

THE FREE-WOMAN

SOME INFERENCES FROM THE THOUGHT
OF JESUS CHRIST IN RELATION TO
PROBLEMS OF PERSONALITY
AND WOMANHOOD

BY

IRENE SOLTAU

STUDENT CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT

32 RUSSELL SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1

First published October 1929

*Made and Printed in Great Britain
by Turnbull & Spears, Edinburgh*

PREFACE

ONE is loath to write on what must seem to many a threadbare subject. During the last twenty-five years every magazine, every debating society, has dealt with all the superficial aspect of woman's position in the world of to-day. Yet in many ways we have not begun to think seriously about this question.

If the woman, for whom her place and her destiny in life is a real personal problem, seeks help and guidance in her quest, her experience is that the Church and the religious leaders have so far given us very little light on the application of Christian truth to the questions which puzzle the women of this generation. I see about me many young married women who are restless, and who find it hard to accept the life of household routine, monotonous tasks, and the complete sacrifice of their professional work. It is obvious that there is a lack of harmony between the temperament and tastes of many modern girls and the life which many women lead who have several children and a few hundred pounds a year.

Here are a few typical cases which have impelled me to write on this question in spite of all that has already been written on its various aspects, but which did not seem to meet the spiritual need of many people with whom I have come

The Free-woman

into contact: A social worker married to a pastor with a very small income and a not very convenient house. She has been married for less than a year, and although in love with her husband, is hankering all the time after her old work and the old freedom from petty domestic cares. I spoke of the fundamental unity in the work of the Kingdom, of the mistake of letting oneself be fascinated by numbers, or of opposing material to spiritual work—I cannot quite remember what I said—but the pathos of the answer has remained: “Yes, I have said all that to myself a hundred times; I believe all this, and yet . . . I cannot break myself in to the new life. . . . Something so strong calls me to the work outside. . . . But do write something for people like me, and try to help us. . . .”

There is also the girl who, engaged to a fellow student, declared that whatever happened she would have to have “her own job” or “some joint job,” for she could not imagine how she would ever “stick housework.” “It doesn’t seem fair that I should have to give up my job and not he. . . . Help us to think it out.”

Of course selfishness, ambition, love of pleasure always bring lack of harmony, but I am thinking now of women who are neither essentially selfish nor ambitious, but just the product of a normally good home and good school. The Christianity they have known has not met the difficulty; often the girl who has responded most eagerly to the call of Christianity has been most baffled by the spiritual problem. Chris-

tianity, with its great call to social and missionary service, "World" needs, "World" problems, seems to have turned her thoughts in another direction and associated itself with large dreams, great reforms. . . . Theologically Christianity has had no message for the intellectual problems of woman's destiny, no theology of womanhood or feminism. Though all the message of Christianity is one of selflessness and humility, and though there is power in the message of the Gospel to give us light and strength to meet any kind of life with joy and make any adjustments to life, it remains that many souls find it hard to make those adjustments unaided.

The aim of this book is to help these to think and pray their way through, to harmonize that inward urge to personal work with immediate duties, to see what Christianity has to say in view of what seems the "unfairness" of the sacrifice.

We have to deal with a relatively new factor in women's consciousness—this love of independent work which appears in quite feminine women. For the most part, the modern student is quite feminine: her keen love of little children does not prevent her love of work from being the most living, active, and awakened part of her personality, something about which she is passionate and sensitive.

The creative instinct, under the influence of certain ideas, has been harnessed to the love of a profession. What is the value of this new development? How shall we meet it?

We want an independent doctrine of woman-

The Free-woman

hood based neither on a verbalist Christianity, nor on French revolutionary ethics, nor on mere reaction from mid-Victorian prejudices, nor even on modern psychology; not a doctrine which simply expresses the tendencies of the age, but a doctrine of womanhood which shall grow up in the light of the teaching and the life and death of Christ, and of those principles which we deduce from them.

Obviously religious life is so much more like an art than an exact science, that arguments and theories can only be of relative value, but perhaps we are tempted to-day to minimize the influence of thought over our own reactions. We all need both thought and some source of inspiration which will enable us to fulfil our function in society. Some interpretation of our destiny is necessary even to the least theologically minded.

All I have attempted to do here is to offer a few suggestions as to lines of thought which may be useful to those for whom this problem is a personal one, and to attempt to show how the conclusions reached in the earlier part of the book can be applied to education and to practical questions.

It is perhaps suitable that any book on the subject should be written in the midst of the interruptions of domestic claims, but it needs to be written with more leisure, more perspective, and more strength. Its defects may incite someone else to give us a real Theology of Woman's Vocation.

Preface

We have studied the question of women's destiny from a definite point of view. From the first, certain assumptions are made. The starting-point is the belief that in Jesus Christ we see the highest revelation of moral strength and spiritual truth, that what Jesus thought and did is supremely significant for us. As often, we build on what to many is not susceptible of intellectual proof, but is a matter of intuition, or if you prefer it, a matter of taste.

If Cæsar appeals to you more than Christ, or Napoleon more than St Francis of Assisi, then none of the arguments in this essay will appeal to you. It can only have any interest if Christ's words and life stir in you some answering echo; if what He experienced and thought is, for you, some guide, or at least some data in your search for truth. That is why we begin by trying to see what Christ teaches, or what His outlook implies with regard to the subject in hand, and to follow this up by noting some points relating to women's experiences as members of professedly Christian societies. It leads us over very familiar ground—perhaps so familiar that one could have taken it for granted; but it seemed better to reconsider again what the Christian outlook really does imply, and see what other conceptions of womanhood, family life, or personality are in contradiction to it.

TO THE
LEEDS UNIVERSITY CHRISTIAN UNION
1919-1926

CONTENTS

	PAGE
<i>Preface</i>	5
CHAP.	
I. <i>How much in religious institutions has kept women in subjection, yet how in the deepest elements of religion she has found liberation</i>	13
II. <i>How dimly and slowly the Church understood the implications of Christ's message</i>	37
III. <i>How women's ideas about their own position were affected by French revolutionary thought : (a) Liberty</i>	58
IV. <i>How women's ideas about their own position were affected by French revolutionary thought : (b) Equality</i>	76
V. <i>How we dare, and dare not, revolt</i>	99
VI. <i>How we need a new Faith</i>	126

The Free-woman

CHAP.	PAGE
VII. <i>How we need some new Elements in Education</i>	149
VIII. <i>How we need a new Material Setting of Life</i>	168
IX. <i>The Future</i>	199
<i>Appendix. Cuts in the Curriculum .</i>	205

THE FREE-WOMAN

CHAPTER I

How much in religious institutions has kept women in subjection, yet how in the deepest elements of religion she has found liberation.

NOT seldom do we find people speaking of religion as of one of the forces which has kept woman in subjection. And, indeed, this attitude appears at first justified by a superficial examination of the world's chief religions. "A woman is never independent" you read in a Brahmin religious writer, and you learn from him that the husband is allowed to beat her with bamboo rods. "Woman is always dependent," says Confucius, "and owes due homage to her father-in-law . . . she must serve her husband and nurture her children." "Nine times must a woman ask her husband what to do," echoes a Persian writer—and if instead of trying to find light for ourselves, we were studying older teachings, pages could be filled with quotations which are but variations on this same theme. Some Hindu scriptures deny that she even has a soul, and many customs imply that she is unclean.

Yet women have clung to religion, and have, indeed, often proved to be its most ardent supporters.

The Free-woman

Was it that they were too much used to the idea of dependence and obedience to question or resent it? Doubtless. The soul's need for the supernatural world, and the desire for help from the gods were strong; but was there not also, in some obscure way, a feeling that, in spite of all, there lay in religion a force which was on their side?

It would not be impossible to trace the liberating effect of religion in the lives of women. Religious revival has often spelt more spiritual freedom for them.

The fact is that great religions have had within them conflicting elements: in a clearer or more obscure way there have been the intuition of a transcendental world on the one hand, and, on the other, doctrines and customs which were a consecration of "things as they are" or of things as the people in power would like them to be.

No wonder that at the stage when the intuition of God is dim, and is hardly clear enough to influence men's ethical ideas, all the official teachings and ceremonies merely accept, follow, and strengthen a condition of oppression which is endorsed but not created by those religious conceptions. So, again and again, religion itself denied the women even the possession of a soul and treated her as the goods and chattel of the man, while at the same time it has priestesses and prophetesses, and acts, in other ways, as a check on the human selfishness of the man. When God is viewed really as a spirit, however gropingly and dimly, the soul of the woman is con-

sidered as capable of being inspired by that spirit, and that belief in inspiration tends to break her fetters. In fact, there are many phases (which are not so far away from present conditions) in which, when a woman is inspired, she is accorded the full rights of personality—but not otherwise.

So religions have never been logical in their attitude towards women because they have this double aspect: the direct intuition of the Divine, and, on the other hand, the desire to explain and justify “things as they are”—a desire which, at its best, if it's true, is an attempt to link up everyday life with divine things, a recognition of divine element in human life, but which does not necessarily help to transform individual or social life.

Yet another element enters into religion which is akin to the one we have just described: this is wonder at the miracle of life and motherhood; and from it spring teachings and customs which are intended to protect, defend, and enforce it. We are not cynical enough to believe that the men who expressed religious ideas and determined religious customs enjoined obedience solely because it was convenient, or out of sheer conservatism. Buried in it all there is a tribute to the beauty of devotion, of the self-abandonment of love, of the humble role in life. Long before people are prepared to play it themselves, they have, at times, an intuition of its beauty and value; and long before this even, they see that social life would be impossible without it.

Another strain in religious thought is due to

The Free-woman

the fact that since the ideas of life it expresses are those of men and not women, the experience of temptation through woman is in a special way the source of evil. Because women tempt a man to fall below his ideal for himself, they are inferior and need special restraint and special discipline. (A society which is beginning to control and discipline sex life, and in which men alone translate their experience into theories of life, is bound to think of women in this way.) Here, again, is an element which tends to maintain a state of affairs based originally on the man's superior force.

Now if we turn to Jewish religion, which, being the background of Christianity, has affected all our thoughts, we find those same strains; because there is a clear sense of the relation of God to the soul, there is no denying of women's inherent spiritual nature, and you find prophetesses, from Miriam to Hulda down to aged Anna; because they had a high ethical standard you find laws preventing easy repudiation and protecting women from violence and from economic oppression. On the other hand, there is the same acceptance of men's domination: women must keep in the outer court of the Temple and are not fully members of the religious community. And because there was a fairly fierce struggle against immorality and no expression of ideas on the woman's side, the tendency to think of woman as especially associated with evil was strong. What the thought of Jesus Christ Himself is on the subject we shall consider in a moment: but

the life and thought and practice of Christendom cannot be said to be moulded by Christ. New elements were doubtless introduced, but as the influences which were at work before continued to affect men's minds we come across those same contradictory elements which have been described as generally characteristic of religious teaching; these we find, because we still have the same interplay of mystical experience, ethical intuition, and the same tendency to explain and maintain things as they are, in spite of the new light which Jesus Christ had brought. In fact, men not willing to take Him at His word themselves, could nevertheless see in some of His teaching a reinforcement of their approval of humility and devotion in women.

These are the factors which went to make up what one may call traditional thought.

Another element emerges more distinctly: it is the expression of the ethical intuition, which can and does appear outside the domain of religious thought altogether, in fact, in revolt against traditional religion. The young twentieth-century woman inherits a feminism which is largely the result of what one may call this lay rebellion against tradition with religious colouring—a feminism which is the child of French revolutionary thought.¹ Equality, freedom, re-

¹ The two books which had a determining effect on English Feminism are Mary Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Women* (1792), and later J. Stuart Mill's *The Subjection of Women*. Both strongly influenced by French revolutionary thought.

The Free-woman

volt against the abuse of power, these were the dominating factors. Here is ethical intuition, real moral power. Again and again, when the traditional element in religion is too strong, progress comes through the protest of the ethical sense.

Sometimes one side of the personality definitely takes the lead: the ethical, the mystical, the æsthetic, or the intellectual faculty dominates, for we do not develop evenly, and in order to break new ground all the vital strength concentrates in one direction. That is a very usual way of advance. But if progress is to continue and be net gain, the newly discovered truth must be apprehended by the whole of the personality, and come to terms with already discovered truth. In this particular case of the woman's movement, it is the zeal for equality and freedom which must, so to speak, be reintegrated into the religious consciousness and become one with mystical intuition. The danger is that in coming to terms with other elements it should lose some of its strength. Yet if it does not do so it becomes sterile.

Constantly we find that one age, or group, or individual is strong in one, while weak in the other. In the highest souls they are united, and both at their strongest and clearest because of the other. Where do we find a stronger, more imperative sense of what is owed to others, of men's equality, of need for freedom, than Francis or Paul or Buddha? Who had the clearest sense of the close relationship between the divine and

human? And were not the two one in their experience?

In none is the intuition of God and the ethical sense more closely linked than in Jesus Christ, both in His inner experience and in His thought. That is why I suggest trying to see what light His teaching sheds upon womanhood and personality in the problem of modern feminism.

*

* *

Turning, then, to the life and teaching of Christ, what do we discover? I suppose many of us are disappointed to find little direct light on the question of womanhood. No great religious teacher has said so little. The feminist finds no explicit defence of her rights—as there is no theoretic defence of her position of subordination. Christ ignores differences of sex and deals with human nature's deepest needs, and assumes these to be the same. This in itself is significant.

We wonder how much His actions broke the usual conventions of His day; were in themselves a challenge to the accepted ideal. His friends thought He was acting unconventionally in speaking to the Samaritan woman, as though His ideas of fellowship broke through traditional barriers. Women were part of the spiritual fellowship; they were in His company; they followed to the Cross; to Mary He appeared afterwards in the Garden, so that she had the

The Free-woman

task of rallying the discouraged band of men. Perhaps one can even trace a development in His ministry ; as the disciples became more used to His ways, women were brought into closer co-operation and friendship. But we have too little material to assert this. We only can see that in those three years He had established the habit of real spiritual fellowship and co-operation. Yet He made none of them Apostles, and, as far as we know, He says nothing revolutionary with regard to them.

What emerges is the supreme importance of what the man and woman have in common ; that supreme thing is a capacity for fellowship with God. In theory the belief is held by the vast majority ; but this does not mean that we have learnt to hold it with that simplicity which really affects our values, or that we have seen its implication, which is, that sex cannot be looked upon as the determining factor in personality. In this sense, the modern tendency to minimize sex differences is in harmony with the thought of Christ—and one may add, the deepest intuition concerning the nature of the human soul. He trusted that “seeing the pilgrim soul” in the other would right relationships between men and women. It is no use rejoicing in what we might call the feminism of Christ without seeing that He bases it on the spiritual nature. A materialistic feminism is difficult to maintain ; even practical materialism, with the theoretic spirituality, brings chaos, because equality has its rational roots

in the spirit and not in the body. In a people who consider that the body and sex are determining elements in personality, modern feminism often spells an increase of sensuality on both sides. :

*
* *
* *

For millenniums women have been told that they must serve: they must live for their husbands in a way that their husbands do not live for them. Even now, over more than half the world, this is believed; and our own customs and our own subconscious selves bear the traces of it, even where this is held no longer as a conscious belief. And in face of this our modern tendencies lead us to vigorously protest, declaring that an individual has a right to lead her own life. In other words, the traditionalist says that some sections of the community must sacrifice themselves to others and to the community; and the modern individualist says that each has as good rights as any other to be happy, an attitude summed up in the words "live my own life." The one and the other often claim the support of Christian religion.

Christ stands with them both, yet in opposition to them both. He expressed more clearly than any other what nearly all men, in their deepest moments, recognize—this paradox: the value of each human being, man, woman, or child, for its own sake and the universal law that all must be willing to sacrifice themselves for others. The

The Free-woman

woman counts, not just as mother or wife, but for her own sake, however poor and ignorant she be. Those for whom Christianity is new see this more clearly than we do. "The secular system of life in Korea, influenced largely by the teachings of Confucius, fully recognizes the instrumental value of women in the maintenance of home and society. But only when the life and message of Christ were brought to Korea did the women find themselves to have intrinsic values. Christ has shown clearly both in His life and His teachings that to God one human personality, whether it be man's or woman's, bond or freeman's, is just as valuable as any other."¹ Any callousness to the suffering of obscure individuals, any toleration of the exploitation of less developed personalities, and the attempt to keep them less developed in order to make the lives of others easier, is the negation of this vision of the nature of human personality. All that is best in the democratic and feminist movements is an attempt to realize this truth. But the value is diminished when it means that, in any measure, we lose sight of the other great truth—the law of sacrifice. Just as the value of much of the preaching of devotion was diminished because it did not go with the sense of the value of the individual for its own sake. In Christ's own life there was no thought of material welfare, renown, personal happiness; life itself is laid down—though He knew the value of His personality and His life—in a way none other

¹ Miss Kim at the Jerusalem Conference, March 1928.

could do. "If any man will come after me, let him take up his cross." "If any man will be great among you, let him be servant of all." "If I have washed your feet, so must ye also wash each other's feet." It is not just an injunction to those who would be disciples, it is a law of life. "If the grain of wheat does not fall into the ground, it abides alone." Self-sacrifice and self-assertion are both equally the law of life. You cannot put either on one side.

Just as the physical life of the race depends as much on the instinct of self-sacrifice as on that of self-preservation, moral life, too, depends on both self-effacement and what for lack of a better word we must call self-assertion. One can see that the way to progress lies in the greater value that all will set upon the personality of others and the greater willingness for each to sacrifice himself. That is quite plain. But what about the value we must place on ourselves? Is there a legitimate egoism, a right regard for self, and desire to make the best of your own personality?

That is one form the problem takes for women at a time when they throw overboard the old idea of subjection.

We have only to look at the life of Christ, and those who have His spirit, to realize how a personality can embody the two aspects. Synthesis is sometimes a convenient word to cover up a compromise or a contradiction: like most weldings it can only take place at a certain heat; a certain depth of experience, and suffering, must be reached before we can combine boldness and

The Free-woman

independence with great humility ; the capacity for asserting yourself with the power to sacrifice yourself. Most of the great mistakes of the Church and individuals are made through the inability to achieve a synthesis of this kind ; through seeing a dilemma where there was in truth no dilemma. (Just as other mistakes were made by failing to recognize incompatibilities in "trying to serve two masters.")

The failure to make a synthesis results in a continuous process of action and reaction. So the right evolution of thought on the women's question depends on our capacity for making a synthesis between the principles of self-realization and self-sacrifice. Humility without a capacity to know and follow the light for yourself, simply acts as a provocation to others to abuse their power ; the meek person is partly guilty of the bullying which he suffers. Humility and self-effacement can have really bad results in life if they are not allied to moral courage and a free conscience.

Men have suffered deeply through women's subservience. It might even be argued that men had suffered the most from it.¹ But the belief in the value of woman's personality must not draw us into a kind of individualism which excludes sacrifice in the name of self-expression or self-fulfilment. Self-sacrifice is one of the great laws of life. Without it no continuance of the race is possible, or moral progress, or

¹ The whole question of the rightness and methods of revolt are dealt with in a separate chapter.

initiation into spiritual realities. At heart we all know this, and at times we all rebel against it. We all believe it when we see a group in which all are willing to sacrifice themselves for the others; we question it only when we see it applied more to one class or race or sex than to another. Christ is a liberator, not because He freed us from necessity of self-sacrifice, but because He taught the way to self-realization through self-sacrifice for all. The fact that the principle does hold good for all transforms both its social and domestic implications. For the soul, strong in the sense of its own direct dependence upon God, self-sacrifice does not spell moral annihilation: human beings with this sense of direct inspiration can combine great boldness and independence with humility and passionate giving of self for the good of others.

*

* *

Another point of conflict between traditionalism and modern tendencies is the relation between the individual and the family. It is a man's problem, too, but as women's lives have, throughout all the ages, been subordinated to the family, it touches them even more closely. What is the place of family life? Christ in a sense staked all on the family. Knowledge of Divine things depended not on ritual, not on national life, or on capacity to grasp metaphysical truth, but simply on our knowledge of

The Free-woman

beautiful human fatherhood. So much so, that one wonders how it is possible for those who have never felt the care of a loving father or mother to understand the whole idea of God. Of all human experiences and human capacities, the thing that leads us nearest to heart of truth concerning the Divine is the experience of family life. It is true that at certain times of life, at the time, for instance, when we are just emerging from the stage when we need parental care, and when we are in a position first to use our critical faculties on parents and see where they failed in our education (the rather sudden advance in the science of psychology means that for the youth of to-day this critical phase is rather acute), at those times we may be unconscious of all that the relation has meant, and the realization of it only re-emerges later. Perhaps at that stage we can realize best what it means when we come into contact with those who have not known normal home life at all. These would for the most part say that one of the chief things which had given them a sense of the ultimate things in life was the friendship of those who had stood by them in difficulties "like a father," "like a brother." This belief that family life was our great source both of knowledge of God and of our duties to our fellow-men is not argued from some stray passage. It is repeated over and over again, the warp and woof of His life and thought. "What man is there of you who, if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? How much more will your Father in Heaven. . . ." Much

of the teaching contained in the Sermon on the Mount is but an expansion of this. This implies that we must have homes in which the man and woman together provide this source of knowledge, by their care, tenderness, interdependence, unflinching care of each other.

But here is the paradox: while Christ bases His teaching about God and the human soul on family life, He at the same time strongly attacks the claim of the family to be an ultimate authority and aim in itself; none have with more vehemence put spiritual above physical links, and challenged the right of the parents to interfere with the real claims of the Kingdom of God. In the Kingdom of God, moreover, we find the love and fellowship like the love and fellowship of the family: "He will find, in this life, brethren . . . a hundredfold."

We therefore conclude from Christ's teaching on the family, that if we must keep home life beautiful, we must never make of family life an ultimate aim; its claims are not supreme and must not stand in the way of the Kingdom. This teaching of Christ is so familiar that we fail to see at once how much it contrasts with the usual principle that the family is a group within the larger society which has rules of its own which are in direct contrast to those of the wider society. Within the family, in theory at least, there is to be love, protection of the weak, each receiving according to his need, etc., while society as a whole is based on force and competition, on the principle of the survival of the

The Free-woman

fittest, or on giving as wages the least that a man will take, while for Christ "your brother" is equivalent to "your neighbour" = "Everyman." These are the principles which must rule the family of all the world.

To attain this result, we must have women who, trained in home values, go out into the world. Home is the place where love, the care of the weak, the equalities and inequalities dictated by love, have grown up in the soil of maternal and paternal instinct; this spirit must spread outside the home. On the other hand, the spiritual fellowship of common discipleship must influence family life. The spiritual community which has learnt so much of the family has much to teach the family, it can help the family to transcend its physical origins, to combine freedom with interdependence.

Christianity, in fact, when introduced into a country, fosters family life, strengthens the links that bind different members of the family together, and yet at the same time it tends to break the claims of the family to be supreme; in some countries it does both simultaneously. By very slow degrees the Christian convert from Central Africa, for instance, gets to treat his wife more as a companion; at the same time the recognition in her of a spiritual life, and the growth in her of an independent conscience, is a challenge to family authority. If we believe, like Jesus, in the value of each soul and its direct dependence on God, then we cannot believe in the absolute authority of the family to claim the whole of a

man's or woman's life. The personality has a "raison d'être" outside the family—(which seems a truism to an individualistic Anglo-Saxon but has not by any means been seen as such by all races). The family is a school of Divine realities, of love, of the nature of personality, but not something which is an end in itself.

Yet can it be all this, unless we sacrifice much to it? How much? That is the question which you cannot answer in a sentence. It is bound to be the subject of endless human experiment. Yet one thing is plain, that the higher, the more spiritual, the life and the love of each member of the family, the more that love is compatible with freedom, the less it thwarts and dominates the members of the family. Therein is the real liberation from the domination of the family.

Yet in all this element of attack on the family in Christ's teaching there is no asceticism. Christ simply attacks it as being rival to the wider interests of the community. In one instance he speaks of celibacy: to those who consider that marriage is intolerable if it is absolutely binding: "better not marry at all than be bound for ever," they seemed to say, to which Christ answers: Celibacy is good either for the temperamental celibate or for those who wish to be quite free for the sake of the Kingdom, but permanent marriage was ordained of God from the beginning. Celibacy is not for the selfish, but for the self-denying. Voluntarily childless marriages are not for the selfish young couples who like

The Free-woman

good holidays and pretty clothes, but for the couple who have some special vocation or work which excludes a child—a psychology with which the modern psycho-analyst, approaching it from his own angle, would quite agree.

Again and again Christians have wanted to think of marriage as something conceded to human weakness: “No,” Christ said, “divorce is conceded to human weakness, not marriage: marriage was ordained from the beginning by God.” This is important because, as long as marriage is looked upon as a kind of concession to human weakness, woman herself is looked upon as a temptress, the old idea that saps all moral dignity. Christ speaks of marriage and sex as ordained of God from the beginning, as uniting soul and body. He assumes this rather than teaches it. His attitude on divorce is uncompromising.

We are perhaps sometimes surprised that Christ declared Himself so emphatically against divorce. “He,” we say, “who did not take a ‘legal view’ of things, who was always trying to free men and women, seems sterner than the Pharisees.” What of the cases of great hardship created by such a standard? Is this absolute view on the subject of divorce an aspect of His teaching which is determined by the conditions of His time? Is it because of the economically helpless condition of a repudiated woman in those days and the temptation to become a prostitute?

