

Equal Rights

VOL. XII, No. 4
FIVE CENTS

SATURDAY,
MARCH 7, 1925



Courtesy of the Albany Evening News.

Members of the New York Branch of the National Woman's Party

At the Capitol in Albany

Working to secure the passage of Equal Rights bills

Feminist Notes

French Suffragists Encourage Friendship

AMERICAN women and other enfranchised women visiting Paris will receive a warm welcome at the Committee for Immediate Suffrage, which organized on January 18. This is composed of members of Parliament and of different organizations interested in suffrage. The organizer, Mlle. Jeanne Melin, hopes to unite the efforts of all suffragists through this committee. Visiting enfranchised foreigners are expected to bring encouragement to the movement. Recently Dr. Stegman, a woman member of the German Reichstag, was invited to address a public meeting on "Woman Suffrage in Germany" and to participate in a conference attended by representatives of various nationalities for the reconciliation of all peoples.

From Darkest Roumania

THE constitution of Roumania, adopted two years ago, concedes political rights to women, but, as has happened elsewhere, these rights have been quibbled away. Parliament has evaded the constitution through interpretation as a result of which women are allowed merely a few representatives in municipal councils to act in an advisory capacity. Women are not only denied a vote, but may not even agitate for a change in the laws. Nevertheless the National Council of Roumanian Women, under the direction of Princess Cantacuzene, has drawn up a bill giving votes to women and making other changes in the Government designed to substitute civil service reform for the prevailing spoils system. The publication of this bill has stimulated discussion, and this, it is hoped, will bear fruit in a liberalized government.

Women Mount the Bench in India

LADY SADISIVA IYER of the Central Committee of the Women's Indian Association has been made honorable presidency magistrate of the city of Madras. The office is equivalent to that of a high-class judge. Although women have before this been appointed to places on the minor judiciary, this is the first time a woman has been given a high place on the bench in India. A similar appointment was given in the city of Mangalore to Mrs. Pandurango Rao.

South Dakota's Ignorant Legislature

SOUTH DAKOTA solons still believe women unfit for jury service. A bill making them eligible was defeated in the House by a vote of 37 to 53.

An Indian Policewoman

FEMINISM has made its appearance among the Blackfoot Indians. Mrs. Wades-in-the-Water, a full-blooded Indian, is a policewoman of the Glacier National Park Reservation, the first of her race to achieve such distinction. Her husband is chief of the Indian police. Although she has held the place for two years and has a reputation for attention to duty, she has not yet found it necessary to arrest a single person. In the task of maintaining order she finds moral suasion the most effective method, as do women police elsewhere.

Gathering a War Chest in Switzerland

A STRONG effort is being made by the Swiss Suffrage Association to meet the requirement of the Leslie Fund, which is now offering financial aid to suffrage movements outside of the United States. An offer of \$500 or 2500 francs has been made to Switzerland conditioned upon raising double that amount from suffrage sympathizers in that country. Mme. Emilie Gourd, president of the Swiss Association, has issued an appeal for the required funds.

Deputy Attorney-General a Woman

MISS REBA TALBOT SWAIN of Brooklyn, N. Y., has been appointed Deputy Attorney-General of New York. The place assigned to her is in the Workmen's Compensation Bureau of the Attorney-General's New York City office. Miss Swain is a member of the American Bar Association, Women Lawyers' Association and the King's County Republican Committee.

Women Farmers

THERE are 17,500 women farmers in Kentucky, of whom 11,640 operate farms. They have under cultivation 871,000 acres and the value of their farms is estimated at \$47,000,000. The average value of land and buildings of women's farms is somewhat in excess of \$4100.

Prize Awarded Woman's Party Member

AT the sixth annual prize story dinner, held under the auspices of the Society of Arts and Sciences at the Hotel Astor on February 21, the first O. Henry Memorial prize was awarded to Inez Haynes Irwin for her story, "The Spring Flight." The second and third prizes went to Chester Crowell and Frances Newman, respectively.

Mrs. Irwin is a Life Member of the Woman's Party and author of "The Story of the Woman's Party," a book that every feminist should own.

