

week, or Bishop Manning, obliged for the same reasons to deliver professional sermons. If the reader is thirsty for documents, let him read the four volumes which Pierre Loti has written on Turkey since the armistice, or examine the photographs of Greek atrocities exposed in Mr. Duncan's Paris workshop, rue Jacob. From the former he will learn that the English Tommy's saying about the Turk being the only gentleman in the war is no jest; from the mouths of soldiers, nurses, chaplains he will discover that these barbarians were, time and time again, chivalrous and pitiful to a degree that would be remarkable even in a Christian; while from the photographs he will learn of what

those poor, persecuted Greeks are also capable. We have space for only one story; it is instructive and it is true. A French boat was bombarded very near the shore, so near that a proportion of the crew was enabled to save itself by hard swimming. Turkish soldiers actually entered the water to aid the survivors, and after the latter had been fed and reclothed, they were marched to the nearest camp. On the way they were slightly jostled and jeered at by the bystanders. The French complained of this treatment to the Turkish officer in charge of the detachment, who replied with the disdain of which only his race is capable: "Do you not see? They are almost all Greeks."

Equality Laws vs. Women in Government

By ANNE MARTIN

THOSE of us who believe that the backwardness of women is retarding the race should consider earnestly the question: Do "equality laws" equalize? Experience shows that the chief equality law, the one giving the vote, has not brought women equal opportunity or position in human affairs. We need cast only a glance at national and State government, at political parties, business, industry, the professions, all still controlled by men, to see that this is so. Millions of women are still safe in their houses, the drudges of our world, "being supported," many of them doing twelve or more hours a day in their homes as unpaid workers. Other millions are earning their living as teachers, nurses, stenographers, clerks, factory workers, domestic servants, and charwomen, all poorly paid or menial occupations, but the only ones obtainable, with the exception of a comparative few attained by pioneers in higher fields. And we see the League of Women Voters and the National Woman's Party, the successors of the two great suffrage organizations which won the vote, still doggedly pegging along after "equality," which the vote was supposed to confer. Both back at the old job, they are pursuing slightly different lines.

The League of Women Voters decided at its recent annual convention to work for training in citizenship, unification of laws concerning women, and for a law to prevent American women losing their citizenship if they marry foreign husbands. The National Woman's Party's program is its "blanket bill" in the State legislatures, designed to remove all legal discriminations against women in the forty-eight States, thus preparing the way to clinch equality by securing a national constitutional amendment declaring equality the law of the land.

The aims of these organizations are of course above criticism. No man or woman can deny the justice of the admirable laws they seek, but the question inevitably arises in the minds of those who wish women to speed on that the race may speed on: Will they accomplish their purpose, the removal of all remaining forms of the subjection of women, *actual equality*, by getting more laws? Are they not taking the shadow for the substance? In raising this question I do not overlook the fact that this work has unquestioned educational value, but I think even the education of women to their real status could be more quickly accomplished by a more direct attack. We have the vote, an absolutely necessary tool in woman's fight for political equality, whatever may be its effectiveness as a weapon for wresting human

rights for men and women from our political government. Why then not use this tool ourselves to knock down all remaining barriers to equality? Why continue to stand at the doors of Congress and State legislatures begging men to vote for our new equality laws? Let women work for more laws if they want to—a few may be technically necessary—but why not at the same time work for the election of qualified women, irrespective of party, to Congress and State legislatures? Is it not more direct, more educational, more "equalizing," to put women into power, pledged to the aims of women, than it is to continue to use the "indirect influence," the "womanly appeal" of ante-suffrage days? It would not even be necessary, to begin with, to elect as many women as men to legislative bodies. European experience shows that a small group can do much. Dr. Gertrud Bäumer, perhaps the ablest woman member of the German Reichstag, recently told me that the thirty-seven women in that body are asked by the men members to caucus on woman's measures. The Reichstag then follows the decision of the caucus. But women in government on a "fifty-fifty" basis with men should be the goal. (I made this remark lately to Lady Astor. She said instantly, "Yes, but you must be sure and have the *right* fifty!")

If, on the other hand, our leading organizations continue to work for equality laws by practically the same methods they used as unenfranchised women (unavoidably prolonging the sex appeal and the "inferiority complex" in the minds of many), and if, after years of effort, these laws are placed on the statute books, the greatest inequality of all will remain: women will still be outside the pale of the real game of politics, and government, life itself, will still be controlled by men, who can administer the new laws practically as they please. Equality laws will not and cannot equalize, any more than declaring the earth flat can make it flat. But the process of winning a half-share in government will go a long way toward developing a sense of equality in the minds and hearts of women. And then the laws will take care of themselves.

We can benefit in this very important matter by the experience of Englishwomen, who in some ways are a generation ahead of us. Those thirty years of age won the right to vote and to sit in Parliament near the close of the war in 1918. Dissatisfied with this concession, which they saw left them still outside government walls, with laws, the professions, business, and industry discriminating against them, they persuaded the coalition leaders just before the

General Election in 1918 to pledge themselves "to remove all existing inequalities in the law as between men and women." In 1919 the Coalition Government passed the so-called Sex Disqualification Removal Act, hailing it as the "Woman's Charter of Liberty." I remember we heralded it in the United States as the second great "Act of Emancipation." Its opening words seemed nobly and generously to promise the dawn of a new freedom:

A person shall not be disqualified by sex or marriage from the exercise of any public function, or from being appointed to or holding any civil or judicial office or post, or from entering on or assuming or carrying on any civil profession or vocation, and a person shall not be exempted by sex or marriage from the liability to serve as a juror.