We may take this into account, remembering

that in certain phases easy repudiation inevitably lowers the status of women. But is it not part of His whole conception of marriage, of parenthood, and of personality itself, for that matter? Marriage was the uniting of two personalities, parenthood was essentially something which gave the child the sense of absolute faithfulness and permanency. In all these things Christ laid down heroic standards. "No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the Kingdom of Heaven." "No man can serve two masters." The whole of His strength lay in those heroic standards. From this we can argue what Christ's ideal of marriage was. It does not follow, perhaps, that the law of any land should impose such heroic standards. What we can argue from it is that He would call "sin" the act of the man or woman who gives up their common life and wants to "start again with someone else." It is here that people find it hard to follow Christ; they either want to stone the woman or leave off calling her act "sin."¹

¹ Few people uphold divorce for its own sake, but many feel it may be the lesser of two evils—living together in perpetual conflict being quite as wrong as separation and probable re-marriage for either or both. For the children it may be claimed the atmosphere of disharmony is far worse than the break-up of the home. But the Christianity which is opposed to divorce is also the Christianity that can give the man and the woman the grace to live together, if not as perfect lovers at least as good comrades, re-building that which had been broken. Should one of the parties be determined to wreck the relationship, then truly it seems difficult.



If we look at the history of social conditions, we find cramped, tyrannical, often unhappy family life, more often than a tendency to give up family life altogether. Though Plato did elaborate a scheme for doing away with family life, it remained but a theory. Perhaps the stream is now set in that direction more than before. Whether it will ever end in more than partial experiments is hard to say. In Communist Russia many of the leaders are working to bring about a state of things in which children are to be entirely brought up by the State; though the Soviet leaders acknowledge that they have no intention of realizing that idea in the immediate future, family life being too firmly established, and State educational establishments being quite inadequate, legislation tends in the direction of what may be called the nationalization of children.¹ The same idea is held by many communists and anarchists, who look upon the family as part of the bourgeois régime and believe that no real liberation of the woman is possible without the break-up of the family.

As young people who are weary with old wrongs, any new remedy, any reaction against the tyranny of the family appeals to us. Is this desire to kill it altogether for the good of humanity? The question would make our

¹ On this subject see *Women in Soviet Russia*, by Miss Jessica Smith (Vanguard Press, 1928).

grandmothers turn in their graves—but still we want to think out, if, why, and how, we want to keep family life. Is it the best setting for the development of personality? Does a child grow better in a nursery school or orphanage than in a normal home? In so many homes there is so much dirt and quarrelling, while so many children's orphanages are run by educated idealists that comparison is difficult. Or compare a boarding school taking over the child altogether with a normal middle-class home.

From the point of view of personality, is the small group of people linked by the instinctive ties of relationship a better setting than the larger group under the care of experts? Of course it all depends on what one's criterion is. If it is sheer economy of money and labour, and the freeing of the individual from all trammels, then the socialized children will meet our case better; but if we see life as an opportunity for developing the deepest things in personality, and the most beautiful human relationships, and ultimately a world-order expressing these, then the smaller grouping of people of varied ages, using all those instinctive affections of parental and filial instinct, linking up physical primitive things with the sense of moral responsibility, is surely the aim to be kept in view, the creative act being followed by years of tending and caring, the person who knows and understands the child's heredity being mainly responsible for correcting his weak points. People approaching the question on the grounds of hygiene or psychology

The Free-woman

would say that, granted that the home was not that of people who were of much lower quality of character than those who, in an institution, would take charge of the children, the home group is the better background for the child's development.¹

Judged from another, deeper, point of view, that is, the knowledge of the meaning of love, the same conclusion is reached. The average home is neither the heaven depicted by the sentimentalist, nor the hell of tyranny or misery or drunkenness to which the social theorist prefers the well-run institutions. In the relationships of home there are often very deep mistakes, bad causes of irritation, errors of upbringing which make environment emphasize weaknesses of heredity, but there are usually in the same home life deep human relations which prove one of the most enlightening and fruitful experiences of life, circumstances which force one to closest grips with the nature of personality and the relationship of personalities to each other. To the large majority of people parenthood is probably, though not always consciously, the most fruitful experience of life—something which most effectively links body and soul, links generations together, cuts across human selfishness ; it is not

¹ See Jessica Smith, *op. cit.*, last chapter, on the question of boarded out children in Russia. Institutions have been forced by experience back to the attempt to reproduce family conditions, *i.e.*, placing children in small groups of unequal ages with less rigidity of organization. Constantly an infant will thrive better under the care of the amateur than in an institution.

the creative act which can effect this, but the years of tending and training. The fact that those who uphold the idea of the family are generally parents, rather than young people who look at it more from the point of view of the son or daughter, shows that it is the experience of parenthood from which most is learnt. What the filial relationship means is often not fully grasped until middle life.

*

* *

However much you may be repelled or surprised by the way in which religions, both ancient and modern, try to impress women with the fact that they are subordinate, if you freely turn for yourself to the deepest aspects of religion, to Christ's own teaching on God and personality, what do you find? That His recognition of the "Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world," and which is within each human being the most important part of the personality, that which transcends sex and race and circumstance. In so far as that thought plays a large part in people's minds, in that measure will personality play a larger part in determining their dealing with each other than the special social function.

It is the realization of this divine spark which brings real equality and which forbids human beings accepting the idea that certain classes of other people are to live solely for others. We

The Free-woman

are to live for others certainly, but that is a part of the universal law for all, both men and women. In the deepest religious personalities we see the possibility of uniting this altruism to independence of thought and action.

In taking a view of the family which is truly religious we see it as an institution which ministers to the deepest needs of the spiritual side of personality and does not hamper it. The Son of man is lord also of family life as He is of the Sabbath.

CHAPTER II

*How dimly and slowly the Church understood
the implications of Christ's message.*

IN any survey of Church history we must start with one who to us may appear as a staunch anti-feminist—Paul of Tarsus.

“What has Paul to do with me?” impatiently asks the modern man. “What do I care what was thought or said by a first-century Jew whose main concern was controversies in the early Church between Jewish and non-Jewish converts and the adjustment of Jewish belief or practice to the new Christian dogmas?”

The only answer to such a criticism is that no survey of the position of woman in a nominally Christian civilization can neglect one who, for good or evil, has moulded to an incalculable degree the thought and practice of the Christian Church, both before and since the Reformation. We may disagree with every word of his, we may come to deliberately rejecting his views, but we cannot ignore them.

There is no greater irony in the world than the way in which the teaching of great men has been misunderstood and used against the causes they advocated. From Plato and Buddha to Karl Marx there is barely a great teacher whose teaching has not been distorted.

The Free-woman

So with Paul it has come to pass that obedience to his injunctions has stood in the way of recognition of woman's spiritual equality with man, whereas the whole of his philosophy is on the side of equality and freedom, and his life was one passionate striving to assert and establish the equality of all men in Christ. To him it presented itself chiefly as equality between Jew and Gentile, but it was part of a larger vision, the vision of the universal freedom, the breaking down of all barriers: "In Christ there is neither male nor female." This is the charter of the woman as well as of the Gentile.

This, I say, was not a fleeting vision, but the basis of his conception of life, the belief on which he was willing to stake all. He has probably done more than any other to make this great truth real to men and women. To us for whom this doctrine is a truism, it is hard to realize how revolutionary it must have sounded in his day. It is always difficult to remember how startling a truth which has been accepted sounded when first it was enunciated.

How quaintly old-fashioned of him to say: "Women must not talk in Church Assemblies," you say. How revolutionary of him, I say, to assert their fundamental equality with men.

But there is the other strain in St Paul:

"For a man ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God, but the woman is the glory of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man. . . . For this cause ought the woman to have power

on her head because of the angels. Nevertheless, neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the Lord. For as the woman is of the man, so is the man also by the woman, but all things of God" (1 Cor. xi. 7).

"Let your women keep silence in the Churches, it is not permitted for them to speak; they are commanded to be under obedience. . . . Let them ask their husbands at home" (1 Cor. xiv. 34).

"Wives submit yourselves unto your own husbands as unto the Lord, for the husband is the head of the wife even as Christ is the head of the Church" (Eph. v. 22-23).

What are we to make of these, and how are we to explain them in the face of Paul's vision of equality and freedom for all?

A variety of elements conspired to produce this strain in his teaching, which does seem opposed to his main thought.

It is scarcely possible to deny in St Paul's temperament a certain strain of asceticism, a tendency to look upon sexual life as "carnal" and "lower," hence to look upon the woman as the temptress. Some suppose he had an unfortunate marriage or engagement. This is pure speculation: those passionate natures who seek good passionately often have that tendency. Sir William Ramsay tells us that the women of Tarsus were the only ones in Asia Minor to go about with their faces veiled. Did St Paul keep a bias against the too free ways of women of other cities? It is possible. Some inspired men transcend their prejudices in moments of deep inspiration and return to them in their more

The Free-woman

ordinary moods, hence the double strain in their teaching. What is certain is that sensuousness was to him the great enemy of the spiritual life. Nor must it be forgotten that Paul wrote to infant Churches in cities of notorious vice. Many missionaries to-day in similar circumstances do not at first encourage the women of their congregation to break all the traditions of their people with regard to modesty of demeanour.

In the early Epistles Paul is too sure of the imminent return of Christ to work out the implications of his own doctrines of equality and liberty, so he does not think of them as worked out in the lives of the people and in institutions: Christ would return before that. "If you are called a slave, remain a slave. . . . Married, remain married."

Paul is obviously conscious of the danger of producing chaos by the very power of his revolutionary doctrines. He feels that freedom and equality can go to men's heads and bring disorder, and he strives to lay a steadying hand on those he frees: the Gentile, the slave, the woman. That gesture of his has been misunderstood, and to it we owe what seems like long delay in realizing the fullness of his main message, but what he strove for consciously was the right of the Gentile, and that he won completely.

But when one has explained away a great deal of what one may call Paul's anti-feminist sayings, there still remain some which are hard to reconcile with his great exclamation: "In Christ there is neither male nor female." In relation to Christ

they are both simply souls, but in relation to each other the woman is made for the man and not the man for the woman. "How infinitely nature prefers man to woman"—and so does St Paul. The woman must obey and submit; true, the husband must love her like his own body, but she must be subservient, and when in the great passage in the Ephesians St Paul sees marriage in a sacramental light, even then he puts the man above the woman in a way which has no parallel in the Gospels. The idea that women are made for men, in a way men are not made for women, brings an element of inequality; not mere inequality in the degree of physical strength, or of ability in any particular direction, or of opportunities, but a more fundamental inequality of value. The significance of this is partly destroyed by St Paul's insistence on the fact that living for others is the spiritual law for all. Several times when he has implied this inequality in one sentence, in the very next he seems to destroy the significance of what he said by re-affirming that "All are from God" or "We are members of His body."

St Paul's attitude with regard to women has to be taken as part of his attitude towards human authority generally. Obedience of the Christian to a pagan state (Rom. xiii.), of the slave to the master (Ephes. vi. 5; Col. iii. 22), of the wife to the husband, of the child to the parents, these must be accepted, but he emptied them of much of their consequence: first, by laying down the fundamental equality and freedom of the soul of

The Free-woman

each, as we said; secondly, by making that obedience sacramental, "not as eye-servers and men-pleasers, but as servants of Christ doing the will of God from the heart. With good will doing service, as to the Lord, and not unto men: knowing that whatsoever good a man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free. And, ye masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening, knowing that your Master also is in Heaven, neither is there respect of persons with Him."

The whole epistle of Philemon shows St Paul's attitude. When the obedience is really given not to the human man, but unto the Lord, while the master himself is looked upon as a slave of Christ, the whole meaning of slavery is changed; there can be no oppression and no subservience. We may say that even the outward form of slavery remains an anomaly: evidently it remains a temptation to the slave owner, but the whole thing is largely emptied of its content. That was St Paul's policy with regard to the institutions he found. Eat the meat offered to idols which you buy in the market, as that is the normal way of getting meat, but treat it, as what it really is, ordinary meat food. Keep your slave, as that is in your time the normal way of labour, but treat him, as what he is, a Christian brother, a fellow-servant of the Lord. Wives obey your husbands (the whole organization of family life rested on ordered hierarchy, wife obeying husbands, children parents), but sacrifice yourself to her as Christ sacrificed Himself to the Church.

He sees the matter more clearly in the case of the slave than of the wife. St Paul himself probably felt the obedience of the wife to be something more fundamental, but in essence his teaching and policy in the two instances are similar. The one danger is that as the precepts of wifely obedience were left, however much Paul may have emptied them of their dangerous content, the old abuses could return, and, as a matter of fact, they did.

*
* *

It always seems hard to understand why the Church was so slow to enter upon its inheritance of liberty. The old pagan and Jewish ideas of women could not be thrown off—prejudice dies hard, and then, as we saw, though St Paul gave all men the charter of equality and freedom, he was afraid of the disintegrating effects of his revolutionary message. It is the old story ; when people are afraid of making changes too suddenly, they often do not make them at all.

Generally speaking, any marked revival of the prophetic strain in the Church has also been a time of free co-operation of women with men as apostles and leaders. The prophet is chosen by none ; he directly hears the call of God and responds ; that call comes to Jew or Gentile, slave or free, man or woman. There are hints here and there in the History of the Church that

The Free-woman

in the quite early centuries women played a fairly prominent part in Church life. *The Shepherd of Hermas* speaks of them as religious teachers; recognized orders of women clergy seemed to have existed. The Council of Paris, as late as 824 and 829, speaks of "women serving at the Altar and giving the Lord's body and blood to the people." But this practice seems to have met with opposition, and there was no implication of anything like equality of status, except in the more heretical and prophetic movements.

The Montanists, those revivalists of the second century, had their women leaders. But if this movement brought women to the fore, it was also responsible for subsequent restrictions. The more orthodox and order-loving were, as always, frightened by what savoured of over-enthusiasm and emotionalism. Sometimes one feels that the Montanist lack of balance was one of the most tragic things in Church History, because it made the Church so fearful of freedom, and of prophecy. We can see the same sort of thing happen when any group of people is carried away by enthusiasm for liberty, for the Apostolic life, for ways of adventure: failing to keep, together with their extraordinary ardour, the more common virtues, they frighten ordinary folks back to the beaten paths.

There were always numerous converts and martyrs among women, mothers of the Church, and deaconesses, but essentially the organization and leadership became more and more the monopoly of men, and women tended to drop out even

of the functions like that of deaconess. It is curious that when people get enthusiastic about law and order, they generally feel that the safest way to secure these is to keep the power in their own hands. In virtue of this law, rather than because of inexplicable selfishness and self-assertion, do men try to keep all the authority in their own hands: so in 365 the Council of Laodicea dismisses women from the ministry and forbids them to serve at the altar; in 511 the Council of Orleans shuts them out of the diaconate; in 587 the Council of Auxerre forbids them from receiving the Sacrament with bare hands.

Perhaps the strongest factor determining the attitude of the Early and Mediæval Church towards womanhood was the rise of Monasticism. The asceticism, largely Eastern and non-Christian in its origins, which was so strong in early monasticism, emphasized the idea that woman in herself is a temptation to man, and marriage a concession to weaker brothers. Some early Christian ascetics went further than any pagans or any Jews in this fear of instinct. Buddhist monks, it is true, were enjoined to shun women, but the emphasis was laid on their own desires, not on the sinfulness of woman, whereas the more extreme Christian asceticism seems to be an exaggeration of the worst strain in the Wisdom Literature of the Jews. St Augustine wonders why women were created at all, and comes to the conclusion that the snake alone could not effectively have tempted Adam! Another Christian ascetic feared even to look upon his own mother's

The Free-woman

face. Another would efface the trace of a woman's footstep on the sand.

Only a few may have gone to these great extremes, but these few were admired by the men, and we presume women too, of their generation. How is it that they failed to see that you could not insult womanhood without insulting also the One who made them, "male and female" and who instituted marriage? And yet, perhaps, we do an injustice to all that strain in the early Church if we do not recognize that it was a recoil from all the corruption and licence of the society in which the Church grew up. That recoil, and that clear vision of the necessity to discipline the instincts have, indirectly, and in spite of the evil effects of nullifying sex altogether, raised marriage, and, through marriage, woman.

The Monastic system had another and very different effect on the life of the Church and its attitude towards womanhood as soon as nunneries sprang up; in the convent there was a meaning for life apart from the family and home. Great leaders were trained and nurtured within convent walls: Hilda of Whitby, who ruled over a monastery and presided at a Synod; Lady Julian of Norwich; St Teresa, one of the greatest mystics and at the same time a great organizer; Heloise, the scholar. It was not the convent that made them good or great, but it disciplined and protected and gave them opportunities for using their capacities in the service of God.

When we think of St Clare supping with St Francis and his brothers, or coming in to cook

and mend for them, or of Catherine of Sienna, surrounded by her mystical family of men and women Dominicans, this youth writing her letters, that one sent off on a message, we realize that whenever men and women tried to go back to the spirit and life of Jesus and His disciples, something of the spontaneous relation between men and women reappeared.

The lives of Catherine of Sienna, of Bridget of Sweden, of Joan of Arc, prove that saintliness and spiritual inspiration could at all times give a woman a moral authority which was recognized even in very unlikely quarters. They could counsel a pope, bring a king to the throne, dictate a military policy. Catherine, almost more than any man or woman, shows us where lies the true source of authority. "Thus saith the Lord." This assurance she won through prayer, great humility, and utter consecration to her calling.

The Franciscan Tertiary Order, and the Brotherhood and Sisterhood of St Dominic, made it possible for men and women to combine the sense of being called of God, to preach, to serve Him in daily life with the married vocation. In the Tertiary Order the married women's spiritual vocation was recognized in and out of the home, and her vocation was linked with that of others like herself. It is no wonder that interest in the Tertiary Order is so keen to-day because it expresses that balance of the double vocation of woman and of the double relation between man and wife and between spiritual and physical.

The Free-woman

The Catholic Church, in spite of all its asceticism, sanctified motherhood, for she gave women the Holy Mother and Child to gaze upon. Earthly motherhood becomes a reflection of Heavenly Motherhood; as the Madonna was worshipped not by women only, but by monks, kings, and warriors alike; not a goddess, a personification of life-force like Astarté or Aphrodite, but a human Divine woman, who suffered and toiled for her child in a poor home. It is almost impossible to exaggerate the strength of the uplifting influence this must have had, whatever our beliefs may be with regard to the doctrines associated with the Virgin.

It was one of the features of mediæval religion that it gave men and women its blessing on their peculiar vocations. The Church had something to say on every chapter of human life. It viewed men and women in the light of their function in society. The guilds of craftsmen had a religious origin and kept for the most part a religious aspect. The married women were members of the guild to which their husband belonged; that is to say, they were not only associated with him in his practical work, as his lieutenant and partner, but through membership in his guild they shared whatever sense there may have been of "calling" in his work, and association with other members of the craft. This gave a religious blessing and recognition on the woman's share in her husband's work.

Mediæval Chivalry was only very indirectly of religious origin, and its ideas affected the rich

alone, but it also gave a certain "mysticism" or philosophy of womanhood. It over-emphasized her weakness and femininity, but that was perhaps inevitable in a society where fighting laid such stress on sheer physical force, yet it acknowledged, and perhaps over-stressed, the power women had to inspire men. It encouraged a love which was not immediately connected with marriage or domestic life; that is to say, it was often removed from the realities of life, but having this of good that it stood for a relation between men and women which was neither physical nor domestic, but one resting on reverence:

The man protects, the woman inspires: we do not to-day find that a good division of labour, but it was not in itself a mean ideal, and was an advance on a more purely utilitarian view of the function of women.

*

* *

The Reformation should have done more to improve the status of women, for its fundamental tendencies were all in favour of the recognition of the value of each individual, of freedom of conscience for all; it was an attack both on asceticism and laxity in morals, a reaction from the more ecclesiastical and priestly type of religion to more primitive Christianity, and for all these reasons it should have liberated woman; but we find no women taking a prominent part in the Reformation—their position remains unchanged. This was mainly because the Reformation concentrated so much attention on the

The Free-woman

Bible and was what we should call verbalist, and thus revived Jewish ideas concerning women. "It is impossible for me to condemn a man for having more than one wife at a time," says Luther, "seeing that the Holy Scriptures do not forbid it"; or again, "take women away from their housewifery and they are good for nothing." Calvin asked his friends to find him a wife because he could not find a good housekeeper, and John Knox goes further, "God has dejected woman from rule, dominion, empire, and authority above man." Women were not allowed to read the Bibles which were chained in the Churches. How far is this from the leadership allowed to great abbesses, or from the intellectual opportunities which the Renaissance had recently brought to so many women!

The Reformation was a revival not only of Old Testament, but of Pauline thought; and Paul's Epistles, as we saw, though at bottom they contain the great seeds of freedom for all and assertion of equality of all souls, do also contain that element of caution. Paul's anti-feminism is there, and the Reformers were Pauline. "Women must keep quiet in Church, they must obey: Paul said so," and because of that all the elements of freedom in the Reformation were largely lost to women. Thus Paul a second time opens wide the gates of freedom, then puts up fences perhaps meant to be only temporary but which prove to be permanent. If we take into account Luther's insistence on strict hierarchy as a principle of church organization and Calvin's

belief in predestination, it is no wonder that the Reformation should have failed to put an end to woman's subordination.

There were, of course, women martyrs and teachers in the Reformation, but not women leaders, and the Reformation marked no immediate advance, however much, as we said, many of its fundamental tendencies were in favour of her freedom. But if it gave no emancipation, it gave a theology of woman's position; it assigned her place in the world; it gave the institution of marriage a different status, no longer that of a concession to human weakness, but of a holy, ordained condition. The influence of Luther's and of Calvin's marriage must have been immense in showing that matrimony and religious leadership were not incompatible. In the reaction against the merit and sanctity given before to celibacy, the Reformation went too far in the other direction, and seemed to forget both Christ's and Paul's teaching on the celibate vocation. It was several centuries before it had recovered sufficiently for Protestant sisterhoods to come into being as a remedy to the blank, meaningless celibacy of the unemployed old maid of the Victorian age.¹ Still, the Reformation had in it the seeds of the new days for women. Its effects, however, were only indirect and therefore

¹ A significant thing happened when Pastor Fliedner started his Deaconess Institution at Kaiserswerth, because it was the re-admission by Protestants of the idea of the organizing of unmarried women in religious orders (even though there were no vows of perpetual celibacy and obedience).

The Free-woman

very slow in taking effect. The Reformation in time had some share in inducing the cycle of thoughts which have, with economic causes, produced our modern democracies; and these ideas which found their extreme and violent expression in the French Revolution are largely the source of modern Feminism.

Long before this could work itself out, however, the religious life of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries again proved that the spontaneous prophetic type of religion meant more freedom for women to contribute to thought and leadership. Quakerism, which was pre-eminently prophetic and mystical, saw women apostles and preachers. Margaret Fox was a leading figure among early "Friends," and even after her marriage with George Fox she travelled about as a minister; they would meet between two journeys or two imprisonments. The peculiarity of Quakerism is that, when the first heroic days were over, the movement kept as a permanent inheritance the belief in the inherent spiritual equality between men and women and embodied these in whatever institutions it possessed. Quakers were the first to adopt and retain a form of marriage in which there is no mention of obedience or of the subservience of the woman to the man. This was only possible because, whatever some individual Friends may have said or written, their attitude towards the Bible was essentially different from that of other Protestant movements. One cannot say that the Old Testament or the Epistles were set on one

side, but the Gospels and the "Inner Light" were the ultimate criterion of truth. The Wesleyan Revival too had its Dinah Morrises, as well as its class leaders, but as the movement settled into a more organized denomination the women preachers tended to disappear. The same kind of thing happened in other countries. In Scandinavia women played a large part in the rise of the Pietistic movements which transformed the religious life of those countries.

From the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries non-religious influences play a greater part, and many contrary currents affect women's ideas of the part she is to play in life. With the increase of riches in the upper class came the notion that it is a fine thing for a man to keep his wife in idleness; though some women made good use of leisure, in the main it had deplorable reactions on women's character and position. She had, hitherto, contributed to the economic resources of the family by helping to administer the family estates in the case of the rich; and by working in the family industry or business in the case of the artisans or business class; and by managing the poultry and dairy if she were a farmer or yeoman's wife. She was her husband's partner, and came into touch with the outside world, while at the same time she managed the home and the apprentices; in fact, the divorce between home and business did not exist.

The riches of the upper class, freedom from housework, the concentration of work in factories, which drew the man, and women too, away from

The Free-woman

home, all this was bad for the development of woman's sense of responsibility and capacity; it did not affect the farmer's wife directly, but tended to change people's ideas of the function of woman in society—the fainting, simpering, incapable woman we meet in the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century literature was not typical of all the women of the past as some moderns seem to think; the overworked factory hand, and the futile, idle woman were both products of the capitalist system. Taken as a whole, women of that period probably mark a retrogression on the busy seventeenth-century woman whose house-keeping demanded such energy and such a variety of knowledge, and who had often to be village doctor and relieving officer, and, like Wesley's mother, give her own children an education as well. With riches, and with the rise of specialized professions, came the inducement to show less enterprise and industry both with regard to their families and to others.

As always, reaction came through excess of the evil. As the emptiness of life was worse for the spinster (and colonial expansion and war increased their number), they were the first to try and find something that would give more meaning to life. At the same time these economic changes, which had given too much leisure to some, had caused indescribable misery among the poor. The unmarried woman's longing for something to do, and her desire to help to cure social evils, were the first steps of the great campaign which has transformed the position and character of women

within the last eighty years. First teaching, then nursing, then medical and social work, all the more directly healing, helping vocations, then all other spheres of work, opened up to women.

It is important to note that practically all the pioneers, in every avenue of work, were women of strong religious conviction, and they all acted under the sense of Divine guidance. Later on came the women who fought for equality and freedom all along the line, usually thinking in terms of political rights. It was the revolt against "the Subjection of women." To the motive which sent out Josephine Butler or Florence Nightingale, was added that indirect fruit of the Reformation and Revolution.