Achievements of Women Archeologists

TWO French women scientists have won distinction as explorers among ruins in Crete. They are Mlle. Martha Oulie and Mme. H. de Saussure, who have recently returned to Paris after superintending excavations on the site of Mallia, a city founded about 2100 B. C. and destroyed three or four hundred years later. They uncovered an entire section of this city around the palace of the king. Houses and other relics of different periods were disclosed. Stones engraved with pictures and unreadable inscriptions, vases made of some unknown material and other curiosities are numbered among the finds.

A Woman Introduces Efficiency

MRS. FLORENCE E. KNAPP, New York's new Secretary of State, although but a short time in office, has already achieved distinction for exceptional efficiency. Setting an example of promptness to her subordinates by herself reporting for duty promptly at nine each day, and by tactful dealing with all she has largely improved the morale of her force and made her office a model for all the State departments. She keeps in touch with her bureau heads at all times. She is now preparing for the Legislature the bill providing for the next State census, to be taken this year. It is the most complete measure in the State's history making provision not only for counting heads, but for thorough information on drift of population from city to country and vice versa. She is also taking measures for enforcement of the law requiring use of voting machines at elections, which her predecessors have neglected.

Woman Legislator Finds Honor Expensive

MRS. FRANK REEVES, member of the Washington Legislature, is finding the honor expensive. Her pay is five dollars a day, which will just pay for a room at Olympia. Mismanagement and incompetency on the part of male legislators having created the economic conditions responsible for the high cost of living, the bringing of the matter home in this way might encourage women legislators to urge their men colleagues into correcting past mistakes.

Wisconsin Keeps Eugenics Unequal

THE Wisconsin Legislature rejected the bill introduced by Miss Mildred Barber requiring women contemplating marriage to be subjected to medical examination as is required of men.

How Suffrage Works in Scandinavia

By Eleanor Danziger

FRANCE has its anti-suffragist women, as once upon a time the United States had. One of the leaders of this group, a Mme. Gabrielle Reval, saw fit to proclaim that Scandinavian women do not appreciate the vote, and that as a result of the grant of suffrage Scandinavian husbands are less inclined than French husbands to be nice to their wives. French feminists took these remarks seriously enough to publish information in rebuttal received from well-informed Scandinavian women.

Mme. Nina Bange, Denmark's Minister of Public Instruction, presented the following statement:

Percentage of Men and Women Voting at Municipal Elections, 1917-21.

Year.	Percent. Women.	Percent. Men.
1917	53.2	74.2
1918	67.6	84

1919	Not given	Not given
1920	72.2	82.2
1921	71.8	84

The women absentees consisted principally of unmarried women, widows or divorcees, who are only beginning to be interested now that other women are voting. In national elections the showing made is much better. Mme. Henni Forchhammer, Danish delegate to the League of Nations, reports that at the Folkthing elections in 1920 the number of women voting was 821,326, as against 755,390 men. Danish women secured suffrage in 1915, and in 1918, 651 out of 1000 voted.

From Sweden, Mme. Bertha Nordenson, president of the National Council of Swedish Women, reports that in 1921 the Riksdag put men and women on a plane

of equality requiring not only that women pay the same taxes as men, but that they respond in wartime to the call for national defense. They voted for the first time the same year, and 796,846 women went to the polls, as against 950,551 men. For the parliamentary election of 1924 nation-wide figures are not yet available, but in Stockholm 85,825 women voted, as against 77,374 men.

A Stockholm daily, *The Allehanda*, sent the inquiring reporter among literary and professional women to learn the results of their observations of the effect of political equality. Mme. Marika Stjernstadt said that suffrage has given women more matters of common interest with their husbands and made married life happier. Others said the same. Frida Stenhoff said woman suffrage stimulates men to vote lest women obtain an advantage over them.

I Went A-Lobbying

By Margaret Loring Thomas

I WENT to Albany yesterday, a-lobbying for Equal Rights. I am one of those persons who "used to go a-slumping, but who now go to Albany to work for reform legislation."

The ride from New York City to Albany, past the homes of millionaires, Sing Sing Prison, red houses with green blinds, green houses with red blinds, tumble-down houses with neither blinds nor color, the frozen Hudson in the foreground and the beautiful Palisades in the background which slopes into one flat field of white snow, dotted with ice houses and cocooned boats, is a panorama of every phase of life.

After such a ride one may arrive at Albany in a state either of exaltation or depression.

The climb from the Albany station up Capitol Hill over a sheet of ice is the beginning of the lobbyist's uphill work. I do not know whether the scrub women are Republican or Democratic or non-partisan, but I do know that the Capitol is cleaner than I have ever seen it before.

