

The argument which prevails over all others is that which was put forward by Sir Edward Grey, the Foreign Secretary, and dwelt on at some length by Lord Crewe in Parliament. This argument is that the ultimate construction of the Trans-Persian road is inevitable, and if England adopts on this question a hostile attitude the Government would run the risk of seeing such a road built some fine day in hostility to the country.

France, adds this paper, will give her full concurrence to the scheme, altho not at present directly interested in it. To quote further:

"France has no such arrangements to make as have been made between Russia and England, but interests of the first order invite her to facilitate the measures which those two countries are taking. Since the financial participation which has been asked of France confer upon her a right to participate in the negotiations and the preliminary deliberations, she ought to do all in her power to make this a means of international accord throughout the whole world, at the same time guaranteeing for the capital invested desirable and solid securities."—*Translation made for THE LITERARY DIGEST.*

CONFESSIONS OF A SUFFRAGETTE

THE CLEVER playwright, essayist, and public speaker Cicely Hamilton, whose comedies have been favorably received by New York audiences, writes in the *London Daily Mail* an article under the heading "Why I Became a Suffragette." She has already produced a one-act play, "How the Vote was Won," to illustrate her principles, altho hitherto it has only been acted by suffragettes, and happily did not include window-smashing or hurling of deadly weapons. She herself was "always," she declares, "a feminist in embryo—by temperament if not by conviction." When "six or seven or so," she was filled with "envy and resentment" over "the preferential treatment and superior prospects of the human boy" and "the artificial limitation of the energies of the average human girl." Later on she found that because she was a woman she was expected to be "charming," and she had "a galling sense" that "what people liked in her was not what she liked and believed to be highest in herself." Yet in obedience to "hint and precept and pressure of example and opinion" she tried to make herself "an attractive personality." At last, however, she came to think this course of self-training was absurd, and she now declares:

"I do not know exactly how and when the whole business first struck me as ridiculous—the perennial persevering endeavor of many and various women to mold themselves to the same pattern (often against the grain) and attain to the same end, domesticity and marriage. But I can look back upon a time when the boring and ridiculous nature of the process, so far as I was concerned, had dawned upon me definitely, and I had decided that it was quite unnecessary to continue it.

"Followed the inquiry as to whether a good many of us were not wasting our best energies along the line of most resistance; and the conclusion that there were frequent exceptions to the rule that a woman found happiness only in the service of her

husband and of child—in short, I began to ask myself how far I and the other women of my acquaintance were really and honestly in want of the things that we had been told from our childhood were what we ought to want. And I discovered not only that some of us, even while striving to attain them with all our might, were not at all in need of them, but that a considerable number of us had not the faintest idea of what we really did want, coming eventually to the conclusion that we, who were women, were creatures not of one possibility, but of many, and that the best and most necessary thing for us to do was to find out as speedily as might be what those possibilities were."

She eventually reached another stage in the development of her feminism. She was convinced that men as a class do not support women as a class, and she recognized that most women work, not for themselves, but for others, altho, unlike men, they receive no wage. To quote her words:

"Long before I had arrived at this conclusion I had, like every woman who works for her bread, got rid of the delusion that women in the mass were supported by men in the mass—as an act of amiability and protection. At one time of my life I knew few women who did not work for a wage, and those few, for the most part, differed from their wage-earning sisters only in this—that they toiled without monetary guerdon. Thus, long before I had learned to dispute, in so many words, the proposition that woman's place is the home, I knew that women situated as I was could not stay at home unless they wished to starve; the said knowledge leaving me with small respect for venerable sentiment, and helping, in no small degree, to develop me from a mere rebel, conscious only of personal misfit in the scheme of things, to a full-fledged feminist—that is to say, to a woman who understood that her sense of misfit and restive-

ness was not peculiar to herself, but the characteristic of a repressed and restive class."