The rights for which they strove were fundamentally just and good both for men and women, but the quality of the progress made depends as much, even more, on the motives, emotions, means, than on the actual accomplishment. Any weakness or fault in these bears its fruits in the results which are obtained, for whenever in accomplishing our aim we allow imperfect motives to come uppermost, or whenever we resort to wrong means, the cause inevitably deteriorates, and we make its progress more difficult, creating an opposition which is more directed against the wrong and non-essential elements of our cause than against the cause itself. Because Florence Nightingale, remarkable and spiritually-minded woman as she was, was autocratic, a certain over-autocratic spirit has marred our nursing system; because the early

The Free-woman

pioneers of woman's education were too anxious to prove at once the mental equality of men and women, girls' education took on the faults of the boys' education of the time. One may say that the difficulties were so great, that in both these cases it was almost inevitable that these faults should occur.

When we review the history of the Church we realize why the nineteenth century has been the time of woman's emancipation. Catholicism gave her a vision of motherhood, and monasticism sheltered the single woman. The Reformation raised the idea of marriage, but did not essentially change woman's position. Quakerism in its permanent institutions gave her complete equality, but did not effect other churches.

The modern tendency to emphasize the importance of action coinciding with other causes, both economic and psychological, transformed women's position. We moderns have not invented good works, but nevertheless they play a different part in our religious make-up.

What meditation, church order, or doctrine has been to people of other ages, active work is to our age. And it is on this full tide of a religion of action that women have come into their own.

The greatest and soundest power in winning woman's emancipation has been due to the direct sense of inner calling to some task. The spiritual history of Catherine of Sienna is one of the best examples of this. The record is in her diary of how the call to work came: "How shall it be done with me as thou hast said, and how can I,

who am so miserable and so fragile, be useful to my fellow-creatures? For my sex is an obstacle as Thou knowest, Lord, through many causes as well because it is contemptible in men's eyes as because propriety forbids me to any freedom of converse with the other sex."

To whom the Lord answered as the Angel Gabriel did to Mary: "The word impossible belongeth not to God: am not I He who created the human race and formed both man and woman? I pour out the favour of my spirit on whom I will, there is neither male nor female, plebeian or noble. All are equal before me. . . . Yes, I will send unto them a woman unlearned and fragile. . . . Therefore, my daughter, thou must make haste to obey . . . it is my will that thou appear before the public."

Catherine. "Behold the handmaiden of the Lord, be it unto me even as thou wilt."

This was the Catherine who had said to her father before the call came: "If you wish me to remain in your house as a servant, I will cheerfully fulfil all your behest to the best of my power."

It is when women were not thinking of their position or of themselves at all that through the inner call they were led out to wider opportunities, developing latent capacities of body, intellect, and leadership in themselves, gaining new freedom for others also.

The process is most clearly to be traced in the great exceptional woman, the apostles and saints, but the same principle holds good for the rank and file.

CHAPTER III

How women's ideas about their own position were affected by French revolutionary thought: (a) Liberty.

I could never conceive or tolerate any Utopia which did not leave me the liberty for which I chiefly care, the liberty to bind myself. . . . For the purpose even of wildest romance, results must be real, results must be irrevocable. Christian marriage is the great example of a real and irrevocable result; that is why it is the chief subject and centre of all our romantic writing.—G. K. CHESTERTON, *Orthodoxy*.

THE desire for freedom, the old revolutionary cry of “Liberté, égalité, fraternité”—that is the leaven which is working in the thoughts and feelings of women with regard to their destinies.

Undefined because it is one of those ideas which spring like a flame from one heart to another and are often accepted without question—ideas which spread like infection from one uncritical mind to the other—this spirit is a longing for some deep, if vague, thing. But that longing for liberty is brought into being by oppression; and in that way it is quite concrete: restrictions become irksome either because authority and force have exerted their power

over-much or because the inner life has made hitherto accepted limitations irksome.

Any serious search for a Christian doctrine of womanhood must therefore drive us to seek for some philosophy of freedom ; if we cannot think our way through to some definition, at least we need some vision of what constitutes Christian freedom. Feminists clamour for freedom, democracy demands freedom, and Christianity speaks of freedom ; for our feminism to be a Christian feminism, we must seek for Christian freedom. Or even if you do not acknowledge in Christianity a moral authority, you must see that the liberty for which you are longing does not carry within itself the seeds of the destruction of other people's liberty.

Obviously freedom for all to do simultaneously just what they " feel like " and follow the impulse of the moment is impossible. If I feel like hitting you on the head whilst you feel like having a quiet time, we cannot both be free to do as we like, the freedom of the one cuts out the freedom of the other ; obviously too, even if it were possible, few would seriously think it a thing to be desired ; but, on rising away from this crude idea of freedom by insensible gradations to a higher form of freedom, we find it hard to determine what is the kind of freedom which we can really enjoy without hurting others, and to see when and how such freedom becomes favourable to the development of spiritual life.

Now the adjustment of the claims to freedom of various individuals, which at first sight may

The Free-woman

look like the most difficult of the two problems, is really easily solved when you have decided what kind of freedom is really the best for the individual himself.

If we look at any imperfectly developed individual, we find that he has desire beneath desire, often conflicting, one more fundamental than another. The quality of the freedom will depend on which element in him is allowed free play. In a sense, by the same principle that all citizens cannot have permission to do as they like without encroaching on each other's freedom, so within the individual all elements cannot have equal opportunity to express themselves. The highest freedom is the freeing of ourselves from the domination of the passing desire in order that those desires which arise from the highest side of our being may have free play.

Too crude a view of freedom is as destructive of personality as oppression.

True freedom is the result of spiritual unity within the personality. There must be harmony between the members, some settled hierarchy, none oppressed, but all contributing to some dominant desire. This is the kind of freedom we wish to see realized in as many individuals as possible. Such a freedom is a matter of the individual soul, and is in the deepest sense a religious problem. Freedom of this kind is attained through self-discipline, through independence of thought, which comes from clear thinking and moral courage, from the habit of

looking at things for their essential inner meaning, not superficially, so that public opinion, conventions, the influence of others, do not dominate our thoughts and our actions. It comes through habitual sincerity and such ways of thinking of people that prejudice does not unconsciously bias our judgment. We must have healthy instincts so that there shall be no hidden domination by obscure desires.

This freedom from fear, from spiritual bondage, is more immediately and peculiarly the freedom which we need and which, as St Paul taught us, Christ brought to men. The freeing of the Jew from the thralldom of the law was to him typical and symbolical of the freeing of humanity from all mental and spiritual oppressions. From the tyrannies of ideas which bully and rule men like tyrants, from the fear of evil spirits, from the fear of men and their laws and customs, from dominion and evil passions and prejudices, Christ liberates men. Compared with this freedom, freedom in outward action, economic freedom, political freedom—all these are incidental.

Now how is this inner freedom connected with outward freedom in all its aspects : freedom from the authority of husbands and of the family, from economic pressure and from political disabilities ? That is the more difficult problem and parallel in many ways to the one of the relation between spiritual equality and equality in more external things. To what extent shall we lay down as a principle for women that the conquest of outer

The Free-woman

freedom will help us to attain that inner freedom after which every soul should strive? Further, to what extent must we work to attain this outer freedom for others, whether they seek the inner freedom or not?

The teaching of many religious thinkers and much of the discipline of the Catholic Church show a deep conviction that less outward freedom actually contributes to inner spiritual freedom. The monk and nun deliberately seek spiritual freedom through the bonds of vows and obedience. Freedom of spirit can often only be kept at the cost of freedom of the body; again and again the only really free men have been men in jail. But though it is true that inner freedom can remain in spite of loss of outward freedom, even more can grow sometimes through loss of outward freedom, yet it remains that the normal expression of spiritual freedom is outward freedom, and is usually a help to the attainment of it. A free man in the fullest sense of the word would not want to imprison another mentally or physically; nor would a child reared in prison be inclined to have a free spirit. Loss of outward freedom is only an aid to inner liberation when the limitations are deliberately chosen or accepted as a means to it, or again, when, in the training of children or very immature beings, the order of outward discipline gives the higher nature a chance to break through the chaos of conflicting impulses. But long continued lack of outward freedom, except in unusually spiritually free people, does tend ultimately

to involve encroachment on the freedom of the spirit.

But shall we, when ourselves oppressed, strive for freedom? To what extent is it a part of our task as Christians to battle for our own liberty? For many women all over the world it must be a personal problem. At any rate, Christianity must first come as a constructive force. It has much to destroy, but it must not destroy the old before it builds the new; in matters of social life the words of Christ apply, "I came not to destroy but to fulfil the law."

But to come back to the question of women's liberation. Woman has complained of being oppressed by her men folk—her husband and her father; there has been every degree and kind of oppression, varying from the primitive savage who treats woman as a beast of burden, to the Hindu who denies her a soul, to the men who look upon her as a toy, and those who deny her any right to an opinion outside the domain of babies and the house. Much of this attitude has seemed natural to woman and has been accepted by her as a matter of course. Many feminist books on the subject have overlooked the other side of the picture; the love and protection, the freedom won by women of outstanding force of character, the various methods of defence of the women, but it remains, looking on humanity as a whole, judging from history, fiction, and the code of law, that woman has been kept under the subjection of husband and parents and denied the rights of citizenship. The man

The Free-woman

has taken advantage of his superior physical strength.

Now it may be claimed that in ages when the husband had wider experience of life, and better education gave him more developed reasoning powers, it may not have been all loss to the woman to accept, to some extent, her outward deprivation of liberty. The authority, held to come from God, was accepted as God's, and we can see how the acceptance, not only of temporal guidance, but the abdication and surrender even of spiritual judgment to the husband, would be sacramental and a form of surrender to God. In some ways this is so like obedience to a priest that we can see how strong belief in sacerdotal authority has practically always gone with belief in woman's surrender to man's authority, both being the vehicle of the soul's surrender to God.

We must not be blind to what there is of sublime in this sacramental view of obedience, even when we feel that it obscures some more vital truths. If our aim be the doing of the will of God, or the Right, the criterion of authority will be a person's capacity to know the will of God or the Right; now, when both have the same spiritual or mental capacities, there is no more reason for the one to rule over the other. Obedience is replaced by common search for the will of God and a humility which inclines each to think the other more likely to find it, by patience to wait, and willingness, if common action is urgent, ultimately to walk by the light the other

has seen. There is a sense in which we are called to mutual obedience—and for both there is such a thing as holy obedience as well as holy freedom. Mutual obedience is, as it were, a sacrament of our obedience to the Divine will.

All this is rather obvious but only needs to be restated, because the cry for freedom is so insistent about us, and so much in the bitter struggle of women was, and is still, apt to make women forget that our ultimate aim is not freedom for its own sake, but freedom to find and do the will of God. Greater freedom from the husband's authority can be, and in the main surely is, a help towards finding and doing the will of God. This liberation from husbandly authority is, in the English middle class, largely an issue of the past, but in some other classes and other lands the older conception still has some hold. Let us not, in the undoubted leadership which we have in the evolution of the woman's movement, attack the old order on wrong grounds.

Revolting against the idea of husbandly authority, it happens sometimes that women advocate a type of independence which is incompatible with close relationship of any kind. Two people cannot be closely linked, yet have all advantages of complete independence. You cannot, in vulgar parlance, both have your cake and eat it.

Another manifestation of the longing for freedom which we see to-day is the unmarried girl's longing for freedom from the old duty of living at home and keeping her parents company.

The Free-woman

Though in Anglo-Saxon countries the freedom of the girl to "live her own life" and have her own profession is largely won, in Latin and Oriental countries the whole question is at an earlier stage; and here in England, too, the clash between filial duty and personal freedom still presents itself in various forms. It is fatally easy to be dominated by a love for freedom, which is due to the prevalent wave of desire for a free life and free self-expression, or, that parental possessiveness should shelter behind a time-honoured tradition; then we have one selfishness pitted against another selfishness.

What light does the Christian idea of freedom bring to bear on this problem? Woman has a right and duty to refuse to allow any other mortal, even her parents, to use her life in a futile way. She must follow the light within her whither it will lead. There is a divine right and authority which every soul should assume when it realizes that it is a child of God; but this is not identical with the right to "live your own life": it is the right of the individual to be free to try to find out and follow the will of God. This should include and not exclude the right to listen to other people's advice and to learn from their experience, and the right to serve others.

One cannot help feeling that when daughters strive to free themselves from the blind prevalent urge to individualism, and parents set themselves free from the old possessiveness and selfishness and put the Kingdom of God first,

some joint conviction arises of what should be done, which varies according to circumstances and which, though it does not exclude sacrifice, does away with outward strife and inward restlessness.¹

*
* *

With freedom from actual authority has come freedom from three-quarters of the conventions with which our grandmothers were fenced about. Human relations have become immeasurably freer: the war accelerated the movement, and in the pleasure-loving period immediately after the war most of the freedom sanctioned by the presence of danger and death was maintained. The war only precipitated things; we were moving fast in that direction before. Within a very few years we have seen the breaking down of age-long barriers of reserve and customs; and no three consecutive generations of women have ever differed so much from each other. It is difficult in fact for some of us to grasp the immensity of a change that has occurred within the recollection of those who are still in their thirties.

Everything in former habits reminded woman of her class and of her sex, of her claim for deference and protection. From one point of view this would make it harder for her to

¹ The whole problem and the method of revolt are dealt with in Chapter V.

The Free-woman

remember her oneness with the rest of humanity. To-day the prevalent liberty of action and manner and speech bring out the brotherhood of all men and women. Social relationships between men and women express the essential humanity of both sexes and have surely grown happier through freedom. But the customs and conventions of the past also acted as a means of discipline; they aimed at making social life harmonious. If we would make a good thing of this social freedom, there must be lacking neither discipline nor beauty of behaviour. In fact freedom gives us the opportunity of developing more real self-discipline and truer beauty. Deference is after all the expression in behaviour of the essentially beautiful virtue of humility—each “considering the other better than himself.”

All these outward changes are both cause and effect of real changes of thought. Freedom from convention goes with more freedom in our thinking. Mrs Grundy did not only influence our actions, but our thoughts—in fact, many of her commands were meant to inhibit thought and feeling, to create barriers and reserves in our minds as well as in our manners. Now these barriers have fallen we need a more conscious, stronger and more positive purity, or else liberty can become very ugly.

Few perhaps could define what they mean by faithfulness in spirit to the marriage vow, or real purity in the unmarried, but men and women must know something of it within

Ideal of Liberty

themselves if we are not to fall into that emotional instability which ruins personality as well as family life. We must, moreover, be prepared to examine the question as to what extent some customs and conventions may be worth while as psychological help to ourselves and to others.

But in England, at any rate, neither freedom from parental or husbandly authority, nor from conventions, nor even political liberty, is the real question: the burning issue for women as well as for democracy is the economic one, the everyday life, rather than a theory. The practical changes are looked upon as an inevitable sequence of change in ideas. In a sense, this materialization is sound, for spiritual truths must find their expression in the most material details; but here, in the working out of the principle, carried away by the lure of the idea and the emotional side of the desire for freedom, the development may be contrary to the underlying spiritual ideal.

Financial independence caused by the better wage-earning capacity of the woman has been a means of moral independence. We cannot get away from the fact that financial dependence does almost always imply less right to do as you like or as you think best. Financial independence may be a necessary stage in some cases to obtain moral freedom, but we must not forget that the Christian ideal is not savage independence, but co-operation. The feeling that we would be indebted to none and bound to none is incom-

The Free-woman

patible not only with Christianity but with any view that love is in any way the basis of life; love must imply an interdependence of which the common purse may be a symbol and a consequence, while savage independence means ultimately bondage to material necessity, like Crusoe on his island. "It is a happy and fortunate state," says Plato, "where the words *mine* and *thine* are least heard, because the citizens regard the common interest in all matters of importance. . . . So too it is well for married persons to have one purse . . . so that here also there may be no *mine* and *thine*."

Economic freedom, like all other forms of outward freedom, has its part to play in helping the inward liberation; conditions have to express not only the freedom, but the interdependence, the liberal sharing.

The right to choose one's own occupation is also a freedom for which we are asking. A hundred years ago there was practically only one occupation for a woman: now there are one hundred, from driving a car to curing a sick cat or planning a factory. Few things are so coveted at a girls' college as a "thrilling job." But to choose one's work in life is not particularly a Christian ideal. To do what one is called to do is the Christian ideal; to carry out that often does, but often too does not, coincide with our tastes and natural bent. Vocation is vocation still when it means some obscure and undramatic piece of service. Vocation does not imply choosing, but obedience. The hard part of it is that

it is not always easy to distinguish the voice of conscience from the voice of our inclinations, but that is another matter. No law can be laid down, but one does notice that people who have done things that were really worth while have often only found their vocation after much struggle and much waiting. It certainly used some of their inherent tastes and bent but at the same time cut across some very strong inclinations, and at times apparently left unused or undeveloped some great gift. If we so appreciate all our various possibilities that we cannot bear to think of any of them being sacrificed or unused, we shall be hampered, not helped, in finding the work to which we are really called. But of course this is a man's quite as much as a woman's problem. Christian freedom does mean that we are freed from those inner forces which prevent us from obeying, not that we are free to choose the most thrilling occupations.

*
* *

Following on the attainment of economic independence, many women now ask for freedom all along the line ; freedom to have no children, freedom from the personal burden of children, freedom to have the child and no husband, freedom to enjoy sex, freedom from the permanence of marriage ties ; there is in the air a revolt of the individual against all that limits or

The Free-woman

baulks. For some, this is the demand of freedom to be happy and to enjoy ; for others, the freedom to fulfil personality or to pursue a spiritual search, through the fullest possible experience, unfettered not only by prejudice and convention, but even by older codes of morality, or by one's own past promises and by the obligation to sacrifice one's own life to another.

This is not alone a woman's problem, but a human problem ; it is more acute for the woman who has always felt the claims of the family far more than the man, and who has started on her quest for freedom through really unjust spiritual domination. But its strength at the present moment lies in its universality ; it is becoming almost irresistibly infectious, and is touching the whole range of life, from the most material to the theological and philosophical : from freedom of movement, short skirts and Eton crop to freedom of thought ; from the more binding process of logic and reason to the vague freer method of intuition ; men and women are demanding freedom from the element of authority in religion—freedom not only from an infallible church or an infallible book, but freedom even from the authority of Christ Himself ; freedom to take and leave what we do not like in His teaching.

In putting all these demands together we wish neither to defend nor to condemn all "en bloc," but we should realize the cumulative effect of all this, how symptomatic and how potent in its

effect on the personalities who do not seek to free themselves from the dominion of the mood of their age and strive "to assist or resist the tendencies of the age in the light of the fullest knowledge and highest ideals," as Dr Temple once put it.¹

So many of the elements which kept this naturally human tendency in check have gone: love of tradition, love of the established order of things, love of the authoritative. Only in all that has disappeared and is disappearing one thing stands out much more clearly than before in religious thought, and that is the supreme nature of love; love is the basic principle, love is to be expressed in corporate life; within and without the churches this idea is emerging—in prison reform, in education, social work, international peace, and the principle of love as a force which tends to organization, in federations of workers, federations of churches, League of Nations. The whole principle of co-operation implies the willingly accepted limitation of unfettered individual independence. So the tendencies of the age themselves hold the remedy to the disintegrating force of absolute individualism. For Christ, freedom does not mean independence from obligation. And this is not only true because Christ said so, but He said so because it was in harmony with realities of life. In a measure, if we will, we can realize this for ourselves. When the soul is free to love in the

¹ In an unpublished address given to the Workers' Educational Association at Bristol in 1912.

The Free-woman

deepest spiritual way, it will bind and limit outward independence, both for man and woman, it will certainly close some doors if love has any element of the eternal, faithfulness must necessarily be a part of love. Even psychologically faithfulness means limitation of liberty of the emotions.

If this be true, we must not be driven into marriage or parenthood either by the pressure of another or by our own instincts or any other circumstance until we have accepted that curtailment of outward freedom which it will imply; allowing, one ought to add, for a certain margin, as the claims may be greater than we reckon. In fact one may say that we have to give marriage, and parenthood especially, a blank cheque on our freedom. Who can tell what illness or poverty will necessitate? Mere chivalry, apart from Christian morality, binds us to do faithfully our utmost for the children who never asked for life, so there can be no moral freedom of retreat. A little child of four once said to me, "What I need is to feel that Mummy and Daddy and I will live together always. . . ."

We should be free from domination of prejudice, free from domination even of husband or parent, in our innermost souls free, but not free to throw over the obligation to perform what we have undertaken. We must win inner freedom for ourselves and help others to find it, grant others all the freedom we can, but, for ourselves, we must be willing to sacrifice that independence of action in the measure that life shall demand,

and be prepared to accept those limitations to life which our undertakings and promises involve.

Admit this and the amount of possible freedom for the married woman of to-day and to-morrow then becomes a practical not a theological question. Granted freedom from prejudice on the one hand, and from the blind seeking of independence on the other, practical problems become easier of adjustment. We shall deal with these when we come to consider the more practical aspect of the question.

CHAPTER IV

How women's ideas about their own position were affected by French revolutionary thought:
(b) *Equality.*

EQUALITY no less than liberty has always been one of the sources of the democratic and feminist movements—equality before the law, equality of right to happiness, equality of opportunity; and with it goes the belief that this justice has its counterpart in the Divine, the ultimate order of things.

Opposition to the democratic and feminist movements comes from the questioning of equality as a valid principle, on the grounds that human beings are not born with equal capacities and potentialities, that we can only try to produce that equality artificially, at the cost of liberty and of right development, and that it is not part of the ultimate reality; as far as we can see, God does not deal with us equally; nor can many forces making for inequality be denied or nullified. Inequality is part of the fundamental order of things.

This line of thought is based upon observation of facts as they are, on the necessity of recognizing and obeying what appears to be a law of nature, and, one must add too, on the unconscious desire that some have of finding a philosophical justi-

fication for a condition of things which is to their advantage; while the equalitarian tendency is based rather on an innate, intuitive feeling of what should be. It is, so to speak, in the ethical sphere the equivalent of the mathematical faculty. It centres attention on the value of the individual rather than on the complementary nature of each person to the other, and on the desire of those who have less than others to obtain more.

In both positions there is the danger of hidden selfish motive. The anti-feminist bases his arguments, more or less consciously, on the one philosophy of life and the feminist on the other.

A great deal of thinking on the women's problem depends either on one's choice between those two attitudes or on some thought-out synthesis of both. It is as necessary to the progress of the feminist as to that of the democratic movement, and in that sense they hang together. But in the case of the former the matter stands out more fundamentally and more clearly, because a large measure of what appears to be inequality, being physical, is quite inevitable, and must be ascribed to the fundamental nature of things and therefore to the will of God; and also because the chief elements of the feminist problem can be found in the small entity of the family, and therefore both the problem and the attempts at the solution can be dealt with in terms of personalities and in the atmosphere of human love. Now, as Christians, we feel that these are the conditions in which we can best think out problems of human life,

The Free-woman

provided, of course, that you are able to transcend the limits of the personal and touch the universal within the personal.

The old-fashioned feminist cries out "It isn't fair," and the anti-feminist replies that life was never meant to be fair. The standard of judgment of the one is not accepted by the other, they rest on two fundamentally different assumptions. In any real study of the religious aspect of the women's question one is constantly touching upon the whole philosophy of justice—and our thinking about justice will therefore influence our thinking about the woman's problem.

A real study of the idea of justice would take us too far; but without some kind of survey of the question one cannot discuss the subject of the destiny of women at all. What then do we mean by justice? If we look at the question from the historical point of view, we see that the idea of justice arises as a revolt against arbitrariness and caprice: two men discover a treasure, the stronger takes possession of the whole of it, and the weaker one, who would have liked to share, feels indignation; only gradually and gropingly, through desire for revenge, quarrels, attempts at peaceful settlement and conciliation, does the idea of equal division show itself to be the most workable and practical solution. It is, by the way, a mathematical and quantitative conception.

In the same manner one can see how the instinct which could drive the strong man to exact the greatest possible amount of work for the smallest possible amount of payment would

gradually lead to the revolt of the weaker ; and, through this revolt, would dawn the idea of some constant correlation between work and reward. Through the inconvenience of capricious behaviour, both sides are brought to the belief in the necessity of keeping to an agreement. Here again the dawning idea of justice proves quantitative and comes as a reaction against arbitrary and violent behaviour.

As in the sharing of spoils or of land, or in the question of work, so in the domain of crime and punishment, we find that, through the inconvenience of the abuse of force, men arrived at the conception of some fixed ratio between the fault committed and the penalty to be endured. First blind fury and vengeance ; then some system of vendetta, such as we still see in uncivilized parts of the world, then some form of rough justice and finally a constant ratio. Experience of the sufferings brought about by the exercise of brute force, working on some deep hidden intuition, thus brings to birth the sense of justice.

We see in all this that the idea of justice has three essential characteristics. (1) It arises in opposition to brute force, and brings *order* out of chaos. (2) As it develops, it tends to become *impersonal*, to deal in general rules which ignore the differences between individuals. (3) It is essentially mathematical, entailing the idea of *quantity* ; equal sharing, equal payment, some ratio between two things—the idea being reached both by intuition and reason.

The Free-woman

To go back now to the question of equal sharing : Justice tends to evolve and to get more refined, taking more and more facts into account. Divide food among three children : crude justice will give them three equal shares ; take their ages into consideration—(that is also justice), and you will give unequal shares ; take temperament into consideration, and you may alter the portions again. So with punishment, age and motive come in. First, material measurable elements bring modification ; then moral factors, harder to measure, are taken into account. Justice, psychologically, has made men more pitiful ; and justice, becoming more refined and complex, approximates to love :

“ Tu me crois la Pitié, fils ; je suis la Justice,”

as Victor Hugo says in *Fraternité*.

Pity and love grow out of Justice. Love has other springs : instinct and divine inspiration, but Justice is also one of the sources of love. Revolt at the suffering which comes from injustice can be either the cause or the effect of compassion. So it is that justice evolves and becomes less mathematical and less impersonal ; but really, as it does so, it approximates to love in the degree in which it deals with immeasurables and takes personality into account.

