. There has been nothing in the results of the experiment in the West to attract the Eastern States. On the contrary, from time to time the latter receive very cogent warnings from people who have been Suffragists, and have watched the working of Woman Suffrage in the West. One or two examples may here be given. Mrs. C. W. Kayser, of Wheaton, Illinois, on resigning the chairmanship of the Woman Suffrage Association, said:—

"Men had been bad in politics, but the way women are going on is worse. I want to get away from Suffrage."

Miss Annie Bock, of Los Angeles, California, formerly Secretary of the California Equality League, addressing a Committee of the United States Senate, said:—

"I gave without remuneration over a year of my life working for Suffrage. It had to do it over again, I would work twice as hard, if that were possible, against it. . . . I have had more than ordinary opportunity to observe and watch the workings of Suffrage, and I consider the result not only unsatisfactory and disappointing, but disastrous."

Judge Snell, of Tacoma, Washington, has said (*Boston Post*, March 31st, 1915):—

"I favoured Woman Suffrage in Washington and voted for it. But . . . I am so greatly disappointed at the way it has worked out that I would to-day welcome an opportunity to vote for its withdrawal; and I believe if it were re-submitted to the people of Washington, and every man and woman of voting age were compelled to vote upon it, Woman Suffrage would be defeated by an overwhelming majority."

Mrs. F. W. Goddard, who is described as "one of Colorado's most prominent and respected women," is reported to have said:—

"For years I believed in Woman Suffrage and have worked day in and day out for it. I now see my mistake. . . . The experiment is a failure. It has done Colorado no good. It has done women no good. The best thing for both would be if tomorrow the ballot for women could be abolished."

When evidence of this nature regarding the effect of Woman Suffrage is forthcoming from four separate Suffrage States, it is not a matter for surprise that in the East the electorates should refuse to commit themselves to such a questionable experiment.

THE WORK OF WOMEN PATROLS.

(Contributed.)

Among the many forms of activity open to women desirous of making some practical effort in connection with the war, the work of Women Patrols deserves notice.

Early in the history of the war it became apparent that the conditions created by the formation and training of the new Armies called for the special attention of those interested in the general welfare of the people. Never before in this country had such masses of young men been called together, and withdrawn from the neighbourhood of their homes and friends, to be quartered in places which were strange to them, and among populations to whom it was equally strange to have troops in their midst. The enthusiasm which greeted the new Armies everywhere was common to the whole nation, and it was certainly not among the mass of the young womanhood that the fervour was least observable. If this fervour was to be wisely controlled and led into sensible and profitable channels, the advice and friendship which older and wiser heads could give to the younger and less well-balanced was obviously called for. It was to meet this need that the Central Committee of Women's Patrols was instituted.

A study of the conditions prevailing showed that in this matter women were the best people to help one another. The problem was to provide an example of wise conduct, and at the same time an outlet for the patriotic desire to help the defenders of the nation. Influence was to be exerted in unobtrusive ways, which would nevertheless carry weight with the people who were to be subjected to it. It was supposed—and rightly so—that the presence of well-conducted people would be the best corrective of any tendency to foolish and unbalanced behaviour. But more than that was required, for the energies of those who have spare time would be wasted, unless they could be diverted into useful occupations.

Hence, in towns where many troops are quartered, arrangements are made for a body of older women who shall make themselves responsible for being about in crowded places, and by their presence and influence set a tone which shall be at once helpful and inspiring. Clubs are started for women and girls, and the opportunity given to all who will to come and give their leisure to work for the sailors and soldiers. The Central Body is prepared to send organisers who will study the special conditions of each locality, and advise those who are prepared to start a local Patrol Committee. The local Committee is organised under the chairmanship of an experienced head—preferably a lady already known to be interested in local work—and the local Committee selects its body of Patrols from those they can trust to do this work discreetly. There are at present 2,302

Patrols working in over 100 places in the United Kingdom. Each woman Patrol wears an armlet as her badge of office, and has her distinctive number.

In the Metropolitan Police area she receives a card of authority under the signature of the Commissioner of Metropolitan Police. In the counties the card is signed by the Chief Constable. In every case the Police are instructed to give all the help and advice which may be required by the local Committee, Patrol Leader, and the Patrols. The scheme has been justified by results. It has received the warmest commendation from Sir Edward Henry, the Commissioner of Metropolitan Police, who attended a meeting of Women Patrols at the Mansion House on June 10th, 1915, and publicly acknowledged the value of the service rendered by them.