Miss Cicely Hamilton does not deny the superiority of the male sex, and has never claimed that the principal part of human genius and ability has been allotted to women. But she often pities men who go through life hampered by the burden of useless, incapable womankind. She writes for women to share the political power and social independence of the male from a desire to help and relieve him. As she says:

"I may add—tho I be not believed—that my feminist faith is not, and never has been, based upon a belief in the essential superiority of the human woman over the human man. On the contrary, I believe that the male of the human species is, take him all in all, a more advanced, competent, and capable creature than his female relative. If it were not so, I should not see the force of demanding for his female relative the freedom of opportunity, which, to a great extent, has made him what he is, while as regards the evils to be remedied, the wrongs to be redressed by means of triumphant feminism, I do not confine my sympathy to the evils endured and the wrongs suffered by women as the result of their present subjection. On the contrary again, since I can declare, in all honor and honesty, that I am often moved to involuntary pity by the spectacle of the well-intentioned male staggering through life under the deadly burden which presses on his back—the burden of incompetent and helpless femininity. True tho it be that his own hands, prompted by his own owliness, have placed the burden there,



TWO SUFFRAGETTES OF THE THEATRICAL WORLD,

Miss Edith Craig (daughter of Ellen Terry) and Miss Cicely Hamilton. The former, on the reader's left, has done picket duty on the London streets, and the other, Miss Hamilton, has publicly debated the question with G. K. Chesterton.

he is none the less an object of sympathy! And tho he resents (as he generally does) any and every attempt to induce his burden to slip down from his shoulders and stand on her own two feet, we, who wish him well, shall none the less persevere in our charitable endeavors to save him from the consequences of his own mistakes!"

The economic side of feminism is especially dwelt upon by Marcelle Tinayre, "the leading French woman novelist," who, writing in the London paper quoted above, declares:

"A great many young girls who formerly would have thought themselves dishonored by going out to work are now forced to contemplate the necessity of having a profession, whether they like it or not. They have to choose between work and misery.

"And there are also with them, in countless numbers, the women who in the mate have found a burden instead of a help and have to lift the weight of the household. There are also the widows, the deserted women, the wives devoted to unlucky or invalid husbands, there are the women once rich, now penniless, only skilled in the art of managing a retinue of servants, but unfit for any practical work.

"It was by coming in touch with such women, in seeing their lives and their souls, that I understood, before I experienced it personally, that the march of feminism is neither philosophical, political, nor sentimental. Its causes lie deeper than in the mere longing for emancipation, or in the new sense of dignity, of responsibility, which have of late sprung into women's minds. Such longings, such desires are but results. The main cause is in the economic evolution which women did not want, but which they must accept."

ILL TRAINING AND SNOBBERY IN BRITISH ATHLETICS

THE DEFEAT of the English athletes at Stockholm and the manifest proof that they were outclassed created a good deal of astonishment in Europe, for it is allowed that England has for years set an example in the cultivation of bodily strength and endurance which other nations have followed. We learn from the Paris *Temps* that French school-boys and collegians are only during this present year becoming trained in sports and inured to fatigue, and that the authorities are waking up to the fact that if the glory of the nation is in its young men, "the glory of young men," as the wise man remarks, "is their strength."

The triumph of the American team is very ill-naturedly reflected upon by the London *Saturday Review*, whose comments we need not quote at length, as this journal is always opposed to things American.

Other writers attribute the British failure to defective training and diet, but *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* assures its readers that in any case England ought to be satisfied with her champions. The object of the visit to Stockholm was attained, for the object was sport and not quasi-professional success. In the words of this monthly:

"For our part, we can not deplore the failure of our English athletes, concerning which so much has been said by exultant Americans. Our organization may be bad; if it be so, it does not matter. Our system of training may be devised by amateurs; perhaps it is none the worse for that. At any rate, we travel across the seas to do our best and to watch the best of others. Even if we do not win, we shall have attained our end. But, object our critics, this is not enough. The failure of England in athletic sports, it is said, is a clear proof of degeneracy. We have taught the trick of running and jumping to others, and have instantly fallen behind ourselves. What does it matter, so long as we have avoided the pit of professionalism? It matters everything, says the noisy press of New York. Henceforth England is a back number in the world's history. If our champions can not run faster and jump farther than the champions of other countries, she is 'down and out' forever. Poor England! Still poorer Germany, who has not given a much better account of herself than Italy and Greece!