I sat in the gallery of the Senate Chamber when the Senate was called to order. A bill was mumbled. A man made some unintelligible remarks, and an opponent called him a "demagogical oligarchial." Unfortunately, the speaker swallowed the noun. The mumbling of bills continued—"appropriations," "highways," the disposal of babies born in prison." What an indictment of our civilization! More bills were mumbled, including one National Woman's Party Bill, "To amend the Surrogate's Court Act, in relation to persons entitled to letters of Administration."

The Senate adjourned. I caught a few Senators on the wing as they left the Chamber. Each man was fearful when he saw a woman that she wished to talk only of jury duty. They are as afraid of women on juries as they ever were of giving them the vote, and so they have an answer ready, "My wife, my daughter on a jury? Never! It's not that I am so opposed, but none of the women in my district want it."

"But, dear sirs, don't you think that your wives and daughters might improve juries by sitting on them? However, I wish to speak of other things as well as jury duty. How about equal opportunities for men and women in the schools?"

"Naw! We want more men in the schools. The schools are becoming feminized. Pay men a premium to make them teach. Something has got to be done to get men into the schools. You can get all the women you want for any price you pay them."

"There are other bills I wish to speak of: To amend the domestic relations law, in relation to the domicile of a married woman; to amend the domestic relations law, in relation to the right of action by or against a married woman for torts; to amend the domestic relations law, in relation to guardianship and parental rights; to amend the domestic relations law, in relation to declaring every child to be the legitimate child of both its natural parents, and making such child an heir of the father as well as the mother, and providing the judicial procedure for establishing paternity. To amend the

real property law, in relation to dower and curtesy; to amend the code of criminal procedure, in relation to the definition of vagrant."

"Women have more than men now. What do you want to take anything away from them for? I will consider the bills. Um, yes, um. I must catch a train." (This last remark is a favorite one.)

The guides who walk through the Capitol are an interesting exhibit. They all tell the same story just before opening the door of the Senate Chamber—"This is the most magnificent picture which ever was painted of Niagara Falls. It took a prize at the World's Fair, in 1893. The artist presented it to the Capitol."

What would the poor artist have done if the Capitol had not accepted it, I wonder.

Senators can sometimes be found in their committee rooms, but the lettering on the doors of the rooms should not be taken literally. "Printed and Engrossed Bills" is certainly indefinite enough to be read in more than one way. Let us also hope that the sign on the door of the Senate Education Committee room may be read in more than one way—

PENAL INSTITUTIONS
PUBLIC EDUCATION

Having a vote does make a difference in the way one is treated now when she goes a-lobbying. It is a great improvement on the old days, and I am convinced that there will be more improvement when we have Equal Rights. That is why it is worth while to go a-lobbying. I am glad that I went to Albany, and I hope that several men will remember what I told them when I was there.

Equal Rights



OFFICIAL ORGAN
of the
National Woman's Party
Capitol Hill
Washington, D. C.

Published weekly
at 19 West Chase Street
Baltimore, Md.

Edith Houghton Hooker, Editor
Dora G. Ogle, Business Manager

Associate Editors:

- | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Nina E. Allender | Rebecca Hourwich |
| Zoe Beckley | Ruth Hale |
| Brenda Euiland Benedict | Inez Haynes Irwin |
| Ruby A. Black | Ada Davenport Kendall |
| Elaine Sterne Carrington | Katherine Leckle |
| Lucia Chamberlain | Hazel MacKaye |
| Mabel Potter Daggett | Edna St. Vincent Millay |
| Phyllis Duganne | Ruth Pickering |
| Crystal Eastman | Alice Rohe |
| Ernestine Evans | Maryse Rutledge |
| Rose Feld | Miriam Finn Scott |
| Zona Gale | Doris Stevens |
| Helen Davenport Gibbons | Sophie Treadwell |
| Joan Grayson | Mary Winsor |

Entered as second-class matter at Postoffice,
Baltimore, Md., under Act March 3, 1879.