The work has also been recognised and approved by the Secretary of State for War, and the First Lord of the Admiralty, both of whom have expressed their sense of its usefulness to the men serving in the Army and Navy. Such semi-official status as the Police possess, and the official recognition accorded to them must not be taken to mean that their duties are primarily those of control. On the contrary, their first and highest endeavour is to befriend and help the young women and girls they come across in their work. In this it is believed they have been successful, and there is gratifying evidence that their activities are welcomed by our sailors and soldiers, as well as by the girls themselves.

Although the Headquarters Committee is prepared to advise local Committees, it is evident that the success of the scheme must depend upon the good sense of the local Committee, the Patrol Leader, and individual Patrols.

The work calls for considerable powers of physical endurance, as Patrols are on their beat for two hours at a time. But the moral qualities involved are even more exacting. It is a work which demands in the highest degree the qualities of patience, tact, and discrimination. A Patrol who is fussy and self-important is of infinitely less value than one who is content to do her work unobtrusively, and often without much apparent result. The opportunities of active influence are less frequent than those of passive example; but it may safely be said that those who practise the habit of passive example are much more likely to obtain opportunities for active influence than those who are perpetually on the look-out for it.

It need hardly be said that the work is neither sectarian nor political, but which makes a strong appeal to those who have at heart the well-being both of our sailors and soldiers and the people among whom their lot is cast while they are training for their part on the battlefield.

THE BEEHIVE.

The Hive has been very earnest in prayer against the Woman Suffrage campaign in the United States. Woman's quiet work has shown that the men are realising the necessity of protecting woman from the heavy burden and responsibility of political affairs.

Our efforts in the way of work have been successful: 15 dozen dressings for the Military Hospital at Dundee; £3 sent to the American Vice-Consul for the relief of the starving Belgians in their own country; and a third ambulance—Furber's hand ambulance—has been sent to the front at the cost of £17 16s. 6d. We have to thank two B.W.T.A. societies for donations of £2 2s. and £3 3s. These ambulances are the greatest comfort to our badly-wounded men, who can be removed with very little jolting, and can be ordered at the Minerva Motor Co., Chenies Street, London.

THE BEST POLICY.

Carried away by the success achieved in her new vogue, Mrs. Pankhurst has not had time to refresh her memory of certain fundamental truths which must be the basis of a law-abiding career. It was typical at once of the generous and *laissez faire* character of the nation, that with the outbreak of war this thoroughly un-English woman, who gave herself up to notoriety and lawlessness, because she imagined that evolution could only come along one hard and fast line laid down by herself, should be allowed to pose as an ultra-patriot, and harangue the people on their public duty. In her limited sphere, Mrs. Pankhurst, unwittingly, no doubt, because any obsession beclouds the intellect, but none the less deliberately, had done more than any other man or woman to besmirch her country's name and to make it a by-word among the nations. But all this was at once forgiven her. *The Times* vied with the *Suffragette* in chronicling her movements. Very few of her London speeches could have been left unreported in its columns. Whatever the British public may have thought, it kept its counsel to itself, even when it came to an attempt on the part of *The Times* to make it believe that a meeting convened by Mrs. Pankhurst and the Women's Social and Political Union was a fitting medium to voice the national desire to prosecute the war with increased effort and determination.

To many there seemed a lack of a sense of proportion in the almost daily notices which for three weeks heralded the Albert Hall meeting in the columns of *The Times*. For her speakers Mrs. Pankhurst had only gone a little way beyond her immediate entourage of pre-war days. In any case she had not quitted Suffrage circles. That in itself need not have affected the spontaneity or *bona fides* of the meeting, but it suggested that, whether patriot or Suffragette, Mrs. Pankhurst clung to the "*Aut Caesar aut nullus*" régime which characterised the organisation with which her name is connected. At the eleventh hour it was seen that the Women's Social and Political Union had not kept the arrangements of the meeting in its own hands to no purpose. As far as the public was concerned, Mrs. Pankhurst's meeting was intended to press for the more vigorous conduct of the war—in itself a legitimate object and unexceptionable. But recalling, no doubt, the stage-managed effects of previous demonstrations, Mrs. Pankhurst resolved to prepare a surprise for both the country and the Government. An appeal over her own name was circulated privately, in the main we may suppose to her own supporters, but to others as well, perhaps by mistake, urging the recipient to attend the meeting at the Albert Hall, with a view to demanding the resignation of the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. A meeting for such an object naturally stood on a very different footing from that of a meeting to advocate the more strenuous prosecution of the war. Mrs. Pankhurst had not only gone one behind the public's back in suddenly changing the character of her demonstration, but had deceived two at least of the speakers who were to support her. The Government, wiser than Mrs. Pankhurst's organs in the Press, refused to give the proposed meeting a wholly false importance by vetoing it, but left it to the Council of the Royal Albert Hall to cancel the letting of the Hall.