But after this sweeping opening statement come certain qualifying clauses which give the appointment of women to the civil service into the hands of their hoary old enemy, the Treasury, and give to courts and judges the right to call women as jurors. A certain piece of portentous language in the Act seems to open up the whole field of higher education on absolutely equal terms, but on analysis it merely gives Oxford and Cambridge permission to admit women if they want to! (Women were admitted to the other universities of the United Kingdom some time before this act was passed. Oxford has used this permission to admit them, but Cambridge still refuses.)

So, excluding its noble beginning, the total accomplishment of the second Magna Charta, when carefully inspected, appears to be: To allow women to become magistrates, barristers, or solicitors, to serve as jurors if judges let them, and to enter Oxford and Cambridge if the University authorities approve! Lady Rhondda's petition for a seat in the House of Lords as a peeress in her own right was based on the Magna Charta's opening words: "A person shall not be disqualified by sex or marriage from exercising any public function." Her petition was denied, under the leadership of the Lord Chancellor (formerly Mr. F. E. Smith, now Lord Birkenhead, and a powerful member of the Coalition Government which passed the act), on the ground that sitting and legislating in the House of Lords is not a public function! And women, of whom there are two million more than men in the United Kingdom, continue to be dismissed in large numbers from the civil service, as police-women, as teachers, doctors, and even charwomen to make room for men. They are also dismissed upon marriage, the authorities snapping their fingers at the Magna Charta, which Lady Rhondda herself now describes as a "dud," "a mere scrap of paper."

Thus Englishwomen have learned to beware of politicians bearing gifts, and to be wary of equality laws. They are now preparing to *take* equality, by taking a half-share in government. A slogan of the Woman's Freedom League, the former suffrage society, led by dauntless Mrs. Despard, is "three hundred women for Parliament." While American women's organizations do not yet venture even to indorse qualified women for public office, the leading English organizations, through a joint committee, are seeking qualified candidates, and not only indorsing them, but raising the campaign funds, often the chief obstacle to a woman's candidacy, for their election. They are achieving a sense of sex solidarity perhaps never before achieved by women. While I was in London recently a prominent militant suffragist was indorsed for Parliament by the National Union for Equal Citizenship, which as a suffrage society under Mrs. Henry Fawcett feelingly opposed Mrs. Pankhurst's

methods. This would be almost like the National League of Women Voters indorsing Miss Alice Paul for Congress, and certainly indicates a unity of action we have not yet won in America.

Is not this significant English movement worthy of earnest consideration by the National League of Women Voters and the National Woman's Party? Just as Englishwomen gave us the final spur that won suffrage, may they not now be showing us the way to win equality? Of those who wish to quicken the advance of the race by quickening women I ask this question: Is it not possible our American organizations have got hold of this "equality" stick by the wrong end? Instead of plodding after this will-o'-the-wisp of "equality" laws, should they not about face, and march together toward Government itself, bastioned and buttressed against them? That way lies at any rate a more certain hope of "equality."

[A presentation of the other side of the case, written by Zona Gale independently of the above article, will appear in the next issue under the title What Women Won in Wisconsin.]

In Support of Hiram Johnson

[By Telegraph]

San Francisco, California, August 4

To The Nation, New York City, N. Y.

I am making no reply to The Nation's article. If The Nation can afford to be the instrument for the expression of the malice and mendacity of a disgruntled and defeated past-master in the corrupt expenditure of money in politics, I cannot with equanimity accept the situation. I am now in the very midst of a bitter struggle with the reactionary forces of California. Your article is designed to affect the contest and to aid these reactionary forces. It is written not as survey of the political situation, or the two candidates, or the opposing groups, but as an attack upon one, and a nasty, untrue, and malicious attack at that. It will not, fortunately, affect the result in California. It can only affect the estimation in which some people have held The Nation.

HIRAM W. JOHNSON

[By Telegraph]

Los Angeles, California, August 3

SENATOR HIRAM JOHNSON has just received from *The Nation* an advance proof of an article written by George P. West, entitled Hiram Johnson After Twelve Years, with a request that Senator Johnson reply to the article in the same issue should he desire to do so. This has been impossible, because the proof forwarded from Washington did not reach the Senator in the mails until today.

I am taking the liberty of wiring you in regard to this communication because for a number of years I was Senator Johnson's private secretary and am, therefore, more or less intimately familiar with the political events in his career upon which Mr. West's criticisms are based. Also for several years I was associated with Mr. West in the reportorial rooms of a San Francisco newspaper, and our personal relations have always been cordial.

The most serious accusation made by Mr. West against Senator Johnson's personal and political integrity is contained in the statement that the Senator took part in defeating William Kent, candidate for the Republican nomination for United States Senator in the California primaries of 1920, and that this alleged part in Kent's defeat amounted to a betrayal of the cause of honest and liberal politics.

Mr. West was the paid publicity director of Mr. Kent's cam-