Through personal vengeance and violence, to impersonal justice, then to a more personal justice bringing us to love. That is the way it evolves. But what value must we assign to quantitative impersonal justice ?

The instinct for fairness appears so strongly and so early in many children that we sometimes feel it must be a God-given instinct, but on closer analysis we see that the very young child grabs all he can get, or, impulsively, gives away all that he has ; and we perceive that it is only through experience, like the savage, that he finds the inconveniences of arbitrary behaviour, and that some sense of justice dawns in him ; still, something of the passionate conviction both of the child and of many adults makes us wonder if it does not testify to some intuition of a Divine reality.

What, then, is the value, from the Christian point of view, of this old sense of justice in virtue of which men claim equal treatment, which sets both the oppressed and their defenders to work, in virtue of which woman can complain that life, or society, has dealt out sacrifices and suffering unevenly between her and the man, and in virtue of which the manual worker can complain that less ease and security has been given to him than to his brothers of other classes ?

So far, we have left religion out of count. In primitive times gods and goddesses had little to do with the idea of justice. Primitive man conceives of God in his own image ; his God is a compound of natural forces and of himself, the divinity behaving as he would behave if he had unlimited powers, being greedy, getting angry, killing ; sometimes the nature element predominates, sometimes the personal element.

The experience of kingship is reflected also.

The Free-woman

To some Jews God was like an Eastern potentate. It is only as human justice evolves that the idea of Divine Justice also develops, reacting in turn on the growth of human justice. But as the idea of the righteous just personality superseded that of the capricious despot, whose will is his own law, so the idea of God as a Friend and a Father superseded that of the just judge and king.¹

To-day many Christians think of God as a Despot, a Judge, and a Father. Personally, in their own devotional life, He is their Father, but in their judgment of world events or of sinful men they adopt one of the other conceptions of God. Now we cannot think of God simultaneously as a Despot, a Judge, and a Father. We act in this or that circumstance, we judge of this or that problem, in the light of *one only* of these ideas of God; and our action is determined by our way of looking upon God at that moment. The event seems itself to evoke that idea of God which has some association with the event in the mind of that person. For instance, a calamity like an eruption will make some men talk of God as an arbitrary Despot; some historical occurrences

¹ I have been speaking of this evolution of thought as though ideas walked across the stage of history labelled and in ordered procession, which is, of course, absurd. For contrary ideas are often held in the same mind like two photographs taken on the same plate; while what we can look upon as the most advanced idea is held by one who lived quite early: Abraham was "the Friend of God," and Malachi looks upon God as Judge. Still, a certain progress can be traced.

will cause them to think of Him as a Judge meting out reward and punishment, and in the happiness of home they will speak of Him as a Father.

The feminist cycle of ideas, with its protests against injustice, has generally evoked the idea of a God of Equality. Now, is there a sense in which we can say that God is just and that the inner intuitive love of justice has some corresponding reality in Him?

In what sense is the God of Jesus a just God? When we go to the Gospels with questions as to the nature of God, we must remember that they are not metaphysical treatises nor even theological disquisitions about the nature of God. (Should we really know more of the nature of God if they were?) We just have to learn from the way in which Jesus Christ thought of God Himself, from the pictures He used incidentally when driving home some moral lesson, remembering that He was talking to people who knew something already, so that He is often correcting false impressions.

First and foremost God is spoken of as the Heavenly Father. Christ prays to "the Father." I go to "My Father and your Father." He tells us to ask with the confidence of little children. . . . God knows each, deals personally with each. Evidently Christ means us to understand that tender human Fatherhood is the picture which brings us nearest to the truth about God; so that, whatever conclusions we draw from other sources of light, must harmonize with this

The Free-woman

conception which was plainly meant to predominate.

The men of Christ's day constantly spoke and wrote of God as a great Judge. Christ Himself uses that metaphor not once, but many times. Of course, the real point of the parable often being a correction of some wrong belief, the picture of Judge or King can be taken as incidental; but the metaphor is used too often for us to say that Christ employed it simply because men around Him spoke of God as Judge. This idea must have had some contribution to make to our thinking.

A missionary from the East told me that in Syria fathers are so proud of their children that they are often very indulgent. Doubtless they have not changed. Human fatherhood, by the very nature of things, is too weak and indulgent to give us a perfect picture. The word "judge" corrects that weakness. We need One who sees our sins as they are, and who brings us face to face with the reality of cause and effect in the spiritual as well as the material world. . . . The term of judge meant something merely terrifying in my childhood and youth, till I was present at a Juvenile Court, and heard the judge endeavour to make both a frivolous girl and a fond but weak parent see the real nature of the delinquency—with a tremendous severity which made her see the nature of the sin and its consequences, and sought to deliver her from that indulgence and partiality for her own mistakes which made the way of reform impossible; then, the destruction

of pride accomplished, the fatherly will to heal and rehabilitate was shown, and punishment was pronounced, not in proportion to the sin, but with a view to help by redisciplining the undisciplined character.

The judge behaved as the father should have behaved: impersonal, in so far only as he saw the sin and held it to light as it was, not as any partiality for the sin or sinner made it appear; otherwise showing all the understanding and saving will of a father.

We must be helped to see our sins objectively, that is impersonally, if we are to be saved from them. Having allowed for the added light thrown by the picture of the judge, we must still let the conception of Divine Fatherhood be the determining factor in our ideas of God.

Granted, then, that the idea of Judge is subordinate to that of Father, and comes in just to complete it, is the Father of Jesus Christ One who shares out His benefits equally? His love is extended to all—the poor, the rich, the child, the Gentile; most, to those who need it most; He makes His light to shine on the just and on the unjust. In the life to come there is recompense and reward in the sense that the good enter into life, the frivolous and unloving into a state which Christ simply described by using the current Jewish expressions for the place of darkness and despair; but He definitely teaches that there is no idea of proportion between the good works and the reward. All get the full penny, the eleventh hour worker like the rest; which,

The Free-woman

if we judge by crude standards of fairness, is unjust. The parables show us God doing the utmost for all who are willing to come: the joy of the Lord, the Kingdom prepared, are theirs.

So in this life there is the love of God pressing into this world of sin to do the utmost for each. Side by side with this we must put the call to suffering and renunciation, with, it is true, spiritual joys and compensations; but Christ's concern does not seem to be at all either the equal sharing of this world's good things, or giving each his deserts in this life; neither consideration seems to enter into His view of God and the world. The ultimate aim of divine love must be moral perfection for all. "Be ye perfect, even as your Heavenly Father is perfect." Perfection bringing perfect happiness, that is the ultimate goal; the perfect balance of unselfishness produces equality as well as the balance of contending selfishnesses.

But meanwhile, as we said, He calls us to be obedient, suffering willingly the consequences of our own and others' mistakes or sins, and not revolting at the suffering which comes through the cycle of natural laws, unknown and half known. The tower of Siloam fell, not as the just judgment of God, but because the tower was badly built or left unrepaired; human carelessness and the law of gravitation were the causes. Sufferings and inequalities are due to laws which in a broad sense are Divinely ordained for the good of those who can search them out, and our foolishness and carelessness are the result of the

bad use of the freewill He gave us ; and these are the sources of our inequalities.

Besides the Personal God, who deals with us personally, there is the play of forces ordained by Him which act upon our destinies in quite an impersonal way. (Great saints seem to bring certain forces of personality to bear in some measure upon these impersonal forces. This is because the impact of circumstances on their lives is so blended with their consciousness of God that they become as one. Christ and they seem to take all things evil as well as good as coming from His hand.) Germs attack the good and the bad irrespectively ; the strength of optimism and faith bring the matter of disease back into the sphere where personal forces have some influence, but none can stop the tide or the setting sun. "He maketh the sun to rise on the just and on the unjust." It is God at the back of the impersonal forces, though much of their impact upon our lives only suggests indifference.¹

¹ It looks as though the relation between God and the material universe was very similar to the relation between our own minds and our bodies : a great many functions of the latter are ruled by our subconscious selves without any interference from the will : others are always under the direct control of will ; but it may happen that things which are habitually under the control of the subconscious are effected, and even temporarily controlled, by the conscious mind and will (*e.g.* heartbeats, breathing, temperature even). Another set of causes enter into play. So between God and His universe there seems to be the double relation : this incoming of the will into regions usually dominated by the subconscious the Middle Ages called miracle, the late nineteenth century an incredible

The Free-woman

So, then, it seems from the Gospels that Christ's whole life and teaching were an attack on the legal idea of God or of duty; an embodiment of the great generosity of love; of the acceptance of injustice towards yourself. We must not be surprised at the inequalities of our fate—we are all treated individually; there is a different training for different souls. "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" If suffering for Him is blessed, and bearing a cross the normal life of the Christian, can any complain that God does not send them their due share of earthly ease or happiness, equal to that of others?

Granting, even (for the sake of argument), that one half of humanity has a heavier burden to bear, is this really difficult to reconcile with what we know of God in the Gospels? Surely not. So much of life is determined by results of physical condition arising out of the natural world, and out of the faults of others; the essential call of life to the Christian is a call to self-denial, not to happiness or self-expression. All this is obvious, but so much of women's clamour for equality in opportunities for happiness is a denial of this, that it must be re-stated.

breaking-into the "natural laws"; modern psychology makes it appear thinkable. In so far as we are all subject to the interplay of cause and effect we will find pain and suffering dealt out very unevenly; in so far as by faith we open the doors to this more personal impact of the Divine Spirit we meet a God who loves us all equally. For that matter there is in any human home the same inevitable justice and injustice, equality and inequality, in the father's treatment of his several children.

Even, however, if that clamour is not in itself Christian there is something beneath it of which it is a "caricature," which is the affirmation of the soul's value, the cry for recognition that God loves all His creatures and would give good things to all. The self-assertion and combativeness are wrong; the assumption that we are ill-treated if God or life does not deal out to us equal opportunities and happiness is not in harmony with the God of Christ, or with what we may call the God of reality, but the underlying intuition that God does care for all, that in some real sense, before Him, we are all equal, corresponds to a very deep truth and is in harmony with Christ's teaching on the Father. It is an intuition which is vindicated by Christ's teaching, that a creature is not ultimately to be looked at entirely in relation to his function in society but must be cared for as a person irrespective of his function.

"Give more than the exact quantity, walk more than the legal mile; don't measure, don't grasp, give, give, and when you have nothing left" . . . then He says, "Blessed are the poor, blessed are the persecuted." Think of each personally, and tenderly, that is the realm into which Christ calls. But then, what becomes of justice? is it entirely superseded by love? has it no place in Christian thought? have clamours for more justice, more equal dealing, no validity?

"Unless your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom?" "Hast

The Free-woman

thou kept the Law and the prophets . . . one thing thou lackest, go and sell all thy goods and give them to the poor." Gospel virtues must include the pagan virtues, must be built upon them—these remain as a challenge. Justice was a schoolmaster which led us to love, as the law led to Christ ; and it is still a good test.

When on the plea that I love my brother, and my brother loves me, I keep two coats and let him go cold, then it is time for Justice to challenge the genuineness of my love—or rather I must wonder if love has not long ago flown away and selfishness is not masquerading in its place.

If I love my wife, love, not mere impersonal justice, governs our relationship . . . but if I easily accept to take twice as much leisure as she gets, justice may well call upon imagination to rouse love from its apathy. Love must give more, not less, than justice . . . and because human selfishness is so subtle and so easily would make us deceive ourselves, the standards of justice are needed to awaken us. . . .

It seems as though we needed the objectivity of a quantitative idea like that of equality to keep us straight. The simple thought of sharing equally the opportunities and joys of life is one which will help us best of all to grasp what we mean by the Fatherhood of God. It is tragic to see how easily a human creature can inveigh against the selfishness or materialistic mind of the man who claims his share of cake while he calmly, with religious detachment, helps himself to the whole of it.

An excessively unselfish community would need the criterion as much as a selfish one to avoid the constant contention as to who should give up the most. (In a family I know they spend half their time quarrelling as to who will sit in the most uncomfortable chair or carry the picnic basket !)

Equality has certainly its place in helping us to deal with selfishness, and as easement even in the organization of unselfish society. But love, when it is true, remains the stronger, more God-like impulse, the real spring of a Christian's action.

How does this apply to the feminist problem ?

First, we should be on our guard against oversimplification, which leaves too many facts out of count. Take one instance : the woman's cry for equal pay for equal work, which on the face of it seems just, may, if a few more facts be taken into account, appear unfair even on equalitarian grounds ; in the present economic system most men have to keep a wife and children (as we have not yet got the endowment of motherhood), his wage must provide for four, five, six people, while the woman's wage must generally provide only for herself, or for, at most, one or two dependants. One does not wish to minimize the extent to which women workers may have to support dependants, but it remains, that normally the man is supporting a family, the woman not ; so that equal pay for equal work would mean that the single woman could keep up a standard of living which is much higher than that of the woman married to a man of the same profession.

The Free-woman

That the spinster should have more luxuries to compensate for the joys of family life is right, but in the present economic state it is often at the expense of the married woman and child doing without necessities.

In fact, we see that the principles upon which wages are paid at present are varied ; supply and demand, of course, is the chief determining factor, but the idea of the needs to be met by the wage is also coming to the front ; in no trade is the actual value of the work really taken as the sole criterion.

Neither in virtue of the law of supply and demand, neither on the basis of the need to be supplied by the wage, can the woman claim equal pay for equal work. This claim may, of course, be a necessary expression, at a given stage, of the equal value of the personality of men and women in a society which judges people by their wage-earning capacity, just as the endowment of motherhood would help many working men to realize that his wife did really work as hard as he does ; but the claim of equal pay for equal work is often made by those who in their struggle for justice drift into a superficial idea of justice : the equalitarianism which takes too few facts into account.

The word " unfair " is used again and again in feminist literature, but many women who feel they have a grievance have never analysed how much of the unfairness they attribute to a man-dominated society and how much to Providence : we are constantly apt to be in a muddle as to

“Who” is unfair to us. Some illogically blame God for it all, and some Society.

The first pioneers of women's movement were more prone to blame conventions and men for everything, not realizing some of the inherent limitations of women. Of inherent intellectual equality or inequality it is futile to speak; women have proved that in different conditions, with a different type of education, the change in mentality is enormous. The one fundamental, immutable inequality is that parenthood makes different demands on the woman and on the man, hence marriage, which usually brings parenthood, is bound to be different for her. Whether we stress its joy or its burden, motherhood is in woman's life an element of irreducible, inescapable inequality.

We must try in our thinking to disentangle the essential from the incidental, to see what are the necessary implications of the capacity of motherhood in an ideal state, and then, what are its inevitable consequences in society such as we have it; we must distinguish in our own minds between the inherent and inescapable and what has been superimposed, and could therefore be reduced.

It is not easy to know what the inherent disabilities really amount to. From no special phase in society can we judge; primitive women vary: we hear of savage women giving birth to a child, with scarcely any interruption of work: we hear of dreadful disease and a high infant mortality.

The Free-woman

Hygiene, a healthy life, and a brave outlook can do much, but for the inherent disabilities, as we said, it is useless to blame anyone. There is the immense joy of motherhood and there is the suffering and work. Happiness and suffering are subjective, unmeasurable; no one can weigh them up for others; we can only say for ourselves, at the time, which outweighs the other. Those who speak of injustice must remember this, and remember too that, as we said, even if for psychological or physical reasons to one woman, or to a generation of women, the burden may seem greater than the joy, it is not the characteristic of life to offer equal burdens and equal joys. Some can have the joys, apparently without the burdens, others cannot. The best philosophy is to cultivate a taste for the joys we have been given.

Nor must we forget that all burdens are not directly derived from the apparent callousness of nature: the life of the mother, for instance, is necessarily influenced by the economic conditions; in the small modern European family, with only one woman of the family in the house, the mother's task is more exacting, the suburban mother of our huge cities bears the burden far more alone than the mother who has the help of the father or of her relatives.

For the conditions due to our present civilization it is futile to inveigh either against nature or our contemporary men. That mingling of motives, circumstances, and conduct which have created our modern industrialism—these are

responsible ; and they are the product of people not very unlike ourselves.

But when we have accounted for inborn handicaps, and for conditions which are almost inherent in modern civilization, for the time at least, we may still find inequalities against which we rebel as being unjustly imposed by society ; the middle-class English girl has done away with a very great deal, but she will see many injustices imposed on other women born in less favoured circumstances. Now it is a false view to see in these injustices a deliberate and mean design to take advantage of a superior position ; it is a misunderstanding of the way in which human nature works. We need not justify it or let it continue, but we need not either misunderstand the whole nature of the inequalities which society has added to the inequalities of nature. Misreading the past does not help us to reform the present or prepare for the future.

There is a perpetual tendency for a certain degree of natural inherent inequality to be emphasized or exaggerated. If, in a family, one child is more able than another, the danger is that after the difference has been recognized it should be over-emphasized. When one person is stronger than the other, and therefore quite naturally is asked to do more, the tendency is, that, after a while, the bulk of the housework should fall to her share ; because the child was less able to make good use of his freedom than the adult, in the past it was given none at all and reduced to automatic instantaneous obedience ; because the

The Free-woman

housemaid may have fewer intellectual needs than the philosopher master of the house, she is given no opportunities for reading. The ruling classes, or the male sex, are not peculiar in this ; it is the natural human tendency to take advantage of the recognition of inequality or dissimilarity.

The trouble is that it drives others to deny inequalities and differences altogether, and after a while it so obscures the issues that one can no longer tell how much was inherent or not—treating people as though they are inferior, weaker, or simply different, makes them to some extent weaker, inferior, or different. At the same time there is a tendency to confuse the inequalities which are inherent, or individual, or derived from differences in education or occupation. That is the whole trouble in the democratic and feminist problem.

Well then, say many, the only way to find out is to treat all as equal, and see. To some extent this is what is happening in the case of women ; the same careers, the same exams have been opened to them ; and, in fact, men did discover that women were not “inferior” intellectually. Many of her irrational characteristics were the result of the masculine attitude. But woman could not really compete equally with men because she keeps her own peculiar burdens and capacities wrapped up with motherhood, which she cannot lay aside, so that she discovers that she can attain the same successes as men, but only at greater cost physically and nervously.

It is a fact that we must not forget when we

argue of justice, even if we take the equalitarian stand, that on the woman's side there is this weight of motherhood, a joy and a burden which varies so much with different women, but which prevents us from attempting to make things equal between men and women.

With a balance weighted on one side calculations become intricate, and this is one more proof of the difficulty of applying the criterion of equality because of the unmeasurableness of so many factors. If you lay the same burdens on different backs to find out if they all have the same strength, you must not be surprised if some of them break. That is the disadvantage of the experimental method. It may be, in some situations of life, the only one open to us, or the only one which will carry conviction, but for all that it is costly and must not be carried on longer than is necessary.

The faculty with which we perceive injustice is not just the same as that with which we perceive love—something lesser included in the greater: we are using another side of ourselves, a distinct faculty. The one and the same action is by one side of ourselves apprehended to be unjust and by another to be unloving; each action has, as it were, to pass both tests. It forms a double security, but of course there is also the danger that by shifting your ground you avoid both tests; and this is at the root of much of our social problem. Slippery, selfish consciences can say: "Of course, it isn't *just*, but then mathematical equality is not the only criterion," and

The Free-woman

another time: "It *does* seem rather hard, but there, we mustn't be sentimental."

Because we can see no practical way in which men are equal, for they are neither equal in intellect, in physical strength, in goodness, in inheritance, equality before God seems a purely intangible, theoretic, almost unreal thing, and it does remain quite unreal to us unless we try to express it in concrete ways by sharing what we have, by raising the down-trodden. To deny or ignore inequalities on the plea of justice is unjust, and contrary to love, but yet to emphasize them is even more unjust and contrary to love.

CHAPTER V

How we dare, and dare not, revolt.

“Strength does not come from physical force, it comes from the indomitable will ; non-violence does not mean meek submission to the will of the evil-doer, but putting of one’s whole soul against the will of the tyrant.”—GANDHI.

“Persons count in proportion to the strength of the idea behind them.”—E. A. BURROUGHS.

“Only, I say it with all my strength. Yes, I am sure of it, in spite of men professing that they are practical, the rich will not move without a goad. I have and I hold—you shall hunger and covet—until you are strong enough to force my hand.”—*Diana of the Crossways*.

“**H**OMO homini lupus ” says the old proverb, and men have changed little since the days of the Romans. We are faced with a world where they have at all times taken advantage of physical inequalities, intensified them and used them in their own interests : laws, traditions, domestic customs, all these have expressed this tendency to exploit an initial handicap, whether of mental or of physical inferior strength. It was largely unconscious, no doubt, but the oppression and crying injustice were there none the less.

The subjection of woman is our chief concern

The Free-woman

here, but parallel problems, which at heart contain the same elements, will help us to keep our perspective. The rich and the educated have taken advantage of the poor and uneducated. The white races took the black as slaves.

Even when men or women do it "for the good" of the inferior, and genuinely work for that good, if the main attention is directed on the difference or inferiority, it is hard not to emphasize it, increase it, and ultimately crystallize and make of it something permanent, remaining blind to the irritation and ultimate revolt caused thereby. It is hardest to deal with, perhaps, when the oppression is manifested not in brutality of a whole class to another, but in subtle, gentle injustice, as in the behaviour of a father towards daughter, or of one Christian towards another—say the white missionary to the native pastor.

How are we to react to the exploitation of inequalities? In face of the slum, the harem, or the sufferings caused by social ostracism—is revolt the right attitude? Or is meekness and turning the other cheek the only and final answer? Must we not only turn the other cheek ourselves, but advise others, and even help others to do so too?

Is there a "divine right of rebellion" against oppression—whether it be the oppression of a Sultan with armed janissaries, or the oppression of an honest British workman, who merely keeps up the idea that he could not make a meal for himself, so as to let his wife have a day away from the house?

How we dare, and dare not, revolt

Except for those of us who really want a fight (and when one comes to think of it, there are a good many), it would obviously be pleasanter and better if the oppressor himself, or herself (for there are many women oppressors), came to see things in the right light and freely altered both circumstances and their own attitudes. Then the oppressed need not get "pushful," and the oppressor need not be thrown violently down, and no one's feelings are hurt. This does sometimes happen. When it does, it is due to an increase of imagination which enables men to realize how they would like to be treated if they were in the other people's shoes, or else they have been infected by some idea that is in the air, like "equality" or "freedom."¹ But we must face things squarely, and see the inherent psychological difficulty of the oppressor seeing the error of his ways, not because he is a man and men are specially selfish—or a bourgeois, and all bourgeois are wicked—or an imperialist and therefore tyrannical—but simply from the nature of the case: because he is human.

Privilege has a subtle hold on those who are born to it or acquire it. It always has been difficult for those who had special advantages

¹ Modern China and Russia are two of those race instances: "Certain it is that the most eager supporters of the Women's Movement in China are their husbands, sons, and brothers" (E. M. Pye, *Notes on the Women's Movement in China*, p. 6, and Jessica Smith, *Women in Soviet Russia, passim*).

The Free-woman

to see the reasons for giving them up quite clearly enough to bring themselves to the pitch of abdication. There are always such innumerable reasons for keeping what one has : we are caught in what we call a mesh of circumstances ; because of those privileges, we take on other responsibilities ; we associate with people who also have those privileges and who would deter us from giving them up ; we are imprisoned and hemmed in by our privileges, even when we want to escape. They inhibit our thinking even, preventing us from coming to conclusions which, logically, would imply our own spoliation. If the British working-man aforementioned came to the conclusion that he could, with an effort, cook his own meal, and that his wife really did need a change and rest, then he would actually have to wrestle with the cooking, forgo the time with pipe and paper, and, worse still, a friend might come in and smile ; so he would rather think he can't cook—and as that is perhaps a humiliating way of putting it—that it is “not his job,” “below his dignity,” “not in his nature,” “it's a woman's job.” . . . If he admires his wife, he will improve matters by idealizing her part of it : “wife's devotion,” “wife's duty,” “first-class cook,” “can't do it like she does.”

Thus the privilege itself maintains itself by creating its own “mystique,” a doctrine and a sentiment to uphold it ; but that doctrine did not probably originate the privilege, but vice versa ; this doctrine becomes the bulwark of

privilege, its protection against fits of idealism, against the cries of the oppressed. Interest and an idea of what is right, crystallized into laws, customs, traditions, class traditions, religion, are a formidable lot of associates—or rather a strong ally, for they become one.

We must realize, before we examine the way of rebellion, the unlikelihood of deliverance coming from the oppressor's side. Women will be fairer to men if they see how they themselves behave when they are born into an oppressor class. Are we not too dominated by custom and circumstances when we leave the dirtiest work for our charwoman and do the pleasantest ourselves? The matter is complicated by the fact that she does not mind the dirty work as much as you do, and does it more easily because it has always been put upon her; so that one inequality always breeds another. Remember your treatment of other women before you get indignant over man's treatment of women.

"You can fool some people all the time," said Lincoln, "and you can fool all the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time." So the inhibitions of interest and privilege cannot blind "all the people all the time," and a millionaire's son turns socialist, a man fights for women's votes, a slave-owner opposed slavery, or a brewer's son works for temperance; but to do so is, for practical purposes, to drop out of the category into which one was born; the privileged class as a whole remains unmoved, so the fact still remains that,

The Free-woman

without cynicism, just because we know ourselves, we must not expect the impulse of change to come from the oppressors. Though women, in their movement for liberation, have been helped by some men, the initiation of every movement has come from women themselves.¹ However pacifist and anti-revolutionary we may be by taste or conviction, therefore, we must see that, even though in theory it is not impossible for the reforming impulse to come from the oppressor side, still, both psychology and experience show that we must not expect it to come without any kind of pressure either from the oppressed or the neutral.

Therefore on those few who first come to think of the social or political conditions under which they live as "unjust" to themselves and their like, rests an enormous responsibility. As long as they remain silent, it is doubtful whether the majority will ever see it, so they become really responsible for the continuance of bad conditions. But if they are merely seeing things in a distorted way, or are led by a false philosophy of life, then their agitation is causing unnecessary moral suffering; on them, too, rests the responsibility of the methods which will be adopted to secure a change.