"The fact that the Americans led in the Olympic games proves neither the decadence of English courage nor the suprem-

acy of American wisdom. It is a triumph of professionalism, and of professionalism alone. It proves that at a given moment America has trained more efficient athletes than any other part of the globe—proves that, and no more. He who wins an Olympic prize returns to America what is far greater than a hero—'a made man.' He gets a post as trainer, and turns out other victors successful as himself. And it is precisely this spirit of professionalism, this lust to win, which will never be introduced into Great Britain. Wherever professionalism has flourished there has been an end of sport."

"A Suburban Athlete" writes to the London *Standard* to say that the cause of British defeat is much more than a question of diet or training. "Caste," he declares, "rules the world of athletics and all is snobbery." On this point the United States has the superiority. To quote his words:

"At present the whole tendency seems to be that only public school and university men shall have all the chances. Those who control the English contribution to the Olympic Games would like to see England represented by nice young men with nice pedigrees and splendid educations, but beautiful tho this idea may be, I think more attention ought to be paid to the humbler members of the community, and our position at the games might improve accordingly. In America a man has all the chances that his jumping or running talents entitle him to, even if he is the son of a dust-man. The Americans have no caste in athletics.

"I was present at the meeting of the Athletics Advisory Club the other night, when the question of how to do better at the next games was discussed, and there were several instances of the sort of thing I mean. A committee was proposed to consider the question of raising money, and it was found that every member was a university man, in spite of the fact that there were many officials of well-known clubs present who, altho not university men, were sufficiently prominent in the world of athletics not to be passed over so calmly. Then during the evening a gentleman got up and assured a mixed audience (I mean that a lot of us were ordinary athletes who had never been to a university) that he was sure that in the matter of training a gentleman athlete could only hope to be properly coached by a man who was also a gentleman. There was a world of iron-bound prejudice in the way in which he said it, and in several other ways during the evening this same spirit of caste prejudice was reflected by different speakers."

Commenting on these remarks, *The Standard* thinks that a suspended opinion on such questions is desirable, and gently declines to accept the views of "A Suburban Athlete." To quote the words of this conservative organ with regard to the case of an Australian rower cited by its correspondent, of which it somewhat loftily remarks:

"Our correspondent's point of view is worth consideration. A little clear thinking on the subject of national sports, as well as even graver problems, is unquestionably desirable; especially as there is a marked inclination to indulge in loose and vague debate, in which the real importance of physical exercises to the race and to the individual is hopelessly obscured. But however much they may be impressed by the hard case of an Australian athlete, who is said to have been excluded from an English rowing club because he had once rowed in a crew which included a police-constable, a majority of our readers would probably be slow to admit that class distinctions, carried beyond all reason, are among the chief impediments to the triumph of British athletes in an international competition. Indeed, we should not be altogether surprized to hear it argued that, as a matter of fact, there is just as much risk of overdoing the camaraderie of sport. Sensible persons will perhaps be inclined to imitate the caution of the Florentine Ambassador mentioned by Horace Walpole. This astute diplomat informed his court that some people said Cromwell was dead, and others that he was alive; but that for his part he believed neither story. But it would certainly be matter for regret if any steps taken to improve the national prowess in sports and games should tend to widen class distinctions. One of the greatest advantages which the nation can derive from their promotion, advantages even more desirable than the prizes awarded at Olympic meetings, is the removal of such barriers where they can be most easily removed. Joining with the less prosperous in their amusements and recreations, it has been said, is the next best thing to sympathizing with them in their sufferings."