As there are lessons to be learnt by everyone these days—by the oldest as well as by the youngest—it is to be hoped that Mrs. Pankhurst will benefit by the rebuff

given her for not realising that for people who want to uplift politics by thrusting women into the political maelstrom, honesty is the best policy. The incident tends to show how far more likely it is that instead of women uplifting politics, they will themselves be dragged down by contact with them. It is not that male politicians are inherently bad, as Mrs. Pankhurst and the Suffrage school of thought suppose, but there comes a time in connection with every cause which is placed higher than the personal concerns of its adherents, when a line of conduct that would not be condoned in private life may have to be followed for the good of the cause. According to the moral standard and strength of character of the individual adherent these occasions may be few and far between, or continuous. In each case the individual will be able to justify his or her line of conduct. A ruling sovereign may disdain a lie, but feel constrained at a grave crisis to mislead a potential enemy for his country's good; a demagogue may conceive it to be his duty to his party to deceive the public on every possible occasion. Politics, therefore, in an imperfect world, are likely to prove far stronger than the individual who enters into political life. Certainly, nothing that has happened in connection with the excursions of women into political life, whether in this country or any other, leads the impartial observer to suppose that they are likely to bend politics to their will. In the United States, where there might seem to be no little scope for "uplifting," abundant evidence is forthcoming to show that women—not, of course, all women, but the political whirlpool is apt to submerge the good and leave the less worthy on the surface—that women are adepts at "improving" upon the worst features of male politics. In the recent elections an alleged Anti-Suffrage campaign, ostensibly carried on by what are known as the liquor interests, was proved to be an electoral device of the Suffragist party to discredit their opponents. We doubt very much whether Mrs. Pankhurst's conduct in regard to the proposed Albert Hall meeting could have been imitated by any male politician. We are certain that not one would have chosen the present moment in which to make the attempt. The action not only lacked honesty, but it revealed either the shallowness of Mrs. Pankhurst's patriotism, or perhaps more likely, the inability of anyone who has surrendered her intellect to an obsession to pass sound judgment on what may or may not be in the country's interests at the time of a national crisis.

THE TRUCE.

"Sleeping, But Not Dead," is the heading given by the *Manchester Guardian* to a report of a deputation of the Manchester Society for Women's Suffrage which recently waited upon Sir John S. Randles, M.P., in connection with the question of Woman Suffrage. The chairman of the Society "begged Sir John Randles to help them by holding a watching brief in the House of Commons for the Suffrage cause and by seeing that nothing should be done in Parliament which would be in any way a setback to the women's cause."

Speaking in Manchester at a later date, Mrs. Fawcett is reported as follows in the *Manchester City News* of October 9th:—"Alluding to the cause of Women's Suffrage, she expressed the belief that it had made considerable progress during the war."

The King, on the recommendation of the Home Secretary, has been pleased to appoint Mr. E. A. Mitchell Innes, K.C., to be Recorder of Middlesbrough.

THE INFORMATION BUREAU.

415, Oxford Street, W.

The Committee have pleasure in reporting a steady and considerable output of work during the past month, both of garments of various kinds and of swabs and bandages for certain of the military hospitals. The appreciation of these gifts by the hospital authorities has been couched in terms exceedingly gratifying, as testifying to the high standard of the work done at the Bureau.

The Bureau has been appealed to again by Queen Mary's Needlework Guild to make a certain number of dressing-gowns for officers, and these also received high praise for the excellence of the work.

The working party of the Dulwich Branch have made and sent to one of the military hospitals several wadded and quilted coverlets, which evoked very grateful acknowledgments from the matron, who appealed for a further supply to be made for the new cubicles for nurses at that hospital. Directions for making these will be willingly given at the Bureau, and gifts of materials will be gratefully welcomed.