The natural course is for this minority to revolt

¹ Gandhi says: "I do not wish to be born again, but if I am, I would wish to be born an untouchable, to share their humiliation and to work for their liberation," implying that the impulse for liberation must come from the oppressed themselves.

and instigate the others to follow their example. The doctrine in support of the oppression is all the easier to maintain because the "inferior" ones have actually been made "inferior" in many ways: less education, fewer chances of expression, less opportunity for taking initiative, do, in time, make people less able to carry responsibility and to rule their own destinies, or, if they lacked these qualities to start with, it keeps them in a position of dependence; and, as it is a human tendency to find some explanation and theory of things as they are, beliefs are developed which explain that oppression, and justify those who rob them of responsibility. Thus it is on the side of the oppressed, too, that only "some of the people" at "some time," and not all the oppressed together, feel it wrong that some initial inequality of race, physique, or culture should be exaggerated.

By revolt is meant the deliberate attempt, by some means or other, to put an end to the existing situation, to overthrow privilege or domination. The very word is associated with the idea of violence. If instead of studying the women's problem we were discussing the desirability of revolt against industrial or national oppression, we should have to deal with the question of armed revolt, but we can afford to leave it aside without stopping to prove that it is un-Christian and ultimately wrong (of which I am convinced), because, however oppressed women are, they are as nearly bound to their menfolk by love and instinct as to their women comrades.

The Free-woman

But there are other forms of revolt: a great variety of attitudes are possible towards recognized inequalities, and a great many methods of exercising pressure on the community and on the family.

As in other matters, it is in taking the long view that we see the ethical rightness or wrongness of things, and not when we let either bitterness or apathy get the better of us. Looking at the world's history, we stand amazed at humanity's infinite capacity for patiently suffering injustice. Men and women will endure inequalities and miserable conditions of life to an almost unlimited extent; at last these conditions appear anomalous to a few, then to many; the situation becomes intolerable, and changes are forced upon the community. The process is seldom easy and smooth. It is a costly matter: it costs the peace of mind of those who rebel, their calm, their meekness, their love of the oppressor; it also costs the peace of mind of the latter, for they naturally resent an attack on their privilege and a condemnation of their moral standards. The established order of things is broken, and even a bad order has its value, for it is a tradition, a rhythm, a social and economic *modus vivendi*. Even when one section of the community is wronging the other, there may be happy relationships; and these are, by rebellion, broken up. The spread of discontent which results when we make people see that they are being unfairly treated brings intense and widespread suffering. Discontent is the most tormenting and infectious

temper ; without changing a single circumstance of a man's life, it can plunge him into unhappiness. It is infinitely difficult to circumscribe discontent either to the people who have a real grievance or to the cause of the grievance. In face of the world's social evils we may see that inertia is the great culprit, yet we wonder if it is not this tolerance of injustice which has prevented the world from being in one perpetual turmoil, which has allowed life to go on, and then we realize the heavy price of revolt. Rebellion may cost something more even than peace and order and unhappiness ; it may mean, and nearly always means, losing one of the most beautiful things in life—that sense of humility, self-abnegation, which, if we have in any measure seen it, it will always hurt us to feel swept away within us ; the humility of the lover, the glory of the times when men forget their rights and think only of giving, of walking that second unexacted mile ; the quiet beauty of the life of an old nurse, who never seemed to know that she herself needed anything but to devote herself. Here we touch an element of ultimate value. Do we easily forgive a revolt which would rob us of her and her like ? The spirit which was in her is expelled by the rebellious spirit. This equality which we found in romance and passion, in religion, in art, the revolting temper blinds us to it altogether. Then we turn round and hate that which destroys an element of such deep beauty in life. For even a rebel generation recognizes at heart the deep joys of

The Free-woman

self-abasement and humility and the glory of not counting.

When the Southern planter fought for the maintenance of slavery, it was surely not solely because he was defending an economic order which was profitable to him—though it certainly was probably the main thing which made him fight—but he was also, in many cases, expressing his love of what the old-fashioned darky servant had been. Saints seek humility for themselves, ordinary mortals love not only its convenience but also its beauty in others; they are thankful to others for its manifestation, and to some extent feel purified by it.

That love of vicarious humility explains something of the religious fervour with which the dominating class or sex seeks to maintain the old order of things, and which often may appear sheer hypocrisy. It is one of these things in which good and evil are most closely intertwined. It is a tribute to the beauty of humility; yet it is a refusal of it for yourself and an unwholesome joy in the abasement of others—mixed with a liking for the utility of their servitude. This with its good and evil is one of the corner-stones of the established order, based on specialization not only in work but in virtues.

But you cannot really specialize in virtues as you can specialize in work, a virtue being only entirely a virtue when it is accompanied by its opposite virtue. The other fundamental mistake of those who would fight to maintain the humility of others is that of forever failing to see

How we dare, and dare not, revolt

that when once a position has come to be seen in the light of an injustice, the more they try to impose it the less they can induce that very meekness and humility which they value. Self-assertion is stirred up; if you want to make a man feel aggressive, snub him and treat him in a way which seems unfair. Whatever there is of beauty in the humble acquiescence in inequality cannot be preserved by the strong when once the "lower orders" or the "weaker sex" has felt it to be an anomaly.

Passing through miles of London slums after a walk down Bond Street, one curses that human capacity for acquiescence. We are between the deep sea of human submission to injustice and the devil of yearning to fight for the right, between peace and contentment with unrighteous circumstances and the agonies of discontent which can make men or women suffer in mind and body in circumstances where they found before safety and ease.

We ask for a form of acquiescence which has the power to change circumstances and which does not poison social and moral conditions, or for some form of revolt which is less costly in moral values than that which is usually practised.

Yet if we want to reduce wrong and energetically change conditions, is a certain degree of psychological upheaval inevitable? History shows that most often it is so. Even when physical violence is avoided, there is on the part of those who are trying to change matters a certain indignation, concentration, nervous stress, which leaves no

The Free-woman

room for certain other virtues. We are almost driven to consider this an inevitable stage. Are we then to accept lower standards of feeling and conduct for temporary necessary stages, "an interim ethic"? "I don't like to stick up for myself. I recognize it's not the highest attitude, but I'll just have to for a while, if ever things are going to be righted." One certainly has to withstand people to the face—to use a Pauline phrase. Moods as well as words may have to be assertive and hot. Yet should whole lives, whole personalities be given over to the mood of rebellion? When we do, we create new problems as we solve old ones. If some truths are left altogether to one side, the lack of them creates new wrongs; we go back to the disadvantages of over-mathematical and crude equality, and lose the most valuable thing of all, the possibility of harmony.

To draw up a rigid formula that will enable us to distinguish at first sight between the wrong and the right kind of rebellion, is obviously impossible; one can only proceed by experience, and note the step of evolution, as it were, between the two extreme attitudes. We have at one end the most primitive type of rebel who would say: "I want this, this is my right and if I don't get it, I'll fight. If there is no army to defend me, I'll kick and make myself objectionable till I get it." A little higher in the scale comes the rebel who will say: "For the good of humanity I'll kick and make myself a nuisance"; then a little higher: "I'll suffer punishment for having

kicked, so that you can see how much I really care for the cause"; higher again: "I must have it because it is inherently right that I should have it: this must be (or must not be), because it is right for all concerned." And at the very top we find the type of rebel who says: "In the name of God this must be—though I lose all by declaring it. You can do no less than grant it, for your sake as well as for the sake of your brothers." This attitude is that of the prophet, the voice of moral authority. The authority of "thus saith the Lord" and the authority of "it is essentially right," are not perhaps identical, but at heart they have much in common; if it is inherently right, it is in harmony with the ultimate nature of the universe—and that ultimate law the religious man conceives of as Personal, and calls God. Such moral authority is the mainspring of all the revolts which have contributed to the permanent advance of human society.

It would be futile to deny what has been done for democracy and for the race problem and for the woman's position by the exasperation of suffering, by the common ordinary desire for better conditions, by human dislike of being unfairly treated; but when any of these motives predominate new difficulties are created. In any great movement all the motives are at work, but the predominance of one or the other leaves its mark—the exercise of genuine, selfless moral authority not only succeeds in obtaining what it demands, but acts on both sides as a moral tonic,

The Free-woman

while the "fight-for-my-own-rights" way leaves a certain pushfulness on both sides, even when, as often happens, the vanquished swing over to the new majority opinion.

The prig and the fanatic are such caricatures of moral authority that the idea may be associated with obstinacy and conceit; nor is it always easy at the time to recognize the real thing. Many contemporaries of the prophets may have considered them insufferable, and the Pharisees thought Christ impossible. It was just His moral authority to which they objected; they did not mind His healing men, or preaching, but they did object to the way in which He tried to break their hold on the people's minds, because He considered that all those minute rules obscured their vision of God and life and made them blind to realities; also because He was sorry that these things should weigh them down and baulk them in their everyday life. He set Himself to break the mental and practical domination of the oppressive law, oppressive priesthood, oppressive tradition—in fact, to bring "the freedom of the captive," of which He read in the Synagogue at Nazareth. He calmly does, and tells His disciples to do, that which was not lawful. He associates with those who break the law. He heals on the Sabbath; He tells the man to carry his bed on the Sabbath. He squarely denounces the Pharisees and tries to break their prestige, and all on His own authority: "it was said . . . but I say." Because He did not call the poor to revolt against poverty or the Jews to revolt against the

Romans or the women against men's domination, because of His teaching on meekness and on non-resistance, we forget that He was, too, a rebel—and an effective rebel; for, a few years later, the Church refused to impose the fetters of Jewish law and custom on Christian converts. His method, we said, was effective in its immediate result of giving men a simpler and more direct sense of the Fatherhood of God—He won a spiritual freedom into which, through His disciples, within a generation thousands were able to enter.

We note the price: because of His fearless attack on the Pharisees, He lost His life.¹ He abandoned that attitude of loving gentleness towards all which He would doubtless have chosen, when He threw vigorous invective at the hypocrites of His days. He was willing to hit hard. But we look more closely still. We see intense indignation and emotion; yet quickly again serenity and tenderness; the sincere Pharisees, like Nathanael, knew He would listen to them and loved them. God, nature, and simple people loomed larger in His horizon than the struggle against oppression, though the situation got tenser and tenser and ended His life so soon. The more we are called to struggle against the conditions of our time, the more we need an anchorage in the Eternal. We must have peace and harmony, and if we cannot be at peace with

¹ True rebels have always been willing to break themselves, their careers or their bodies, more willing to break themselves than their enemies.

The Free-woman

our own time, we need to find peace in the timeless elements of life. Christ's days were so full that it was at night when others slept that He had to find the sources of serenity and of moral authority which enabled Him to withstand the powerful ones of His day effectively yet remaining tender and master of Himself.

*
* *

A natural tendency is to think that we shall avoid the dangers of quick redressment of wrongs by accepting the idea that changes must come slowly. But we see in Christ and in many great liberators an extraordinary sense of urgency and a belief that the reign of justice can come immediately. "Ye shall not taste death till ye see the Kingdom come with power" is typical of the prophet who will not tolerate injustice even temporarily.

There is danger in very rapid change, but there is equal danger in accommodating yourself to half-measures and to indefinite postponement. The rebel keeps normal less by patience and the willingness to go slowly than by limiting the field of rebellion so that he is not at war with the authorities or the community about everything. Again and again, though a man lives surrounded by many injustices, he seems alive to some only and concentrates on one issue. John Woolman and Wilberforce concentrated on slavery,

Josephine Butler on the exploitation of woman, Elizabeth Fry on the state of English prisons ; temperance, peace, housing, each have ardent advocates who know that, urgent as other issues may be, their duty is to see as it were one evil at a time. Though they usually bore some witness against the others too.

In Christ's time there was political oppression, there was poverty, and women were not free. We sometimes wish that He had left us an example of the best way to revolt against war or industrial oppression. The struggle against the Jewish law may seem a dead issue to us ; was it simply a first step ?

The supreme truth which He felt called to convey to men was the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. This belief more than any other affects men's behaviour one to another. The Rabbinical teaching above all else made it hard for men to keep a filial attitude towards God and brotherliness towards each other. The law obtruded itself on their consciousness at every turn ; compared with this, the Roman domination must have been fairly remote. Christ liberated men from the oppression of the law rather than from economic oppression, not because the law was a "spiritual" matter and economic conditions are "material" things—for the rule of the scribes and Pharisees virtually affected material things, too, and bad economic conditions are also a matter of spiritual failure—but because liberation from the thrall of pharisaic domination was the most immediate necessity.

The Free-woman

Without it, their minds were too preoccupied to realize the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, too used to intricacies to perceive the simplicity and directness of His message. The great liberators have been those who have fought strategic battles to free men from what most obscured these two great truths. Sometimes the battle is joined over what seems to us a small point: often what appears unimportant is the vital next step, and very large issues are decided on some apparently trivial test case. If St Paul, for instance, fought the battle of the recognition of universal brotherhood on the question of circumcision, it was a key position, the holding of a pass. But the fundamental truth could be also defended on some other point, that of the baptism of Gentiles, or of the eating of unclean foods; that is where Peter made his stand. Again, the Christians maintained their right to worship God in their own way—the issue was narrowed to one act of worship of Cæsar which they must perform or refuse to perform; by refusing to burn incense they were breaking down the claim of the State to identify religion and the State. It would be far easier for those concerned, and especially for those who read the history of it later, if the more fundamental question at stake stood out more explicitly. But in the very nature of things in actual life, it is the concrete manifestation of an idea with which we have to deal and not its more general expression. One of the difficulties in deciding on the rightness of revolt is precisely

How we dare, and dare not, revolt

the difficulty in seeing if we are being pugnacious over a small detail or are really called to hold some important strategic position. The battleground is often chosen by the others who elect to look upon this or that as symbolical of some bigger principle.

*
* *

If we look at the long line of men whose revolt has had in it a large measure of real moral authority, with a love for humanity which included the oppressor, then there emerges, though perhaps dimly still, a type of revolt which answers, in some respects, to what we desire; that is, a revolt which is not too costly in moral values.

The painful aspects of revolt are not eliminated: for the rebel the suffering is even greater,¹ and the antagonism of the oppressor or of the community is in no sense diminished; men resent someone who asks nothing for himself but rebukes injustice; he is harder to deal with and to understand than a person fighting for his own rights. In the long run, however, it is a revolt which does not cut at the very roots of content or of humility and uncounting love.

At this point or that an act, taken by itself, may be an act of self-assertion, and the greatest saints have not always been able to keep the inward temper of love with which they started

¹ Remember Josephine Butler's moral anguish—or Gandhi almost starving himself to death.

The Free-woman

their reforming campaign, but these defects are temporary and incidental and make it possible for oppressed and oppressor to find the ways of peace (though we remember that most Pharisees never forgave or understood Christ).

Love in a perfect community might be all gentleness and peace. Love in a community where there is evil must be a redemptive love—that is, it suffers because of evil, but it also strives and resists evil. A French writer defined love as the complete abandonment of one personality to another¹—that can only be true of love for the perfect and divine; love towards that which is human must have the element of resistance. The most sacrificial love is perhaps Mother-love, yet it is Mother-love which needs to have in it, at every turn, that capacity for not yielding rather than for blind abandonment.

The ideal rebel is one who embodies this union of sacrificial and resisting love. The deepest contemporary expression of this truth is to be found in the life and writings of Gandhi, from whom we note some passages of particular interest in this connection: “Strength does not come from physical capacity. It comes from indomitable will. Non-violence does not mean meek submission to the will of the evil-doer, but the putting of one’s whole soul against the will of the tyrant. Working under this law of our being, it is possible for a single individual to defy the whole might of an unjust empire and lay the foundation for that empire’s fall or its

¹ Jacques Rivière, *A la trace de Dieu*.

How we dare, and dare not, revolt

regeneration.” “Non-violence in its dynamic condition means conscious suffering.” To quote Gandhi again, “He may not hurt those he believes to be unjust, one must not be angry with them but love them.” “Oppose tyranny but never hurt the tyrant. Conquer him by love. Suffer punishment even unto death for disobeying his will.” “He must be free from the fear of kings, people, caste, families, thieves, robbers, ferocious animals and death. A truly fearless man will defend himself against others by truth-force and soul-force.”

“Where there is only a choice between cowardice and violence—I cultivate the quiet courage of dying without killing, but to him who has not this courage, I advise that of killing and being killed rather than shameful fleeing from danger—he who runs away commits mental violence.”

In no domain more than in that of liberation of women is there more need of this philosophy of revolt, for some effective way of lifting burdens, without breaking the delicate fabric of family relationships, whether you think of the peasant woman of Russia who is now on Soviet Committees, the women of Turkey or of Afghanistan or of China.

*
* *

Different countries of the world are at very various stages, evolving at varying speeds. The evolution of Anglo-Saxon women has had

The Free-woman

a great influence on the position of women throughout the world: they have certainly been, because in England there were so many unmarried women, and their less accentuated sex life, that minority which initiates changes. The rôle has involved dangers and difficulties; the peril of inducing a spirit of change with no power of construction, of over-influencing people who should evolve along somewhat different lines according to their own genius. But in the main, impossible as it is to say how much the Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian women have hastened changes in other lands, the part played by the Northerners is still important, and even if we do not try to exert undue influence on Latin or Eastern developments, the march of the Revolution in northern countries—for it is as much a revolution as the industrial revolution—will inevitably influence the world movement very deeply.

We can speak in fact, to some extent at least, of a world organization of women's movement. This has both its advantages and its dangers; the difficulties coming from the fact that, as we said, such different stages are reached and such a different speed in the various countries. Here we can apply what we said of the terrible responsibility which rests on the minority which induces rebellion and on the urgency not to be merely destructive. Thinking from the point of a younger middle-class English-woman, we see that this responsibility for others also applies to her relationship with working women: to her, if not always to the working

How we dare, and dare not, revolt

woman herself, the position of the working man's wife seems wrong; customs are still widely prevalent which are a crying injustice; it is taken for granted, for instance, that she needs no pocket money and no leisure, while her husband needs both, and that in a variety of ways she remains subject in a measure which the middle-class woman is not. In many working-class homes the position of women is entirely different from that of the middle-class woman. Is it that, tired of always obeying, the man vents his need for command by being "master in his own home"? How is she best to be helped to change matters without losing that marvellous spirit of devotion which humbles us when we see it? Crude attempts can more easily destroy the good than cure the evil. Yet out of chivalry we cannot accept that she should be so treated, for neither the man nor the child will reach full moral development while they accept a treatment of the wife and mother which is a denial of her full moral rights.

Looking nearer home again, what is the situation for the younger English woman? She has obtained complete political rights. The Married Woman's Property Act and the reform of the divorce law have done away with the inequalities which subsisted before. She has obtained equal educational opportunities and virtually every profession is open to her.¹

¹ The only professions still formally closed to her are the priesthood of the Catholic, Anglican, and Presbyterian Church, and the fighting services.

The Free-woman

Socially she is emancipated; customs and tradition leave her practically as free as men, to live alone, or travel alone, or do whatever she pleases. Some vestiges of the old order remain in the persistence of certain prejudices, but in the main the woman as an independent personality has largely won her freedom.¹

When one considers the magnitude of the change, how old were the laws and deeply rooted the customs which have been swept away, one is amazed at the speed with which it has all happened. A bloodless revolution—marred by something which could be called violence, but in which the suffering was borne by the rebel and not by the community.

From some points of view the revolt is over. Read any book on the Woman's Movement published a few years ago and you see that most of the changes which were then demanded have been accomplished, more quickly in fact than many dreamed. Yet there remains a vital problem still really untouched, to which this, in a sense, is but a preliminary.

A generation is arising which is asking for changes that affect the whole structure of society and of the family more intimately and more

¹ Economic equality is not won yet, though some professions have it—but the whole basis on which wages are given is in a state of flux and chaos: supply, demand, minimum needs, all play their part—paying the single woman or married woman with husband also earning the same salary as the man with wife and young family increases the *inequality* of what is available for spending per head per person. See chapter on "Equality."

How we dare, and dare not, revolt

radically. It is beginning to be felt as an anomaly that marriage should make such entirely different demands on the wife than on the husband—that most of the equality of brother and sister or fiancés, at school or college or in work, should suddenly end at marriage. Because bearing of the child is the woman's special part, society has, as it were, taken it as a sign that the man's should be all the active work outside the home, hers practically the whole joy and burden of the rearing. There is a growing sense among many (I will not say that they are a majority, but they are that significant minority which begins changes) that this is a wrong view, that there should be the possibility of sharing both the cares of the child and the wider outside responsibilities: they demand of the community that laws and public opinion should make it possible. There is no wish to neglect the children nor even hand them over to others' care, but a passionate desire that this care should be shared by the husband.¹ On the whole, the women's movement has never been a movement against men, but rather a tending to get nearer to man in closer fellowship in work and home.

Without minimizing the importance of what one may call the first chapter of the Women's Revolution, realizing all it has done for society, for the unmarried woman (and all women are first unmarried), all it has done to bring us to the brink of the second chapter, we must realize never-

¹ In its more practical aspects that question will be discussed in the last chapter on "Practical Implications."

The Free-woman

theless that this next step is the most revolutionary and the most difficult. More than in any other domain the price of revolt is moral suffering to man and woman, possible suffering of body to the child, and the price may have to be paid in the most precious coin there is, the harmony of happy relationships. So what has been said in general terms about inspiration and methods of revolt will apply doubly here.

That is why, to make the experiments which will perhaps effect great changes in our customs, will need very fine spiritual quality, and a good deal of patience and willingness to suffer—and also that which is part of love, the capacity to resist.

A concrete expression of society's opposition to this change is shown in the Municipal By-laws which force the woman who is in the employment of the town to give up her work upon marriage. A demand to repeal those laws can be based, not necessarily on the belief that the woman should certainly keep her work, but on the grounds that she and her husband should be free to experiment as to what are the conditions which are good for themselves and their children—and that the community has no right to interfere with this experiment on this plea that it has to protect the welfare of possible children, any more than it would be free to dismiss a man on the pretext that his delicate child was suffering by residing in a particular city or district.

Step by step the freedom of the unmarried

How we dare, and dare not, revolt

woman to find out for herself what was possible or not to her has been granted. She has entered all domains ; there may be some which she will find unsuitable and which, when she has proved her capacity nevertheless, she will abandon ; the married woman is beginning to experiment in the same direction. These bye-laws to which I have alluded are only, it is true, a small matter, but they are symbolic of the opposition of society.

CHAPTER VI

How we need a new Faith.

WE need a theory and a belief with regard to our place in the scheme of things, but these are not enough. How can our intellectual belief transform our emotional reactions, our tastes, our capacities? Ideas may appeal to us as right and beautiful yet fail to have much effect upon our lives because their influence is nullified by some stronger force. How can it become a real living vision, a "mystique"?¹ No set of people can work and suffer without a "mystique" of some kind, if it be only the grey vision of the necessity for resignation to fate. . . . Whether this be a religion in the more precise sense of the term or some other ideal, for people to labour and endure and suffer with any willingness there must be what is at heart a "mystique."

Of two individuals of an equal degree of unselfishness, the one who has some vision of his function in the world will be enabled to make greater sacrifices with less effort. And when that "mystique" is collective, ordinary individuals

¹ We borrow this word from a French writer, Charles Péguy. He uses it to express the vision or ideal which lies behind practical schemes and policies, which gives to all great movements and causes that compelling power and makes men and women capable of great devotion and sacrifice.

are raised in some respects above their ordinary capacity. The captain of the sinking ship, the doctor in an epidemic, the fireman in the burning house, are all helped psychologically to rise above natural selfishness and fear. All these cases prove the power of a "mystique" to help quite ordinary mortals, both in great crises and when there is a call for drudgery.

Tradition, when it embodies a "mystique," is not a dead but a living power for good, and when traditions are undermined, some force which made for altruism is gone. For all that, many traditions will have to go, because the sacrifice or subservience which they enjoined were not at bottom good for all concerned. The tradition of the woman's devotion to the home is a case in point—but, as we break down the tradition of the kind of woman's subservience which was really wrong from the point of view of the fundamental equality of all human beings, a new "mystique" of devotion and sacrifice must grow up; more individual, less narrowly instinctive, adapted to inspire altruism outside as well as inside the home; more consciously based on religious belief and on the conviction that altruism alone makes family and social life possible.

Nothing is infectious like content and discontent, and the capacity to suffer or work for a particular cause is immensely helped by the attitude of others. Some things which seem unendurable to us have been borne by fairly ordinary people when the religious convictions of all their contemporaries expected it; and the

reverse is true. Look for instance at an Indian home, where the young woman will not only give her whole life to the service of her husband and children, but remain obedient to a domineering mother-in-law, because she takes it for granted that this is her religious duty and the right order of things. Even without a change of creed, a change in emphasis, a decrease of the force with which the creed is held, changes our capacity for endurance and contentment, and modifies our capacity for enjoying a certain set of circumstances. When the tradition or emphasis which made a certain kind of life possible or even enjoyable has withered under criticism, just or unjust, or has been destroyed by the inrush of a new set of ideas, then, in order to recreate a tradition or a "mystique," as we have called it, it must re-emerge at first as something intensely personal and conscious, and closely enough connected with intellectual belief to be handed on to others. At any rate in this analytical age it would seem to be so.

Therefore, ultimately, it is a personal religious problem. Christ's teaching of the value of each soul and of the call both to the man and woman to put away all personal ambition, all personal tastes and inclinations; of the human family as the source of Divine knowledge, and of the supreme claims of the Kingdom—this is a basis for a theology of womanhood which is adapted to life as we know it. But the problem remains, expressed again and again in words like these: "Yes, I know all this and believe it, but it does

not grip me. . . . The whole inequality of the claims of marriage still revolts me. . . . I still feel I don't want to give up my work, and this very side of me which rebels seems something too much part of myself for me to kill it without killing something so essential in me, that I can't do it." . . . The obvious answer is Christ's saying about losing your life to find it: this is probably ultimately the only answer.

We have to recognize, however, that a moral struggle is harder when we have to fight against something which at the core has some real element of good in it—something ultimately divine. That is the difficulty, for instance, of the person struggling against an illicit love: love in its essence has something so good, that he cannot bring into the fight all the forces he would have if he were fighting evil. That is the difficulty of the girl struggling against her desire for marriage and children.¹ Is it not, then, good to recognize that this urge to go out and work at the world's problems does contain something which is a call of God? It is a part of God's answer to the great social need. But if it contains something of a call from God to face wider responsibilities than the home, we have to recognize how for many of us, in the form in which it comes, this urge is still a temptation, for it comes warped by those ideas, those impulses which are only a fresh variation on the

¹ In fact, we must have gone a long way along the road to depravation before real evil, unassociated with good, is a real temptation to us.

The Free-woman

eternal theme of human selfishness, and the eternal attempt to find an excuse for evading the law of sacrifice.

Ultimately we cannot put aside something which contains a call of God, but if, at the time, it comes associated with too much human selfishness, or if it is not for us here and now, we have to face laying it aside entirely. Again and again spiritual progress is only possible if we are willing to cut off something which is itself not only not bad, but actually a gift of God (Matthew v. 28), whether it be the passion of sex, or the passion of work. The essence of whatever was divine in the urge can ultimately be fulfilled when it has been purged by the willingness to give it up, and by self-discipline in other directions.

The obvious difficulty is that the woman will retort: "Much of the sting comes from the fact that life does not make the same demands on the man; he can in peace enjoy both his home and his work. My husband is not forced to the same conquest of self along either line, and the whole matter would be easier if we had fellowship in the sacrifice." . . . The fundamental inequality of those claims cannot be ignored, and it is a fact that we must face, and learn to face with equanimity. Can we not even be thankful that life forces us to face certain spiritual truths which must be at the heart of the man's spiritual life too, but which he can more easily avoid, for a while at any rate?

The likelihood of our attaining to the vision of what our womanhood can be largely depends

on the emotions which are aroused by the facing of the fundamental inequality :¹ "The truth is that a man and woman cannot travel far in the Christian life before discovering the inexorable fact that feeling is as much under the law of Christ as action is, and that certain emotions are inconsistent with obedience." Perhaps in some circumstances we can act rightly while we still feel wrongly, but emotion which is not subject to the law of Christ will prevent clear vision. That in a way is putting cause before effect, for it is the vision of God's will for us which really changes our feeling about our lives ; but meanwhile God cannot make us hear His whispered meaning of the simple, obscure, humble things above the thunder of our revolts.

"And God was not in the storm." . . .

The whole revolutionary cycle of ideas stands in the way of spiritual discoveries for the woman at this time, for, whatever place it may have socially, it cannot be at the very spring of our spiritual life.

Another attitude of mind which makes the way hard is the habit of taking oneself too seriously and of forgetting one's own insignificance ; of thinking too exclusively of life in terms of what we can do for the world, and not enough as a time of preparation for the eternal

¹ Inequality here implies not inequality in value or in intellectual capacity, but simply the unevenness with which the burdens of parenthood are laid on the man and the woman.

The Free-woman

life. Managing a small home, caring for one or two little children who may, or may not, turn out well, in spite of all our care, may not seem a very important bit of service, though its effects are more far-reaching than you may think; but as a school for learning some very vital truths it ranks a good deal higher. Because some past generations thought perhaps too much of saving their souls, we feel we must not think of ours at all, but be perpetually serving others in some very vital and important way.

Whatever be the spiritual conflict—the acceptance of celibacy or the renunciation of the work of our choice—to win through to the right emotional attitude, we have to dwell on the right ideas and act upon those ideas.

*

* *

It is easy to imagine many people saying: “If only women let their instinct speak, they would have no trouble to adapt themselves to home life. Talk of the necessity of renunciation in the case of the woman who is suffering from her singleness, but with the married woman, let her listen to instinct. . . . If she were really in love, if she had any maternal instinct, there would be no problem.” But this attitude fails to recognize facts as they are, for instinct does not really solve our problems. At the same time it raises the question as to whether it is really desirable

that the sex instinct should become stronger than it is now in the majority of women.

It is true that to some romantic love comes with such strength that all else is, for a while at any rate, swept before it, but one must acknowledge that this does not occur in the majority of cases in even quite happy marriages. It is only in a minority that quite overwhelming certainty and permanent surrender of the whole personality occurs on both sides. Moreover, it is all a matter of the relative strength of the different sides of one's personality. Even a girl of healthy and strong instincts may have in her other currents which are even stronger, for the passion for work is after all another manifestation of the creative instinct or the instinct of self-assertion; the way in which the instinct manifests itself is influenced by the kind of ideas to which we are subject. The woman's work instinct is probably partly a sublimation of the sex instinct that has become stronger than the instinct from which it originally sprung. The work instinct in its more definite professional aspect is the result of mixing with men and adopting men's attitude about work, adding to it a woman's passion.

If we look for a solution mainly to the awakening of sexual instincts, rather than to the producing by religion in the modern woman of a greater willingness to fulfil the work of motherhood, we shall create more difficulties than we solve, unless we mean an instinct which is very profoundly influenced by the religious side of

The Free-woman

the personality. More awakened sex, merely, does not always mean more domestic virtues; the contrary would in some cases be nearer the truth. Stimulate sex in the modern woman, and it results in more love of clothes, in wanting passion without responsibilities or claiming the "right to motherhood." In more sophisticated people it is only where sex impulses are influenced by some ethical, traditional, or religious ideas that they tend to more devotion to the child and home.

Neither do we want to go back to the more old-fashioned instinctive type of woman who often made a devoted mother to little children and then quite failed to understand developing personalities, and who unconsciously provoked resentment of her possessiveness. The big child suffers from the over-instinctive mother who wants to keep him young, who wants to possess him, and who cares more for his body than his mind. On the whole, the child fares better with the kind of woman who finds care of the infant drudgery, but who understands the growing mind. The best types of mother are neither the instinctive and emotional, nor the intellectual and self-expressing, but the women who have some moral or spiritual "point d'appui" outside both sex life and outside her own desires. There must be something in her which transcends and transforms both.

*

* *

For religious life profoundly to modify the working of sex instinct, so that sex is used as the driving power in the work of motherhood, while at the same time it is purged of its blind possessive aspect, it must be the kind of religion which sinks into the very sources of thought and emotion. No mere intellectual assent, nor an enthusiasm for the social message of the Gospel, will do this; it can only be effected by some transforming vision or by a strong religious discipline. However enlightened or broad our creed, or however bold be our social applications, nothing can change the fact that ultimately our religion must be judged on the strength of its impact on character. Whatever our ecclesiastical allegiance, our religion must help us to live in harmony with our instincts and make the best use of them, whether it is the work instinct or the sex instinct. It is one of the functions of religion to purge instinct of its blind, unruly element which simply spells disorganization of life.

One of the ways in which religion does this is by bringing a new emotional force into our lives. Now it follows that if, out of fear of emotionalism, we keep out all emotion from our religion, we deprive it of much of its power. It also follows that if, from fear of anthropomorphism, we lose all sense of the personality of God, so that there is no Person to love, again we deprive religion of some of its power to help us in our emotional and instinctive life, for the sense of God's love for us and our love for God

The Free-woman

will help us like nothing else to accept either the loneliness of celibacy or the renunciation of chosen work ; but there must be real love, not the mere idea of love.

In adult life, if not before, we may discover within ourselves an elemental strain ; primitive man and the whole life of nature may surge up within us. We need to know what attitude we are to adopt towards nature. Do we view the instinctive and elemental side of man as the point of departure in human evolution, a medium within which a moral, spiritual life took its rise, but which in turn is profoundly modified by this spiritual element which comes more directly from God, this spiritual element becoming more and more the determining factor of life ? Then we are saved from seeing in the primitive woman, who may at any time surge up in any of us, either the one who must lead us, or the enemy. She is our rough foster-mother to whom we as a race owe much, but who may not rule us, for she has only reared us for God. How are we to treat her ? How much can she teach us ? This is no easy matter for any of us to decide, but Christianity should mark this out at any rate : there is some spiritual germ in us which frees us from her dominion, and, at the same time, she is part of God's world and therefore cannot be simply an enemy to our souls. The followers of Christ, like Christ Himself, as sons of God, move as princes in the Kingdom over which we have dominion. In the measure in which we can let this truth sink into us, we shall

find it easier to face a life in which much that is "natural" has to be cut out; celibacy becomes more acceptable, and motherhood less instinctive and possessive; the longing for work is spiritualized.

Further, it is when religion determines our relation towards nature that we can view material things in a sacramental light. It is when marriage in all its aspects is seen as a sacrament of a relation between God and the Soul that we gain the wisdom to raise it above the material, or the strength to do without it. There is the source both of humble learning from nature and mastery of nature, that apparent contradiction which seems at first so hard to understand. The sense of the sacramental nature of ordinary things like meals and cleanliness can help to give deeper significance to material domestic life as well as to marriage itself.

Again, it must be repeated, vision, which is perception of the nature of the universe, and religious discipline, which is really the retaining of the vision constantly before your mind, so that it moulds personality, these alone will transform our instinctive reactions, and determine in the end our likes and dislikes, our capacities and incapacities.

Perhaps of all the elements of Christianity the one which should help us most is the heroic strain of Christ's teaching. Christianity leads us into a realm where the heroic is the normal. Only through the heroic can men in any way conform to the great laws of life. The life of

The Free-woman

the Spirit, and the expansion of the Kingdom, demand heroic sacrifice. How dimly we average Christians have always understood this! Yet if we can think of a thing as normal, it becomes more possible. Christ's thought moves in a realm where only through great renunciations could men follow Him at all and obtain what He called "fullness of life." He accepted for those He loved best what we moderns would easily think of as "repression" or "mutilation" of personality, while the modern man and woman fear repression so much that they run away from all self-sacrifice.

*

* *

So far we have spoken mainly in religious terms. How far has modern psychology¹ helped us on our way? What has it got to give? The diffusion of some notions of psychology has helped us in some respects and hindered us in others. It has helped us to understand and rehabilitate instinct, but like all newly discovered truths, it is apt to be held in a distorted or super-

¹ In speaking of modern psychology we are not here concerned with the work of scientists themselves, but with the diffused effect of their writing on people who have never studied the subject at first hand. All new schools of thought affect in time indirectly the thinking of the large majority of the population; it is this more distant echo with which we are concerned.

ficial way. One of the truths which it preaches is the danger of repression—the need for self-expression. This, with all the magnifying of liberty which has gone on ever increasing during the last decades, has encouraged the notion that discipline is bad and self-sacrifice unhealthy. It is a tempting doctrine that sacrifice is bad for our mental and bodily health, and however much the psychologist may protest that his teaching implies nothing of the kind, it is easy to see that superficial people are pleased to find scientific justification for their innate dislike of self-discipline. People listen when the psychologist speaks of the danger of self-repression and run away before he begins to expound sublimation. So that the woman who has had to forgo marriage, or the married woman who has had to give up a work she loved, are more sorry for themselves than they used to be. It has also made things harder for many because, while it did, as we say, rehabilitate instinct, it explained many things which we used to think of in spiritual terms, in terms of “instinct.” “Mother love” is seen simply as part of “sex instinct”; philanthropic work as a manifestation of “self instinct.” Perhaps it is better for us not to give elements in our lives grander names than they deserve, but if the terms and the train of thought which they evoke make us forget the more directly spiritual origin of some of the driving forces within our personality, we are the losers. For, as Pascal says, it is better to think too well than too badly of human nature.

The Free-woman

Is maternal love only instinct, and something sprung from the physical nature? Is there no force behind philanthropic and religious work but the instinct of self-assertion? Surely both in fine motherhood and in philanthropy there are elements which are of spiritual, not physical, origin. While the idea of evolution and modern psychology have given us a sense of our link with the animal world that was necessary to our understanding of ourselves, it tends to make us forget that we are also "sons of God," though we may be related to the apes.

The fact is that things have significance on various planes of life: as the mouth is for eating, speaking, kissing, so on all hands we find that one and the same thing is used in quite different domains; so, too, any one fact can be expressed in various terms. Obviously your meat can be viewed from a utilitarian, a culinary, medical, social, or mystical point of view, and when we think of it or speak of it we choose the set of terms we shall use according to our dominant interest. Each is real in its own way. So much of the art of life depends on which of the significances you dwell upon, and what is the relation in your mind between them.

It is now often assumed that the physical origin of a thing most truly reveals its real nature, and we are invited to dwell on its primitive beginnings. But roots, essential though they be, are not the most important things to look

How we need a new Faith

at in a tree. By its fruits, not by its roots, shall a thing be known.

An author more often reveals his deepest thought in the conclusion of his book rather than in the beginning. A saint reveals more than the monkey or primitive man of the nature of humanity. It is for us to choose how often we think of man as descended from the ape or as a potential saint. How terrible, for instance, to see all meals from a medical point of view, worse still to eat habitually behind the X-Ray screen! The medical profession itself forbids us to take always a medical view of things. Now because psychologists are handling a new science, because it is necessary for a new system of knowledge to be imparted quickly, it has tended to obsess us. Psychological processes, like digestive processes, must be known, not only by specialists but to some extent by all, and that knowledge duly taken into account; but granting this, the psychological view of things must fall into its place as one of several ways of viewing a feeling or act. That is not to say that we must strive only to view things in their religious or moral aspect; the man who always looks at a mountain as a manifestation of the glory of God will feel the glory of God less than the man who sometimes has studied it from a purely geological point of view. But when questions of life, conduct, motive, are involved, we cannot afford to study a thing for long, so to speak, apart from the spiritual point of view. No terms or set of terms express the

The Free-woman

whole of reality, but in the main the terms used by Jesus Christ will serve us better for our habitual thinking.

*
* *

Modern psychology has taught us, too, to question and analyse our motives, not to take it for granted that the one of which we were the most conscious was necessarily the strongest and had really determined our action. It has drawn our attention to the strength of subconscious instinctive elements. At times we have the impression that we are terribly complex, and at others that in fine all is reduced to "sex" and "self" instinct. There is a great truth underlying this, biologically. Yet when it leads us to view the whole of life as expressions of primitive instinct we are as far removed from reality as if we ignored instinct altogether, for it ignores what, to those who take a spiritual view of the universe, is, though often still weak, the most real part of the man, and potentially the strongest element in him. It is natural, therefore, that when first the strength of instinct is pointed out, this should have the effect of causing bewilderment or even moral disintegration. To illustrate this, here is a quotation from a letter to a Study Circle leader (at the Circle people who did social work had been spoken of as moved by the self instinct):

"You insisted on the 'selfishness' which

moves many women to give themselves up to 'outside work,' and I agree with you that in a greater or lesser degree there is a certain 'selfishness' in the work of many women, but I think that by taking that line there is a danger of 'putting off' a good many women from doing work for the community, and to look upon social work as 'selfish' as opposed to 'home-keeping,' which is 'unselfish,' is a wrong anti-thesis, and one which is not really going to help women to do their work in the world. Of course it is true that to many women home occupation is a more searching self-discipline and a harder self-denial; it certainly calls for more continuous self-effacement and self-denial, but it is only a question of degree, and it also depends on the temperament of the woman.

"In the past, women who enjoyed homes were looked upon as the happy ones—the Florence Nightingales as the devoted ones and meritorious ones; now there is a certain tendency among some of us to reverse the position. Because we have found such happiness in social service, we are almost tempted to look upon it as a temptation. We have thought that it was 'so nice that it must be wrong'—like the old ascetic's view of marriage.

"Then modern psychology reveals to us that it is the expression of our 'self instinct,' and we get to be afraid of it as a form of selfishness. What we thought was the 'will of God' and a sense of humanitarian pity was only our self instinct or sublimated sex instinct, and naturally

The Free-woman

we are apt to be tormented by the sense that just in the part of life when we had heard the call of God most clearly, all has become blurred, so that we approach it with a bad conscience."

*
* *

How much is gained by focusing the attention on the more instinctive side of the motive, the one which hitherto in religious circles people were probably most blind to in themselves? As a phase which leads us to heart-searching, to a better understanding of ourselves, it will help us to recognize the instinctive side, but motives strengthen as we use them and act upon them: personality will grow more as we focus on the more spiritual impulses. If, for instance, "A," a spinster, cares for her friend's baby, she had better think of it as doing her friend a good turn rather than as "finding some outlet for her maternal instinct": for her sake, and also probably for the sake of the more unselfish way in which she will do the work (at times which suit the baby, not at times when her maternal instincts need expression). If it occurs to her that she does as a matter of fact find some small satisfaction in it herself, she just recognizes the fact, but in planning her time, is it not better that she should still keep her attention mainly on the altruistic motive, or rather on the needs of the baby.

When the ex-singer, "B," married and tied to her house, is asked to sing, it is better for her to think of the pleasure she may give or the sheer joy of singing, rather than saying to herself: "Here is a chance for self-expression which I am badly needing," or something to that effect.

Of course this attitude of emphasizing the more altruistic motive must go with a whole philosophy of human nature if it is not to be mere hypocrisy. It implies that we believe that in human nature there are elements which can become stronger than the primitive instincts, or it would be truer to say that there are elements in us which can so use and transmute those elementary impulses that their effect, nature, manifestation are entirely changed. They are so transmuted that, expressed in character and life, they seem almost the opposite of the element which the Spirit of God took and moulded to its use.

This process the psychologist calls sublimation. Sublimation is the diversion of these great primitive desires from the primitive object to some other channel, so that these can be used to good purpose. The parental instinct of a childless woman expressing itself in nursing or teaching; the desire for power expressing itself in letting God's power flow through us.

We can view sublimation as a convenient outlet under abnormal conditions, or we see it as wonderful in the spiritual ascent of man. This will change the whole emphasis and make

The Free-woman

sublimation easier, as it will not appear as a second best.¹

In presence of the restlessness of many married women, or of the woman doing monotonous work, we are dealing I think with the thwarting of the power instinct (though it would often not be recognized as such).

Prevalent ideas, the setting of life, education, strengthen the instinct. Just as sex is wrongly stimulated by the popular magazine, the picture, many novels, so there are aspects of our life which stimulate love of outward success, influence, of doing things that show; while at the same time there is little outlet apparently for power of that kind in family life; new educational methods discourage the woman from ruling her children in the old sense; the small family of children are her friends and equals; her new household would not wish to be ordered, nor does it come into her ideal of marriage to use her power over her husband. Power is apt to be associated with things in the world outside and with intellectual expression.

Though the bringing up of children and the managing of a home may take all the time, and all the energy and intelligence, there is, sometimes wrongly and sometimes rightly, the sense that it fails to use some fundamental urge. There is as much need for sublimation here as in the case of unsatisfied sex instinct, and the conditions are the same; these are, that right

¹ On "Sublimation and Religion." See Geraldine Coster's *Psycho-analysis for Normal People*, last chapter.

sublimation must be (1) good for the person herself; (2) good for the community, *i.e.* her family and her children; (3) should satisfy the ideal she has of herself.

This can occur in two ways: by using more of her powers on the education of the child, and ridding herself of the idea that the school should take over almost the whole of the child's education; by taking more share of responsibility for social conditions in her own town and district. To be able to achieve this many women need help, for absorption in small material details has taken away the capacity of doing these things, but it has not taken away the desire which makes expression necessary.

Another way of looking at the matter which is not really incompatible with what has just been said, is, that restlessness, which is such a feature of all human life, denotes unfulfilled spiritual desire.

In other words, we are really desiring sublimation, because sublimation is the law of our spiritual life. Restlessness is a sign not only of powers which find no outlet, but of a sense of powerlessness. Beneath the natural self which is crying out for self-expression, is the spiritual self crying out for more spiritual power over evil within and without. That discontent is a thing for which we must be thankful, for the world is in need of people with more power, just as it is in need of more love. Only a limited number of people can have power in the sense of having authority, fame, being at the top of

The Free-woman

their professional ladder, but power over self and on behalf of others could belong simultaneously to all. That is the use of power which Christ decided to make when He was tempted in the desert.

It is in giving us some intellectual explanation of this transmutation that psychology can help us most—by exposing in less forcible, and less beautiful, but to some more understandable language, the fact that unfulfilled desire may lead us nearer to God, that the primitive desires without which the race could not have existed can often be transmuted to some other end, that, in fact, it is often in and through this medium that spiritual forces have worked.

When we have come down to primitive instincts, self-protection, sex instinct, we have not come down to what is most fundamental. These may be most fundamental biologically, purely from the point of view of the body, but they have themselves created tastes in us which have in turn become more fundamental and more essential to our nature: these are the love of harmony and the love of power, which are even more fundamentally the forces which created the world.

CHAPTER VII

How we need some new Elements in Education.

WOMEN are seldom contented with the kind of education they received themselves. Those who had few educational opportunities would like their daughters to have a better chance. Those who had them, in spite of the intellectual enjoyment, in spite of the loyalty to old school or college, feel that something was lacking. A girl's education would be a comparatively simple thing if we knew whether she were going to marry or not. But that we can never know. The professional girl has a way of getting engaged just before or just after she has passed her final examinations, whilst her home-keeping sister, who would have made such a good wife, is left stranded. In the past, women were brought up with a view to marriage, and then the unmarried ones, like George Gissing's piteous old maids, were a problem to themselves and to everybody else. One-eighth of English middle-class girls will not marry, yet if we bring them up solely for a profession, they will find marriage too great a sacrifice, and will not be as well prepared for it as they should be, and they may find that their physique has been overstrained before the burdens of motherhood are ever taken up.

The Free-woman

So there is no doubt that girls should be educated with an eye on both possibilities. In fact, we must produce the adaptability which will make her effective and contented, either earning her own living or bringing up children and running the house, or at least able to decide which is her vocation and not always long for what she has not. Restless discontent is the greatest evil of the age, and women by the very nature of their lives are most prone to it.

Our main indictment of much in the modern education given to girls rests in the fact that it has professional life too much in view: it has been copied too directly from boys' education, and is too much dominated by the idea of examinations. "It certainly strikes one as a naïve assumption that women should ask to share the educational privileges of men on the ground that, in so doing, they would certainly secure the best education," as Maude Royden puts it.

A girl who is really effectively prepared to be an intelligent wife and mother could not fail to be a useful member of society, and would never beg her bread; but when psychologically her whole nature is bent towards marriage, she suffers too much if she remains a celibate. That is why we cannot go back to the old type of education even if we would. But does the new kind of education really meet our needs?

From an early age the child must work all day for her own improvement: if not for her pleasure, for her advantage. The pressure of examinations is responsible for too much of this

concentration on self. Mary cannot help her mother because she has to work for her examinations. Of course we must admit that the girl is at a period of development when she must be preparing to give, rather than be actually giving, but the preparation lasts so long, and is so exclusive, that the habit of giving may not be acquired at all. If from the age of seven to twenty-two you have to put your own concerns first, it is hard to change suddenly at twenty-three. This means the sacrifice of moral to intellectual education. The condition is largely due to the improvement of education, the wider curriculum, and the introduction of examinations, but above all, perhaps, to the pressure of examinations. Yet the whole efficiency of girls' secondary education has been the result of the introduction of examinations into the schools. The history of girls' education during the nineteenth century is a proof of this. Further, it is difficult to see at present how there can be efficient preparation for a profession without tests, so we cannot thoughtlessly throw them over. At present examinations are bad because they dominate the outlook for too many years; they are narrowing, and tend to concentration on self, and they dominate the teacher's mind as well as the pupil's. They are bad also because they encourage ambition, which is only a thorn in the flesh of the married woman. Thirdly, they are harmful because, in many cases, they strain the nervous system. One recognizes nevertheless what examinations have done for

The Free-woman

women's education, and one realizes that they must inevitably remain the gate to many professions. We must therefore see whether we cannot prevent them mastering us, but turn them rather into good servants of education.

One can suggest various ways of mitigating this evil :

1. Many more girls should look to handicrafts as a means of occupation and livelihood, failing marriage, and the less intellectual or less physically robust should drop examinations altogether.

2. Examinations should be taken at a later stage. There is a foolish tendency to send up candidates earlier and earlier. A certain boarding school obtains exceptionally good results, from the point of view of brightness and health record, by deliberately sending up candidates to examinations a year later than other schools, so that they reach examination standard almost unconsciously and without cramming. The less attention is concentrated on examinations the more we avoid their disadvantages.

3. The examinations themselves could be modified. There is already a strong tendency that they should become less memory tests and more intelligence tests. The real trouble lies in the way they loom so large in the mind of the average teacher and parent.

If we have to examine our modern education and see all in it which militates against unselfishness and humility, the qualities without which the woman cannot be a good wife and mother,

we must also see that modern education leaves time for what is spiritually constructive.

A woman needs a philosophical outlook on life. One cannot help thinking that for the girl who goes on to college, a year's interval, when at all possible, should be made between school and college—say between eighteen and nineteen—a “Home year” to look round on life, to do things for others, and to realize what ordinary life outside school and college is. Holidays and vacations are never the same: they are lived under the influence of term time. This interval of a year is a better solution than an attempt to do too much outside the college curriculum during college courses. The girl will object that in this way she will “lose” one year—she will not go up to college with her classmates, and get rusty, etc.—yet this price is worth paying for the advantage of getting a year's break in academic life, for the main thing is to obtain a philosophical outlook. Somehow education must succeed in giving her this. English education prides itself, rightly perhaps, on the fact that it has evolved a method of training character: self-reliance, trustworthiness, the art of playing for a side, of taking a beating. We have aimed at, and in some degree we have achieved these virtues, but the quality which for want of a better term I have called the philosophical turn of mind—or rather perhaps wisdom—this it is harder to attain. To begin with, those who have to impart it—parents and teachers—are often lacking in it themselves.