The work for the Belgian Hospital goes on apace, and further consignments of over one hundred coats have just been sent over to Bourbourg. Mrs. Deane's working party has made and provided the material for 13 of these.

Miss Dormer Maunder, who lately came over on short leave, expressed her pleasure and gratitude at the work being done for her by the Bureau, and as she has been asked by the Belgian military authorities to organise another large hospital on the lines of the one at Bourbourg, she desires that the Bureau shall be her central depot in England for the supply and despatch of garments and other comforts. The Committee are glad to assent to this, and desire hereby to make it known that all parcels destined for Miss Dormer Maunder at the Bourbourg Hospital, should be addressed to her c/o Women's Patriotic Bureau, 415, Oxford Street, London, W., whence they will be sent direct to Belgium. The appeal for a room for the swab and bandage makers of the Bureau has met with a generous response. Through the kind offices of Miss King and Dr. Gibbs, Sir James Harrison, Chairman of the Hospital for Diseases of the Heart, Westmorland Street, W., has most kindly lent an empty ward in that institution, for which the Committee desire to tender him their very grateful acknowledgments. As this ward offers ample accommodation the Committee will be glad to receive the names of more workers for this branch of the Bureau's activities, the demand for all kinds of swabs, sponges, and bandages being constant and increasing. Full particulars can be obtained at the Bureau, where intending workers should apply.

The Committee had hoped to be able to include in this report an account of the meeting already announced to be held on November 23rd, at Lady Haversham's, in aid of the Bureau funds. Owing, however, to Mr. Forster Fraser's many engagements, the meeting had to be postponed to November 29th, by which date the REVIEW will have gone to press. The account will therefore appear in the January issue.

Contributions to the fund have already begun to come in, and the Committee desire to acknowledge gratefully £1 from Mr. and Mrs. Harben; £1 from Mrs. A. E. George; £1 7s. collected by Mrs. Prendergast Walsh; and other contributions from Miss Rigg and Mrs. Godwin.

WOMAN IN THE HOME.

One effect of the war has been to silence—almost—those who never tired of sneering at political opponents who held that the well-being of the nation required that the majority of women should find their main scope in motherhood and the home. It was never denied that numbers of women are compelled to earn their livelihood away from the home; but the contention was that the home and all that went with it, particularly motherhood and the care of infant life, called for the first attention of women who claimed to be interested in their sex. The jeers that could always be relied upon at certain meetings to greet the reference to "women's sphere being in the home," are no longer heard. In their place the country has witnessed a splendid campaign to promote the welfare of motherhood and infancy. To show how marked has been the change of view we quote some significant statements by Suffragist writers:—

Dr. C. W. Saleeby: "We have heard too much of rights and too little of duties . . . but the rights of mothers are in a class apart. . . . To-day those laws of life are teaching themselves to us all. . . . The bees should be our teachers. . . . The queen is the mother, not the ruler nor the voter. . . . The sterilised milk depot and the crèche and various other methods of the kind, recently set up in Berlin, for instance, 'so thorough and so bad,' as Mr. Benjamin Broadbent said to me the other day, are fundamentally wrong, even though they be of some use *faute de mieux*, because they tend to divorce mother and child. . . . The recent records of infant mortality must now be definitely associated, in many instances, with the ghastly new drinking among the wives of our men. . . . (Among the speakers was, above all, Mr. Broadbent, of Huddersfield, who proved and did once and for all what we writers and talkers merely asserted and advocated." (*The Daily Chronicle*, October 26th, 1915).

Dr. Elizabeth Sloan Chesser: "One of the lessons we had learned of late was the value of trained women to the nation. Every woman should have a career. She should be trained in housewifery and child management first, and then in some trade or profession." (*Manchester Guardian*, October 23rd, 1915).