The Free-woman

This attitude of mind is essentially not a characteristic of an age of quick emancipation and change, and yet it is this very slackening of tradition that makes personal sound thought and wisdom all the more necessary. Men are specialists in a variety of things: women are so often called upon to be "specialists in life," as Maude Royden puts it. So women must be philosophers in the sense that they must be able to think of life as a whole, to see things with a certain aloofness, so that they are not driven by the intense desires either of ambition or passion. They must know when to bend to circumstances and when to dominate them, and how to deal hourly with small material details without being mastered by them. The great irrevocable and exclusive choices which woman is called upon to make demand strength, will, and intuition. In the majority of cases she needs to be more of a philosopher than an intellectualist.

Perhaps all this side of education depends more upon home than school, but the school must co-operate and not make it impossible. To this end, school administration must not dominate the teacher: there must be a measure of calm and unhurried work in the child's life; time for thought, time for useful side-tracking in class. Grown-ups—teachers and parents—must not be too much afraid of sharing their experiences with the children. Whatever the curriculum in our girls' schools, the pupils, while being taught the various subjects, must at least be taught to think. An enormous pro-

portion of educated women are either mothers, teachers, social workers, or organizers of some kind, that is to say, engaged in work demanding the capacity to hand on knowledge ; it is essential that they should be taught to teach. A woman is successful or unsuccessful as a mother almost entirely to the degree in which she can hand on wisdom and facts to her children in a way which they will willingly accept. Hence the utility for the senior girl of the study of elementary psychology, especially child-psychology.

The French, who are not such good educationists as the English as far as the formation of character and the development of the body are concerned, are in advance of the English in the matter of training the child to think clearly and to express itself with lucidity. These two gifts may be partly an innate quality of the race, but they are also the result of conscious continual training in school through the methods of interrogation in class, the amount of time given to essays and ethics, and to the handling of arithmetical problems. How often, in the training of even the small child, the gift of stating a thing clearly and attractively makes all the difference between a nursery "fuss" and pleasant obedience. It is almost impossible to exaggerate the importance of the mother's capacity to explain things. Without it, each generation has to do its finding out for itself. On the capacity for the handing on of wisdom depends the growth of civilization; so the future mother must have the kind of education

The Free-woman

which will make her able to explain and transmit what life has taught her.

Nor can we afford to neglect the artistic and scientific side of the girl's education, both from a professional and a home point of view. At every turn a scientific outlook and some knowledge of elementary science, especially perhaps anatomy and physics, are useful in the housewife, for more and more does applied science offer its services to the home-maker. Nor can we reduce the artistic element, for on all hands we are sighing for beauty in the material world, and our home-makers must be artists.

It is, however, futile to add to the list of subjects which must be learned, and then plead for more calm and leisure. For most people economic conditions exclude one of the ways of covering more ground in less time, that is, the method of having smaller forms in the schools. So if we are to add in some directions and keep calm and leisure, we must simplify in other directions: that is essential.

It is quite obvious that, with the present large forms and with present methods we cannot possibly, without strain, teach a child all the things which seem useful—or even at the first sight important. An essential qualification of the educationalist must be the courage to omit, to break with tradition if necessary, in the process of experimentation.

A revolutionary person can see three ways in which a child's work can be immeasurably

reduced and the energy employed partly in leisure, partly in more culturally fruitful ways.

1. The introduction of phonetic spelling, which would save somewhere about a year's school time.

2. The introduction of the metric system, which would save the equivalent of another year.

3. The substitution of French by Esperanto for the average school child.

Whatever we think of these modifications, looking at the life of the fifteen or sixteen year old high school girl of to-day, one is driven to the conclusion that, in the interests of the race, we must make courageous "cuts" in her curriculum; these, I think, seem less detrimental to her general mental powers than the exclusion of anything else. We should increase the element in her education which conduces to clear thinking all through school life, and reduce to a minimum those which work the other way. Happily the convention by which all girls, irrespective of gifts or tastes, were expected to learn the piano, is breaking down, but let us not replace it by the convention that all girls must learn Latin verbs and declensions, or even French.

In giving up the idea that education consists in making a girl attractive by teaching her "accomplishments," we must not think it consists in getting through matriculation and doing all the things boys do. It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that a large proportion of our

The Free-woman

boy's education, then those who wish to prepare their daughter for the possibility of marriage and motherhood as well as for the possibility of a profession, will avoid the co-education school; but as a matter of fact, from the better, more deliberately planned co-education schools come women who are less purely professional and masculine in their outlook than those coming from the girls' schools which grew up at a period when girls were more definitely competing with boys.

Against the co-education school, which is simply a boys' school into which girls are made to fit, there is obviously much to be said, but the better co-education schools have made a serious attempt really to meet the needs of both, whilst at the same time giving them that knowledge of each other which is useful in later life. Obviously both the professional woman and the married woman need to know from experience whether, and in what ways, the masculine mind and temperament differ from hers, and how men and women can best understand and co-operate with one another. So much human happiness in marriage depends upon this understanding, that for any system of education which attempts to meet this need there is much to be said. Some of the changes which we advocated in girls' education are really to some extent needed by the boys too: more leisure, and less of the competitive element.

In the last resort, what the woman needs above all is to realize in herself the Christian paradox:

the call to self-sacrifice and the realization of the value of personality. The old type of boys' school or girls' school, which is still too much influenced by the tradition of boys' education, with its stress, competition, ambition to pass examinations, is not the right place for the girl to discover these truths. What is bad for the girl is a purely masculine training, because some traits of that same "masculine" training are non-Christian, and their spiritual deficiencies make the mother's vocation especially hard to follow. Further, since women are more intense than men, they are, in circumstances which encourage ambition, tempted to be more competitive and more ambitious than men.

Whether England as a whole, on the ground either of psychological or practical difficulties, turns down co-education or not, the fact remains that the type of education produced in the newer co-education boarding schools is valuable as an attempt to attain a synthesis, so to speak, of the masculine and feminine. Some of the women who are most fitted to adapt themselves either to professional or domestic life were trained in co-education schools.

*

* *

If, in speaking of education, we began with the school rather than the home, it is that of late years, in the education of girls at least, the school

The Free-woman

has often been the dominating influence. To the mother who wishes to suggest or modify something in the programme, the big-school-girl replies: "Mother, you don't understand. At school we must do this; all the others are doing it," or "The teacher says we have got to do so." Many mothers, especially those who have had fewer chances of education themselves, see their girls carried off into a world where they cannot follow them. Proud of her children having these opportunities, or just overcome by the current of change, the mother has to stand aside and let things take their course. Examiner, teacher, daughter, are too much for her. Further, in the face of so much assurance, she begins in spite of her misgivings to wonder if all this drive and overwork are not after all for the best and part of the necessities of the new age; and in many cases the daughter seems carried beyond the reach of the mother's influence, so that there remains in the girl's life only the school, that is, the influence of single professional women (one is thinking at present mainly of the people who are the first generation to receive a secondary education). A few years ago, mothers disapproved more often than not of the girls' modern education. Now mothers are more often proud of the children having advantages which they did not enjoy, and will often be the first to encourage their daughters' ambition without understanding some of its inevitable implications.

How is the tradition of the meaning of wife-

hood and motherhood to be handed on? The mother is, as a rule, not given to express herself about these things; she can only put them into terms which seem old-fashioned and unacceptable to the new generation. When the mother has attempted to express to her child that mystical belief in her vocation whereby she has lived and worked and suffered, it sounds just old-fashioned "sentiment" or "cant," since she uses set phrases ready to hand because she cannot express herself otherwise. Happily, spiritual inheritance often comes without words, and just where conscious handing on is most difficult, instinct and heredity sometimes come to the rescue. We must nevertheless recognize all that we lose through carrying so many girls away from their mother's conscious influence by giving them a mental outlook so different from their mother's and by putting them under the influence of single women during the most formative years; for the girl will often have to learn all her philosophy of marriage and motherhood late and alone, open to chance influences and swayed by the mood of the age.

In the great experience of marriage and parenthood, do we after all need tradition to help us? Can we think all its problems out alone? Because of the blindness and tyranny of old traditions we question tradition altogether, but we must then face the immense burden we put on individuals, often incapable of bearing it, of each thinking out all afresh for herself.

The Free-woman

We must do all we can to link up the mother's and the teacher's work. The Parents' Councils and Committees which have barely made their appearance in England are quite organized in many German schools. It is not simply the need for the particular girl's teacher and the mother to know each other, but it is necessary for teachers to know more about the life of the home-keeping woman and vice versa.

To turn to the home itself, in what way can the mother help to prepare her daughter for these two different kinds of life which may be the lot of any girl?

Fifty years ago the girl was taught to be the ornament of the home, "its ministering angel"—"its servant" the new woman would call it. Now she, like her brothers, is allowed to concentrate on the development of her intellect and personality. At the same time, in some homes, she simultaneously has to help in the old way. Here is the rub: the girl has the double burden, and in many cases it is too heavy. She has to pass the same examinations as the boys and to do odd jobs for the family, having withal less physical strength than her brothers. Yet we have said that we must keep the two possible vocations in view: the profession and marriage. This is a very hard problem for the mothers: exempt the girl from lending a hand in the house and feeling some sort of responsibility, and she will grow up undomestic and unused to serving; take too much of her time for house-work, on the other hand, and if she fail in her

examinations, how will she fare in the great economic struggle? Moreover, nothing wears the young out so much as the sense of conflicting duties.

Like the unjust steward of the parable, we have to compound with our debtor—in other words, to cut down the claims of study, as already described in the early part of this chapter (and let mothers be bold with argumentative daughters and plausible dignified headmistresses!), and the home claims must also be dealt with in the same way. It is feeling perpetually at the beck and call of home duties which wears the girl out. Some systematized work, some special times or holiday periods when the mother will be really relieved by the daughter, must be arranged, to go with the systematized work of school. The daughter often suffers because the housework is so unsystematic. The mother can do much by making the claims as definite as possible, so that the girl need not feel perpetually on duty.

A great deal of feminine revolt is born in girls when they find that the boys are given chances and opportunities denied to them, and burdens are placed on them from which the boys are exempt. Mary and John come home from school. John takes up a story book; Mary is told to prepare the tea. Mary is bound to feel rather sore unless she has no taste for reading, or unless she has been brought up to believe in some kind of mystical or religious way that it is her destiny to serve John. Yet mother's

The Free-woman

“unfairness” can be defended quite rationally : later on Mary may have to learn to run her home and get tea whether she feels like it or not ; besides, mother would tell you she waited on her brothers when she was young ; she might even add that if she asks more sacrifices from Mary, it is not that she loves her less, but associates her with her womanly service for the home (a more superficial reason, too, is that it is generally easier to get Mary than John to help). Yet this is not a judicious treatment of the problem ; it too often arouses resentment at the inequalities between men and women, which is just the thing we do not want to do, quite apart from the fact that it is bad training for the boy, who will make a disagreeable husband. It is just because we do not believe that the equalitarian standards are the ultimate ones that we must beware of stirring up the demand for mathematical equality by violating the youthful instinct of justice.

The frank dealing with the fact of sex will make a great difference to the new generation. It is not, however, enough to remove the element of false shame and secrecy : there must be a suggestion at the same time of the special responsibilities which motherhood brings to the woman. Reacting from the time when almost from babyhood the little girl was cramped and perpetually checked by remarks that “little girls could not do this,” and “it was unladylike to do that,” and “little girls don’t play rough games,” we are in danger of failing to give even

older girls any intuition of the special responsibilities which await them. The way in which a girl first faces her disabilities and suffering often determine her attitude towards her limitations later in life.

Here again, as in the over-emphasis of competition, while the failure is not only with the girl's education, but with the boy's also, it perhaps affects the girls more deeply if we let the child underestimate the element of pain and discipline in life, we make it harder for her to adapt herself to life. Readiness to accept limitations, sacrifice, or outwardly monotonous work, and to see in these limitations the law of life, is likely to make people optimists rather than pessimists.

CHAPTER VIII

How we need a new Material Setting of Life.

IN the more theoretic part of our study we were driven again and again to the fact that much of the wisdom of life lay in knowing when to be resigned and when and how to revolt or, to put it more mildly, when to accept and when and how to modify circumstances.

Now we come to the question of the material setting of life—the staging. However much we may believe that people should rise above their material circumstances, we know what an immense influence they have upon us, and that as we modify our own circumstances we are helping to change tradition in domestic life. New economic forms will create new forms of human friendship, it is true ; but it would be truer still to say that new types of relationship will produce new economic conditions—and new systems of domestic and social organization. The order of the day is experiment.

An important factor in the problem has been that the good resigned woman put up with conditions which she could and should have sought to modify. In trying to be unselfish, she did not realize that she could not suffer physically and intellectually without making her children and husband suffer too, and reducing

the amount she could do for the world and for them. Even now while half humanity is fretting uselessly over conditions which after all are inherent and could be a joy, others groan and accept foolish burdens of their own making. Do we not know the woman who sighs over the labour of a day's washing, consisting of so many unnecessary articles—white lace curtains, doyleys, mats, a pile of little white frocks for the schoolgirl daughter, and yet who makes no attempt to reduce the amount? Let those who are strong have as many white curtains and as many doyleys as they like; each one of us must have some scope for expression of our own taste, else our houses, reduced mathematically to the greatest simplicity, would all be alike! But the pity of it is that the woman who is weary, over-tired, and dejected as a result of washing or ironing a multitude of unnecessary things has not the intelligence or the spirit to do without them. She never seems to understand that husband and friends would rather have the good temper than the mats and doyleys. The art of life consists in finding the temper of mind which welds spontaneously beauty and simplicity. It is because there is in women a queer love of being a martyr that they so often accept conditions which could be modified. Doubtless this characteristic is a by-product of her instinct to sacrifice herself.

The process of simplification of material life needs to be carried on energetically. One glance at an 1858 frock will show what progress

The Free-woman

has been made ; but there is a constant inclination to complicate one thing when you simplify another. There is as much to be done as has been done already : in the matter of food, it is for us to find out how much cooking is really necessary. If half what the grated-carrot-and-nut-people say is right, we not only waste our time but do ourselves harm ! We must find out, not only in laboratories, but by careful recorded experiments in numberless homes.

Then there is the whole domain of scientific mechanical inventions and their application to housework. Within twenty years, even within the last four or five, the total number of hours spent on housework has been immensely diminished ; and here, again, the process is only begun. American moralists will warn us that women, having too little to do, spend their time eating chocolates and smoking—to which one would answer that it is “ up to ” American moralists to enlist them in some more useful occupation. You can't relieve some people from overwork without some others getting underworked and getting into mischief. In the presence of the overwork of thousands of women, the need is, as we said, research by people who keep æsthetic and hygienic considerations in view.

Another problem of modern domestic life is loneliness : quite a number of women have told me that for several years after their husbands went to work in a different town they never had one meal in some one else's house ; perhaps

A new Material Setting of Life

two people made rather formal calls, the calls were returned, and that was the end of it. Imagine a girl who has taught in a large school or has been a sister in a hospital having interesting work and a circle of friends, who then marries and spends day after day in solitude, her husband being away from eight to nearly seven, doing her solitary housework, having a lonely egg and cup of tea for lunch (for it does not seem worth cooking much for herself) and waiting for evening to come. Her friends congratulated her when she got married; she has a good husband, a roof over her head, and enough money to live on—so no one would dream of thinking that she needed help or sympathy. But days seem long and the perpetual repetition of the same tasks monotonous. On the other hand, the husband does not wish his wife to work outside the home—besides, schools will not take married women; it is often also too great a strain to do the house and full-time outside work. Many try it for a while and give it up, and in any case regular work would have to be abandoned when the child comes.

Solitude is a delight when we seek and find it: it is apt to appear as loneliness when it is imposed upon us. Further, when intellectual pursuits are possible, solitude is a joy; it is not when we are leading a practical life which does not occupy the mind. A book is better company than a scrubbing brush—though the latter may have its points. Many also miss the

The Free-woman

element of comradeship which they enjoyed in business or college life. In the old days, when people tended to live and marry in their own town, things must have been very different. Regular Church- and Chapel-going and share in Church work left no room for loneliness. Friendship, occupation for spare time, help in emergency grew out of the Church life, and this is still the case for some. But more and more does one find this loneliness and waste of young women's gifts and energy. This suffering is unnecessary and not the rightful, inevitable part of the sacrifice of marriage. If it is prolonged for more than a temporary spell, it becomes bad for wife, husband, and possible children. It is worth overcoming shyness, "seeming to push"; it is even worth working with or making friends with people of whom you are inclined to be critical, rather than let your capacities and energies go to waste. There are always babies' welcomes and settlements which are glad of help, lonely and sick people who need visiting, and many ways of utilizing professional training in social work. The whole difficulty seems to be to find these people and bring them into touch with those who need them. Apart from voluntary work, we should help and encourage women to find paid part-time work when they have no children.

In this work of bringing together women who have time and energy to spare, and those who need them, several people can help. There is the neighbour, the employer's wife, the vicar

A new Material Setting of Life

and minister, who might try to put even the young woman who is not a regular Church-goer into touch with some one who will find her work and friends, and lastly, some labour bureau that specializes in this kind of case. There should certainly be in every town some society or agency to deal with this type of occupation. In these days of unemployment the question of paid work is difficult; it seems hard for the married woman who has her husband's support to be cutting out an unmarried woman, but after all if the money earned is spent in getting extra help or extra things, some one is employed indirectly. Another point is that a part-time job may not be of much use to the single woman entirely dependent on her own earnings.

The full-time employment of married women is another question to which we shall return, but we need the sympathetic understanding of the situation of the married childless woman who finds it hard to fill her whole life with the upkeep of a few rooms and the cooking of meals—who is wasting her capacities and is in need of more friendship in life, and yet who is not at present willing to come into fellowship with any Church. While some people in certain professions, who are not given to shyness, are asked to do more things than they can possibly get through, and have numerous friends, others have no friends and no use for their spare time. In a small town the problem is simpler, but in a large town it is no easy matter to rescue the shy newcomers from loneliness, from unbroken

The Free-woman

housework. Especially is this so where they go to no place of worship and the husband's occupation is not such as to give the young married people a ready-made circle of acquaintances. Domestic life is not sufficiently balanced by outside activity and fellowship, and some women are then apt either to lose the habit of thinking of the outside world, or to feel that marriage has demanded too great an impoverishment of life. Again, there is the danger of the woman's unnecessary submission or futile revolt, where the situation calls for common-sense modification of circumstances through a little courage and initiative. There is an enormous waste of capacity and energy; and that unused energy is acting as a poison in society.

We may find it good, after a strenuous life before marriage, to have a quiet spell for a while, with time to think, to adapt oneself to the new life which is beginning, get up physical strength, read books that one had no time to read before. We may accept thankfully and make good use of a certain amount of solitude, but there is a point when, for many, the lack of friendship and outside stimulus become a source of depression from which we must rescue ourselves and others, if they will let us. The trouble, however, is that being lonely is one of the bad habits which it is hardest to lay aside. Fastidiousness, touchiness, pride about differences of material conditions, inability to return hospitality in the way it was received, all these hamper the liberty of fellowship and upset the

balance of those three claims—of God, the home, and the wider brotherhood of men and women outside. To-day the evolution of a Christian type of womanhood is dependent upon that harmony.

We have spoken of the loneliness of many women in the early years of married life, but many know by experience that the loneliest time was when they were caring for a baby. The child deprives the mother of the company of her own thoughts and books. Five or six hours alone with a teething baby is the most utter loneliness imaginable to the inexperienced mother; she is debarred from the comfort of solitude; the letter from home remains unopened, it is a struggle to keep up the fire and make a cup of tea, she is not allowed even to gaze a moment at the sunset outside. The baby cuts the woman off from all former occupations, old friendships become materially difficult to keep up; when friends do come, it is often very hard to carry on a rational conversation with a ten-months' old baby present; attending a place of worship becomes a problem, and if a woman has say even four children, at intervals of two or three years, that condition of things will last from eight to twelve years at least.

That is the fact which must be faced—we must try and get not only a “mystique”—which will inspire us, but modify the modifiable conditions for the welfare of all concerned. One alleviation is the presence of effective servants,

The Free-woman

and that brings us to the question of domestic service. Are we to look forward to a time when Mary Jane will have altogether disappeared from the scene—or can we reckon with her?

So many conditions of post-war life have gone to make the situation of the mother more difficult: these are almost too obvious to mention, but many older women find it hard to understand the modern girl. The expenses of life, the lack of room, and the difficulty of getting good servants mean that many daughters of women who led leisured lives have now to do all their housework themselves. Whether the servantless condition has much to commend it or not is another question, but it makes life more strenuous, and it means that although in theory the middle-class Englishwoman is freer than ever, in practice, if she is married, she is more tied by material necessities than her grandmother was by convention; lack of time and strength are just as effective a bar to intellectual development as any restrictions imposed by custom. It is, in fact, almost an irony of fate that the generation of women who have won almost every right and broken all the conventions which debarred them from freedom to work and study should be the first generation to be tied by the stern necessity of cooking the next meal, washing up, and looking after the baby's laundry. Feminists and anti-Feminists should realize that although Parliament has given the woman the vote, although professions

and universities have opened wide their doors, and although Mrs Grundy has become more indulgent, while skirts and hair have been cut short, yet the married woman of the middle class has not for many generations been so tied by "Kinder and Küche." The halving of the income and the exit of Mary Jane make more practical difference than the vote or anything else.

Certainly the ideal thing is that we should live more simply, and that all inclinations to think certain things menial and the people who do them beneath us, should disappear; but although too much of the world's time and energy has perhaps been spent in the past on housework, certainly too little has been spent on the rearing of children. While two nurses and a governess may give to a family of children more attention than is good for them, the mother of several young children, who is doing all the work of the house, cannot give enough time to the nurture of the child, especially now that we have replaced the older, more rigid discipline by methods of training which demand far more time. The more we try to train the child by letting him have much freedom and by explaining our orders, the more time we must allow, or else we have complete anarchy. . . . So our more modern methods of discipline call for an organization of life which will leave us adequate time and strength.

Urgent things like the getting of the next meal are apt to crowd out the moral and intel-

The Free-woman

lectual training. Those who know the lives of working women see every day how hard they find it to discipline the children. The child gets what he cries for, because his mother is too worn out after doing the washing and the cooking for six people to have the energy left to stand the baby's cries. All the strength goes to domestic work, little is left for the training of the children, and little time left for friendships with them. The Christian ideal cannot be this levelling down of our way of life to a condition which is so apt to crowd out the one essential thing, the nurture of the child. Many middle-class mothers one sees are driven to this same neglect of the intellectual and moral training of the child through domestic overwork.¹

This problem of getting through adequately all that is to be done is met in America by the development of machinery as applied to housework. We, too, can do much in that direction, but it cannot possibly adequately solve the problem, because when children are concerned too many unmechanical things remain to be done; besides, it will be a good many years

¹ In taking for granted that the normal family will consist of several children, I do not forget the duty of seeing that they do not come so near together that proper care of each is impossible. I do not know of a single case of a middle-class family where three or more children have been allowed to come near together (by which I mean smaller intervals than two to three years) in which the health of the mother, the harmony of the household, and the development of one or more of the children have not suffered to some degree.

before we can all get really convenient houses, and the tendency to the small flat will crowd out the child altogether. In fact, that is the danger: if we insist on living in conditions where we are independent of help, we shall see more and more childless or one-child families. Any mode of existence is wrong which forces the child to fit into a way of life in which there is really no room and time for it.

In many lands, and for untold centuries, the patriarchal system has solved the problem. Missionaries from Korea have described the difficulties of the more "emancipated" young Koreans who are beginning to set up independent households at marriage. They wish to do it to imitate the missionaries and be progressive, but they are overwhelmed by having to care single-handed for the child and home; they are tied to household duties like none of the old-fashioned ones who live with their mothers-in-law. One sees how an intelligent woman like Gina Lombroso, the Italian writer on Feminism, thinks it a pity that the larger family life should be given up—the elder woman being responsible for the house, the daughter-in-law for the children. For Anglo-Saxon individualists it is psychologically impossible, but the problem remains: one pair of hands cannot do all adequately for long stretches at a time. The heroic efforts of the working woman do not prove that one person can, in present conditions, do all that is needed to train and rear four or five children; but who is to help? There is not

The Free-woman

the steady supply there used to be of women who will patiently and demurely do all our hard work for us, and ask nothing in return but £18 a year, and the worst room in the house to sleep in, and meals amidst the saucepans and dirty plates. Some people would feel it convenient if the wheel of time could be put back, but some of us are not happy about letting others serve us in this way. It is not only because of economic pressure and the scarcity of servants that many who used to keep maids struggle to do without help. There is an uneasy feeling about the whole matter. The old tradition between maid and mistress caused that state of things to seem natural. Some were born to serve, others to be served; this tradition is breaking up before our eyes; now we each have, as it were, to establish our own *modus vivendi*, and that always calls for a certain gift of the art of life.

It is good and right that many should try to do without help, not only through lack of funds, but through love of simplicity and of healthy hard work; but till the general standard of health is considerably higher, and till we get better housing and more co-operation, the average woman who has not been trained all her life to hard manual work cannot manage a house and several small children absolutely unaided without overstrain, neglect of the children or husband, and that complete absence of leisure and solitude which ultimately tends to react badly on all; so we should admit the

principle of accepting help in the bringing up of our children. "The servant problem" must be, and is, capable of a Christian solution. The one impossible attitude is to go on having maids as a disagreeable necessity: either let us do all ourselves or let us make the relationship of mistress and maid or mother and mother's-help something helpful to both, and one which we have brought into harmony with our belief in universal brotherhood and the value of each human soul. The essential thing is that we do not just use another life for our own convenience, but see to it that we are really doing common service. We can work together for the future generation, and the helper's work is an apprenticeship for rearing children herself later on, or if she is not to marry, it gives her at least some of the joys of managing a home.