Miss Mary Macarthur: "In ordinary times when the country is at peace the average woman has not a wide horizon. Her interests and her activities are usually centred in her children, her home and her friends . . . although she may not have realised it, the everyday woman was probably rendering the highest service to the nation by doing as well as she knew how the work that lay nearest to her hand. But now . . . thousands of women . . . ask with a pain like a stab at the heart what they can do to help the country through to happier times. . . . It may not be very popular or tactful to say so, but the ministrations of that street crowd [the reference is to an incident previously described] were about as helpful to the stricken man as the performance of some amateur women war workers, actuated by the best motives, have been to the country. . . . To all women I would say, 'Do first and faithfully the work that lies nearest to your hand, however humble or remote from national service it may be.' Many women go quietly about their household ways, spending, scheming, retrenching, keeping their children healthy and happy, facing adversity with calm and courage. Nobody ever hears of them; no praise or photographs of them ever appears in the Press, and yet who dispute that they are bravely helping the country through the crisis? As for some of the women who go rushing frantically about, trying to push in here, trying to push in there, praying that some beam of publicity may chance to fall on them, they are thinking, to say the least of it, as much about themselves as about the country. . . . Whatever we do should be done simply and sincerely, patiently and without ostentation." (*The Daily Sketch*, November 8th, 1915).

Mrs. Creighton: "In view of these duties, let us consider the special tasks for women, and first, the care of children, whether from maternity centres, babies' welcomes and schools. All that had to do with them was of a new importance, for they were the nation of the future. . . . All working on these subjects were doing what was as important as work at the front." (*The Nottingham Guardian*, November 5th, 1915).

In the light of all these remarks, the reading public might be tempted to suppose that, when Mrs. Fawcett spoke recently of Woman Suffrage making considerable progress during the war, she must have meant considerable progress towards realising how false had been the outlook on life which underlay the movement.

CARE COMMITTEES.

In connection with the movement for promoting the welfare of the nation by paying more attention to the care of child-life, the following letter from Lady Craik, which appeared in *The Times* of November 2nd, is of special interest:—

Sir,—The recent meeting at the Guildhall called attention to a subject which must deeply interest us all at this time, when so many brave young lives are being sacrificed—the care of child-life. The speakers, and, later, writers to the Press, referred to schools for mothers, babies' welcomes, and other most excellent institutions for increasing the knowledge of and averting the dangers to infant life. But there is also another stage of child-life to which I would ask the attention of my sisters—the stage that lies between infancy and the first stepping out into the big world—when all is growing and forming, and the little bodies are a prey to many ills that might be averted by resort to skilled scientific care. Here the Care Committees, established in connection with each elementary school under the London County Council, come in. Their function is to see that the children are cared for outside school hours. That physical defects or tendencies to ill-health, as discovered by periodical medical inspections, are not neglected; that parents are persuaded to resort to medical aid; that defective hearing, sight, speech are at once dealt with; and that no child runs the risk of growing up with a physical weakness or defect that might have been obviated by attention in childhood. The work is not easy, and the apathy of the parents is often disheartening. "I won't bother about Tommy's ears (or sight, or teeth); he'll be leaving school in three months, and then it won't matter," is frequently the feeling expressed. But it is real woman's work, and is sometimes sweetened by success, and is constantly aided by the sympathetic attitude and kindly help of the teachers, than whom, so far as my experience goes, no more devoted or loyal-hearted body of men and women could be found. The work is pressing, the workers few. Won't the women come forward? It is not as exciting as drilling, or signalling, or motor driving. It does not involve the wearing of uniform (dear, just now, to the heart of woman). But it has its own charm, and its value will reach beyond one generation. I would gladly give details and suggest where work could at once be found to any who care to ask.

"A WOMAN DIPLOMATIST."

The "Eat Less Meat" myth which placed these words on the menu of the Lord Mayor's Banquet must take second place to the "Woman Diplomatist" legend appearing in the *Glasgow Herald* and other papers. It would seem that Miss Pressley Smith, an organiser in the employ of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies, has received an appointment in the British Legation at Christiania, presumably as private secretary to the Minister. At the source from which the information has been derived by the provincial Press the appointment has been described as that of secretary to the Legation, and the Press has fallen into the trap of regarding Miss Smith as a full-blown Secretary of Legation. While some journals seek for precedents, others trace connections between Miss Smith's appointment and Sir Edward Grey's views on the Suffrage question. Yet we seem to have met women in Government Departments and had not been told to regard them as Secretaries of State.

News of the death of Madame Longard de Longgarde at Vienna on September 29th only reached this country during the past month. Madame de Longgarde, better known by her maiden name of Dorothea Gerard, was a writer of no small merit. She was heart and soul with the purposes for which the N.L.O.W.S. was formed, and from time to time contributed to this REVIEW.

The Hon. Mrs. Eustace Fiennes, whose hospital work in France is well known to members of the League, has been awarded two decorations by the French Government for the services she has rendered to our Allies.