There must be more than mere material reward, and we need more than material help. . . . If we keep people in our homes purely as a practical convenience and they have in no way a share in the spiritual making of the home, and they are exiled into a solitude which would be cruel to most natures, their presence will become an intrusion from our point of view.

Nearly all workers now claim more leisure and more pleasure than people used to do, and naturally domestic workers do too, but fundamentally the need is less that of improved material conditions than of increased motive for effort. Everywhere men and women need more incentive to work and devotion. They no longer

The Free-woman

feel like working unlimited hours just for a bare existence. Occupations which bear the stigma of inferiority are unpopular, because people have ceased willingly to accept labels which seem to imply an inferiority which is more unfashionable than ever.

Yet where strong incentive is given, people are still willing to work hard and well. It is no use trying to keep the old traditions: the war has killed them; but we can gradually create others: traditions of common devotion of mistress and maid to the work of creating a beautiful home. Few links can be quite so close, especially if this is based on a common religious aspiration expressed in common worship as well as in work. When there is only one maid or helper in the house we have to let her share in the home life and yet safeguard the intimacy of the family itself. All arrangements will have to keep both in view.

Another solution of the problem of domestic work is, on the contrary, to let the houseworker live more independently: limited hours of work, and life at her own home or in a hostel. This answers to the modern need for independence and community life. It will doubtless be the solution for those who need less help, and for the girls who need more independence. It is likely to be a more commercial arrangement, less is given and less taken.

Many feel the advantage of having as helpers people of their own kind of upbringing; fellowship and understanding are easier, but service

The Free-woman

feel like working unlimited hours just for a bare existence. Occupations which bear the stigma of inferiority are unpopular, because people have ceased willingly to accept labels which seem to imply an inferiority which is more unfashionable than ever.

Yet where strong incentive is given, people are still willing to work hard and well. It is no use trying to keep the old traditions: the war has killed them; but we can gradually create others: traditions of common devotion of mistress and maid to the work of creating a beautiful home. Few links can be quite so close, especially if this is based on a common religious aspiration expressed in common worship as well as in work. When there is only one maid or helper in the house we have to let her share in the home life and yet safeguard the intimacy of the family itself. All arrangements will have to keep both in view.

Another solution of the problem of domestic work is, on the contrary, to let the houseworker live more independently: limited hours of work, and life at her own home or in a hostel. This answers to the modern need for independence and community life. It will doubtless be the solution for those who need less help, and for the girls who need more independence. It is likely to be a more commercial arrangement, less is given and less taken.

Many feel the advantage of having as helpers people of their own kind of upbringing; fellowship and understanding are easier, but service

may be an opportunity of bridging over difference of class. At no other point do people of different classes—we may not like the word but the thing it expresses still exists—meet so closely together. It can have a place in bringing greater understanding between different sections of society.

Although, as I said, the relation of mistress and maid can be such a happy one, it is best, at present, to recognize the difficulties. These come from two people, who have most often been brought together almost by chance in a domestic agency or through an advertisement, having to co-operate with each other in a daily, hourly way in a work which touches the mother at a point where her possessive and jealous instincts are apt to be alive; add to this that they have a completely different outlook and education and habits. To make things harder, there is at present the influence of constant suggestion of conversation and jokes (how many nice maids do you see in *Punch*, for instance?) that the other is difficult to get on with.

On both sides we need much imagination and good nature, and a bringing of our best; but more than good nature is what is really needed—real sense of comradeship which comes from co-operation in the task of making a home for the child and a refuge for the stranger.

Lack of a sense of the significance of things, and lack of imagination are the causes of failure. In trying to understand people who differ from us, a recognition of the outside influence to which they are subject plays a great part. For

The Free-woman

that matter, for a woman to understand or deal with either her daughter or her maid, she must understand and allow for the effect of those tendencies of the age : a greater love of freedom, more leisure, more pleasure, more clothes ; a disinclination to show respect or obey without question. We may not approve of all their manifestations—we may try to help the younger ones to resist those we consider mistaken, but the futile thing which simply wrecks our relationships is to rail at them, and get out of sympathy with those who are inevitably more or less influenced by them.

We may seem to have wandered from our subject in stressing this question of servants, but what chance is there of woman finding or keeping some vision of the will of God for her, if at the centre of her life, within her own home, there is discord. Nor dare we build our happiness on the unhappiness of another woman. With new housing conditions, limited families, husbands working shorter hours and nearer home, woman may be able to do without another woman living in her house, and even to take her share of outside work. But it is futile to remain blind to existing practical conditions.

*

* *

After all, economic conditions will prevent many women from having full-time help, quite apart from the temperamental difficulties, but

A new Material Setting of Life

some scheme of co-operation between families could be worked with success and profit. Ten small houses built round a quadrangle, with a common kitchen, from which the main meals could be fetched, a common building for laundry, and a common nursery where children could be left for short periods, the work of cook, nurse, laundrywoman, being undertaken by an expert, if the community is able to pay for it, or in turn by various members, if the resources are more restricted. There is no question of infringing on family life: this method simply means the reducing of manual work by co-operation, which means more leisure and therefore more family life. The sceptic will at once insist that the ten women will quarrel. He is very likely right; they may disagree about the menu, or the degree of ventilation to be had in the common nursery, if the only link between them was one of practical utility. After a time it is more than likely that half the women would rather have more troubles and more liberty. Nevertheless, this method would probably be successful if the motive for desiring leisure were very strong, as, for instance, the desire to do useful work outside the home, or if there were some spiritual link. But the desire for service, some common conviction, would probably hold together a group of women with some sense of give and take in co-operation. After some experiments, others might follow. A group of members of the staff of a French university lived in a private road of a suburb and carried on a

The Free-woman

good deal of co-operation: one taught the piano to all the children of the group; another did the shopping for several others; another the jam-making, and so on. This co-operation grew up quite spontaneously. Though the members of this large family have scattered, and some died many years ago, the memory is still very vivid amongst those who knew it. The link there was intellectual and idealistic; the motive for giving up some independence was the love of co-operation and of leisure for intellectual pursuits.

Where there is more money, it is easier to combine forces in domestic affairs, as is proved by the rapid increase of expensive service flats. The rub comes when stricter economy makes it harder to combine freedom and co-operation: then there has to be some strong motive like that of common service.

*

* *

One of the great problems for many women to-day is the increasing desire for both marriage and a professional life. It is rather a threadbare topic; but the present generation is still feeling its way and making experiments. Granted, as we said when dealing with the more theoretic aspect of the question, that we are called as far as possible to keep in our minds the balance between the claims of home and the wider

universal family, according to what circumstances and individual vocation shall suggest, how shall we face up to this question?

It could not be wrong in theory to bring up a family and at the same time do a successful piece of work outside the home. The one question is if it be psychologically and practically possible to give adequate care to both. Most of us do not—at present, at least. As long as the health of women is as it is, and the competition as severe, most of us during the child-bearing and child-rearing period will not find it possible to be good mothers and at the same time hold our own in a profession.

Many children are proud of their professional mothers, and grown-up sons and daughters may find that their mother's wider experience of life makes them understanding. These women will put down Hutchinson's Rosalie in *This Freedom* as an absurd creation: there was no real reason for all the tragedy; more calamities arise in the homes of worldly and too narrowly domestic mothers than in the homes of professional mothers. But in spite of the exaggerated melodrama of the end, Hutchinson has made a good study of the psychological difficulty: the present-day woman's passion for work, and the possibility of it making her cheat herself into thinking things were all right at home when they were not. It is hard to throw oneself into work and spoil it by knocking off because the governess has left or one of the children has measles.

A new Material Setting of Life

There is at present, however, in women, and to some extent in men, too, a very deep-seated haunting desire that life should enable them to share more fully than it usually does in a common work. While this desire appears similar to the demand for a married woman's independent profession, it is at heart very different, for it reveals what, at the heart of the woman's movement, is really drawing men and women together; a longing that marriage should be more of a comradeship in life, that both the work outside the home and within should be really jointly shared and not rigidly divided. Present-day conditions imply for most a divorce of home life and work outside; it is seen at its worst in suburban life, where the woman is absolutely cut off from any share in the occupation of a husband who barely sees the children except at week-ends. This, surely, is not what marriage should be: for while the physical aspects and the spiritual remain, the joyful working together of two people, going, as it were, step in step, the daily co-operation in the moulding of children's character—all this largely disappears, and with it much of the true purpose of marriage, which, in the highest sense, must be the union of two vocations. We must not, of course, take too external a view of what this union must imply, for two people could experience it very deeply, though manifesting it by two different types of external activity, but, as we saw when considering the spiritual and practical aspects of equality and freedom,

The Free-woman

stances that all their energies become absorbed by the running of a small house, but in the vast majority of cases the girl who finds in home and children either the complete satisfaction of her mental and spiritual needs or the expression of an unmistakable duty should not worry as to her contribution to society being inadequate. It is with the girl who fails to find such satisfaction in such work, and does not really feel that she was ever called to it, but that, on the contrary, she is neglecting something which is really vital to her, that we are here concerned.

For that matter, the desire to keep on a profession after marriage is by no means universal; many women from the first want to concentrate all their strength on home, and may come to marriage rather weary of the unrelenting demands of school or office, and very glad to think another will take the responsibility of wage-earning. In fact, in all walks of life where the professional or business life contains a good deal of drudgery, as the glamour of independent work gradually wears off, it may again come to be thought of as a burden than as a privilege; but however that may be, we are likely to see a certain number of women more strongly individualistic, who will still desire independent work, and it is in the interests of the community to remove the bars which make that work impossible. The married woman doctor or teacher has a very peculiar contribution to make; and society should help them to make it, rather than hinder them.

The Free-woman

it is not a sound policy to expect something spiritual to thrive while being deprived of all its outward manifestations and practical implications. Surely the two chief elements in life, love and work, should be neither warring with each other nor, as it were, entirely different compartments in life, but should be complementary and mutually supporting. The staging of life can either help or hinder this process. It is largely an individual matter whether that is best achieved by a relatively separate life or by more hourly co-operation. Present civilization allows for very little of that daily comradeship in activity; for it is a demand that can hardly ever be satisfied in the present economic system. A few artists, authors, agricultural workers can freely plan their own work so that the man and woman can, together and each in turn, arrange to share in the home and bread-winning activities; but in the present economic system, with its drive, rigidity, and relentless competition, the man and the woman are both competing in the economic market against single and childless people, and for the most part people must definitely choose to be within or without that labour market. If they are within, then all their strength must go to keeping their footing within it, and they are dependent on the other partner for caring for the child or children.¹

If we study medieval sixteenth or seventeenth

¹ Many would doubtless find the satisfaction of joint vocation in a really complete joint parenthood; but that is precisely what modern life makes so difficult.

century life¹ we realize that this is a comparatively recent development, reacting from the growth of capitalism. As work became highly organized, more rigid, and turned into a struggle for existence, it was inevitable that home and work should tend to separate, for the infant and the competitive system are at the two poles of life, and as the mother is the one who anyhow tends to be pushed out of the competitive field, she is naturally the one who becomes permanently isolated from it with the child. That is what the modern girl must remember when she complains that the modern man does not share enough in the running of the house. She must remember what it really implies to be caught in the present-day relentless competitive machinery, when you have children dependent on your earnings.

Here again we see the close relation between the feminist and democratic movements. The desire to bring material life more in harmony with the real needs of woman and child drives you to ask for a re-modelling of the whole of society. It is hard to base home on love and equality in a society based on competition and strife. Former generations, therefore, conceived of home as a kind of island in a stormy sea; but the essential Christian idea is the application of home principles to the whole of life. It is therefore natural that the demand for a Christian home should ultimately lead to a demand for a revolution in society; and it would be in line with

¹ See the book already referred to, Alice Clark, *Working Women in Seventeenth Century*.

Christian thought if the man's desire to be a better father and to make his wife share more in his daily life should be an important factor in breaking down a system based on other principles.

Short of a social revolution, however, we can imagine certain reforms which would tend to bring nearer the kind of life we desire. Shorter hours of work (which many social reformers believe to be possible—Lord Leverhulme spoke of six or even four being sufficient), the growth of the small garden city, involving less loss of time going to and from work, and anything making for a revival of agricultural activities. Generally speaking, it means getting away from the big industrial cities to smaller and simpler communities.

*

* *

Girls who are marrying now, or who are already married, must, however, face facts as they are now. What we have called modern conditions, *i.e.* high organized industry, the use of machinery, the life in large cities, the need for relatively long hours—all this is the framework in which most of us will, after all, have to live. The clock cannot be put back, and the transformation of present conditions is not demanded universally enough to be realized in a few years. That is for to-morrow, but what about the bride and bridegroom of 1929? They can try, if it is not too late, to choose one of the occupa-

A new Material Setting of Life

tions in which joint work is possible (there are really many such, if both are willing, in order to work together, to sacrifice the kind of work each would naturally have done had he been alone). They can make of common leisure the real expression of their common vocation (many a man, as it is, really finds in his leisure occupation the real expression of his personality, his work being merely a livelihood); they can think of life as did the men of Greece and Rome, as consisting in definitely different stages, none complete in itself: the theoretical in youth when he prepares for life; the practical, when we care for the coming generation; the philosophical and public when, the cares of child-rearing over, we express those things learnt in the earlier stages. It is evident that at each of those stages the co-operation of husband and wife will be expressed in completely different ways; they may learn together, if they marry very young, and in later years their contribution to the wisdom and experience of society may well be a common work; while in the practical stage actual occupations may be very different, but the link, while apparently more remote and needing more imagination for realization, is not less close for being more spiritual and mystical; and if pursuing separate ways does at times feel irksome, we remember that it is often all only a certain stage, bound to end in a few years.

*

* *

The Free-woman

There is another new factor in the evolution of women's position of immeasurable importance—that is Birth Control. It spells a quite new mastery over life: parenthood becomes a voluntary and optional matter: the woman can choose marriage and motherhood separately. This is not the place to discuss any of the medical aspects of the question. From a moral point of view it is a new power; like all powers it can be used for good or evil, selfishly or unselfishly, wisely or unwisely. It is a part of that new freedom which adds so much to our responsibilities. It is an opportunity for escaping from the creative side of love and lapsing into selfishness *à deux*; it is also an opportunity of sublimating the parental instinct in social or religious work. That is, the creative consequences of love can be expressed in a greater variety of ways; it can be used for the betterment of the race, and can help enormously in the process of social reconstruction; it can also spell race suicide.

It is easy to put forward insufficient and futile excuses for having very small families or no children at all, when a full experience of parenthood would have developed character and served the community. There are people "whose only idea of a baby is a Baby Austin," an easy life, nice furniture, good holidays, a comfortable and sickeningly unlovely existence, with love going rank. Birth control often helps people to forget that marriage loses most of its meaning when there is not common service to

A new Material Setting of Life

the child or to the community. Professor Zalkind, of Bolshevik Russia, who looks at the matter from a purely non-religious point of view, comes to the same kind of conclusion; one of his "twelve commandments" is: "Marriage only between people planning a long common life, between people fitted in every respect for joint creative effort."

By creative effort is not meant necessarily the producing of a large family of children; for we must serve society according to her needs and not according to our impulses or according to tradition. In England, at any rate (and it applies to many other countries), the problem is over-population, and the need is quality rather than numbers, reconstruction and re-moulding of society rather than expansion.

It is perhaps not without significance that the cry for work outside the home has coincided with the decreased need for child-bearing. It looks as though the race was guided by some subconscious instinct: just as, after the war, there was an increased birth-rate (especially marked in larger number of boys born), so now that science has decreased the death-rate, especially the infant death-rate, there should at the same time be a tendency among women to seek other expressions for the creative and nurturing instinct than the bearing of large families. So the impulse which drives the woman to concentrate less on the bearing of children can be viewed as the adaptation of the race to a later stage of civilization, where the rapid

The Free-woman

increase of population has become not only unnecessary but undesirable; and on the other hand the world is in crying need of social reorganization to become a real world family of God.

CHAPTER IX

The Future.

IT is impossible to look into the future without being convinced that the position of women is destined to undergo changes as great as—in fact, looking at women of all classes and races, greater even than—any changes already undergone in the past, and that such transformations must either entail directly, or at least be accompanied by, profound alterations in our social structure.

But it is in the nature of prophecy that, while prophets have a sense of coming changes and even foresee some of the details accurately, the actual fulfilment is disconcertingly both like and unlike the vision. That is true of the way in which the early leaders of the Women's Movement visualized the future. In some ways things have proved to be more like the dreaded fears of the anti-feminists, whose visions were laughed at as ridiculous, than the plans of the early supporters. Some of these spoke of the vote as something which would solve every problem, but in no way change the ordered life of the women of their day; though they spoke of radical change, one can see that they did not realize its practical or emotional implications, while the unreasoned fear of the anti-feminists

The Free-woman

that it was the beginning of a movement which would ultimately threaten the whole order of home life as they knew it was not without foundation.

So with us, all we know is that our imaginings will be strangely like and unlike the fulfilment. In dealing with life and people there are always innumerable unknown and incalculable factors. It is because the future is not fixed by fate, but will be what women make it, that great is the responsibility of those who can consciously think their way through to some reasoned position. We may be democrats, but democrats, in spite of their principles, have always believed in the responsibilities of minorities; in fact, they had to, being minorities themselves to begin with.

But though we must try to see where we are going—we realize that because our experience is so limited, and the way we tread is so new—we can never know exactly whither we are going or whither we are, willingly or unwillingly, leading others. It is because you cannot plan the evolution of human ideas as you can plan a house or a bridge, or a best frock, that in dealing with human things the means and the temper in which these are used matter so much. In so far as we can transcend the mood of sheer reaction from the past and follow a positive vision of our own we shall make progress. Discontent with what is, and a certain violent wrenching away from it, may be an almost inevitable mode of advance for weak human

creatures ; but we must go beyond that stage : the past is neither all right nor all wrong—neither are the tendencies of the age altogether good nor altogether bad.

What then goes to create that strong current which we call the tendencies of the age and which seems to sweep people along ? The same economic conditions bringing together a large number of people in similar circumstances ; the same ideas expressed in political propaganda ; the infection of example, word, and thought which acts so strongly both on the sensitive and the thoughtless ; that passion to be like other people ; in a word, the herd mind. And within it all somewhere a leaven, a something which seems to come from deeper sources—one would almost say some inner call to a whole generation—all so intertwined that the thoughtless following of fashion, the foolish *idée fixe*, the stupid adopting of new shibboleths and catchwords, are mixed up with that something deeper ; overlaying it, degrading it, or ousting it out altogether. “ The breaking-down of tradition,” I remember being told by someone who was deploring modern movements, “ may be a liberation for the moral *élite*—in fact, it is ; but it means that the rank and file, who are not capable of individually taking a strong moral line, are left without help or guidance.” And the answer is that when we break down tradition, a new tradition must grow up, some capacity for moral judgment must develop, or else it is true that we shall be worse off, being

The Free-woman

left a prey to our own blind impulses or vagaries of passing fashions and crazes.

Another sure prophecy is that rapid evolution will mean moral suffering. One individual responds quicker than the other; there are differences of point of view and deep misunderstandings between mother and daughter, husband and wife, which are bound to hurt; contradictions within the same personality which must cause pain. There will be material conditions which do not express or correspond to the needs of the individual. All this spells social friction, not found in a more stationary, less individualistic society.

So we shall have to take this suffering as part of the day's work, so to speak—until having gone past this individualistic stage, we shall have come out into a spiritually integrated society. In the past that peace and continuity was attained by a large degree of uniformity, by a deep-seated belief that there was only one possible point of view, only one possible way of looking at womanhood, only one possible set of traditions and customs compatible with happiness and the development of human personality: many women have thus been happy under a régime which might seem intolerable to us.¹

¹ "Only those who have been thrown into contact with a stationary and homogeneous society such as that of primitive African tribes before coming into contact with Europeans, or such as the up-country Boers of South Africa were twenty years ago, can realize adequately how wholly free from moral and social problems and social

Traditions, customs, laws, all the theory and practice of life, express generally two things, a "mystique" or ideal, and human "selfishness." In the proportion in which all this expresses an ideal rather than a selfishness, it is worthy of respect or not; but the result of the two are so blended that it is hard to distinguish, impossible to weigh up accurately.

The "mystique" is generally one-sided: out of the wide field of reality one side only, one side of the coin of life, so to speak, is represented. The selfishness has naturally and inevitably been that of the one in the strongest position; that is, up till now, of the man; the "mystique" expressed is that of motherhood and sacrifice.

The new customs, laws, general ways of life will be good, not in the measure in which they simply destroy the old, but in the measure in which they refuse either the substitution of one selfishness for another or the balance of two equal selfishnesses, and stands rather for a greater "mystique" than the old one, which is twofold, expressing the motherhood of the woman and her real freedom to serve in the highest and widest way. That it is difficult to comprehend both is obvious . . . but that it is essential is also obvious.

friction such a society can be. It is in studying such societies that the truth is vividly forced on one, that the key to half, and more than half, of the phenomena in our social conditions can be found only in our rapidly changing conditions necessitating equally rapid change in our conceptions, ideas, and institutions."—Olive Schreiner, *Woman and Labour*, p. 268, note.

The Free-woman

That individuals everywhere and whole groups and nations will swerve more to one side or the other seems, the more one looks at the evolution of mankind, almost inevitable, but we know that fundamentally the two aspects are not opposed. Certain ways of stating questions, certain circumstances or moods, especially at times of revolt, make aspects of truth appear contradictory when in reality they are not.

The more the remaining customs and laws which express man's selfishness are opposed by the men themselves the more easily will women probably find the true balance. If men fail (as they may very well, for there is nothing harder to see and believe in than the necessity of giving up one's privileges), then women will have to work for it themselves, and they will not find it easy to do so without hurt both to themselves and to men. The strong sense of vocation to help other women will prove the best motive, and not only other women—but men, too. And we must keep the rooted belief that ultimately, however conflicting interests may appear on the purely material plane, the happiness and spiritual development of both sexes are wrapped up together and interdependent.

APPENDIX

Cuts in the Curriculum.

Now at the risk of sounding revolutionary and Utopian I would suggest some very important "cuts" in the curriculum which would enable us to have more time for science, literature, art, and leisure. They are not things which any individual school can put into practice to-morrow, but they are things for which public opinion can prepare, namely: phonetic spelling, the metric system, and the replacing of French by Esperanto.

It is useless to bring forward the objections to these drastic changes without really attempting to prove that the advantages which would accrue are not worth the sacrifice. We must realize the enormous gain of time, of time which could be put to better use.

The question of the metric system, too, is not merely an educational problem: it touches the whole of life and implies a reorganization of our daily existence, but educationalists should press for this reform on behalf of the children. The elementary school teachers estimate that in the aggregate the equivalent of a year of the child's school life goes to mastering our complicated system of measures and learning to do the elaborate reckonings.

Taking a broader view than merely the saving of time which could be used in a better way, there is the effect of these subjects on the general mentality of the child. They call for the capacity to exercise the memory in a purely arbitrary, mechanical way;

again and again when the child asks the reason, the teacher has to say that there is none, or if there is, the child would not understand it. T-h-o-u-g-h makes one sound, but c-o-u-g-h does not rhyme with it, as you might think. The five-year-old feels he is being introduced into a puzzling, unreasonable sort of world; grown-ups do not seem surprised at what appears very stupid to him. Some of us can remember how our first reading lessons made us feel that the world of grown-ups was an unreliable world, where one never knew what was expected of one. If half of what we are told of the importance of first impressions is true, then it matters very much if our girls and boys, when they are first introduced to the world of letters, are impressed by the reliable and logical, or the arbitrary, unreasonable side of things. We shall of course answer that as life is full of things which are not logically planned, but the result of growth, our little ones had better grow accustomed to the world as it is, and thereby obtain the sense of the gradual development of things; but as a first foundation the teaching of logic is more important than the teaching of patience with illogical things, which surely ought to come second. Bigger children who pursue their studies could learn the older spelling and something of the ancestry of the English language; then the queer inconsistencies of our spelling would have meaning.

To a large extent the question as to whether French should be taught to all the children of Secondary Schools is very similar to that of phonetic spelling. To replace French by Esperanto would be to replace a subject which is difficult, which demands memory for detached details, but which bears the impress of the life of a nation, by a simpler, easier subject characterized by clearness and logic, and associated with the idea of universal brotherhood. A wide experience of French matriculation papers of schoolboys and

schoolgirls at matriculation standard makes one feel that the results do not justify the time and trouble spent upon the study of French. The average girl would not understand a Frenchman speaking his own tongue, nor could she talk to him to any extent, nor is she ever likely to read a French book for pleasure. The study of a foreign language has been of course of some use—most things are of some use—but considering it has meant from five to ten hours a week for at least four years, is the result good enough? The fault does not lie in the teaching: well-qualified, painstaking teachers cannot teach large forms of children the intricacies of a language like French, nor is much conversational French possible in the circumstances. The average child has not a sufficiently strong motive to make him undertake a task which implies so much drudgery, and lack of adequate motive is an important factor in the fatigue caused by drudgery. It is far better to confine the study of French to children who will make a special subject of it: to bright children, those gifted for languages, those who can have spells abroad, or who will pursue the subject after. From an international and cultural point of view, it is more necessary that a few should know the language really well than that thousands should have a degree of knowledge which can have scarcely any practical or cultural value at all. Since, however, from the point of view of the child's capacity to think, he needs to distinguish the idea from the word, we must have a language besides English. Esperanto or Ido is a useful solution: these are good, too, for broadening the child's sympathy, and later would make travel easier. It is futile to object that the study of one of these two international languages introduces us to no literature, for ordinary matriculation French does not do so either. One-fifth of the time which is spent on matriculation French would enable a child to write and speak

The Free-woman

Esperanto easily. Schools which have tried it find that it stimulates the child's interest in the people of other countries, as correspondence with children all over the world can be part of the Esperanto lesson.