Subscription, \$2.00 A Year

OFFICERS OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

Lincoln 1366

- President, Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont, N. Y.
 Vice-Presidents, Alice Paul, N. J.
 Doris Stevens, N. Y.
 Elizabeth Selden Rogers, N. Y.
 Margaret Whittemore, Cal.
 Mrs. J. D. Wilkinson, La.
 Myrtle Cain, Minn.
- Chairman National Council, Elsie Hill, Conn.
 First Vice-Chairman, Gail Laughlin, Cal.
 Second Vice-Chairman, Edith Alinge, N. Y.
 Secretary, Anita Pollitzer, S. C.
 Treasurer, Sheldon Jackson, D. C.
 Congressional Chairman, Maud Younger, Cal.
 Executive Secretary, Mabel Vernon, Del.
 Finance Chairman, Sarah Pell, N. Y.
 Headquarters Chairman, Evelyn Wainwright, D. C.
 Headquarters Director, Martha Souder, Pa.
 Hdqrs. Furnishing Chrn., Florence Bayard Hilles, Del.
 Organization Chairman, Laura Cramer, Mich.
 Anne Archbold, Me.
 Dora Lewis, Pa.
 Florence B. Boeckel, D. C.
 Sophie G. Meredith, Va.
 Mrs. R. J. Caldwell, N. Y.
 Dora G. Ogle, Md.
 Helen E. Scott, Md.
 Zona Gale, Wis.
 Lois Warren Shaw, N. H.
 Sara Grogan, Ga.
 Dr. Caroline Spencer, Colo.
 Edith Houghton Hooker, Md.
 Amelia Himes Walker, Md.
 Inez Haynes Irwin, N. Y.
 Florence B. Whitehouse, Me.
 Elizabeth T. Kent, Cal.
 Mary Winsor, Pa.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

Annual Dues.....	\$10.00
Associate Members.....	\$1.00
Subscribing Members.....	\$3.00
Founders.....	\$100.00
Life Members.....	\$1,000.00
Endowers.....	\$5,000.00
Sustainers.....	\$5,000.00

OBJECT OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

To remove all forms of the subjection of women.

THE LUCRETIA MOTT AMENDMENT

"Men and women shall have Equal Rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction."

"Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation"

[Senate Joint Resolution Number 21.
House Joint Resolution Number 75.]

Introduced in the Senate, December 10, 1923,
by SENATOR CHARLES E. CURTIS.
Introduced in the House of Representatives,
December 13, 1923,
by REPRESENTATIVE D. R. ANTHONY.

A Specious Question

IN 1922 the Consumers' League published a pamphlet entitled "Twenty Questions About the Federal Amendment of the Woman's Party." This is one of the leaflets recommended by the A. A. U. W. to its branches for study in connection with the Equal Rights Amendment. On page 5 of this pamphlet the following question appears:

- "10. What will become of the penalties:
- for seduction?
 - for violation of the Mann Act?
 - for rape?"

A bracketed note follows, which reads: "The penalties embraced under question 10 obviously apply to men alone, and constitute an inequality, civil and legal."

We have before challenged the implication of this question and the accuracy of the note. Now further evidence appears to support our stand. On Friday, February 27, the following item was published in the Baltimore Sun:

"WOMAN IS INDICTED IN MANN ACT CASE"

"FIRST INSTANCE OF KIND IN BALTIMORE—COMPANION HELD ON SAME CHARGE."

"The first indictment under the Mann Act ever found here against a woman was returned yesterday by the United States Grand Jury against Mrs. Angelica Fontes. She was indicted jointly with Morris Fontes on the charge of conspiring to violate the law."

From a reading of the Mann Act it is perfectly clear that it applies equally to both men and women, for it provides specifically for the penalization of any "person" who transports a female for immoral purposes. Although the word "person" in the Constitution of the United States does not necessarily signify both sexes, we hope that in view of the incident cited there will no longer be concern lest the Mann Act is equally careless in its interpretation of plain language.

Facts vs. Fancies

ONE of the principal arguments advanced against the Equal Rights Amendment is the alleged "fact" that women cannot be organized. Various explanations of this painful circumstance are offered. "Women only go into industry for a short time until marriage," say the proponents of welfare legislation, "and consequently take little interest in raising labor standards." Or again, "Women are pin-money workers; they live at home, and consequently are not forced, as men are, to organize for a living wage and decent working conditions." "The nature of women" is also cited as a sure and lasting impediment to their use of the weapon so effective in men's hands.

Starting from this premise, we ourselves might almost grant the necessity for welfare legislation, though if women were such morons as to be incapable of organization, it might be even better to commit them all to institutions for the feeble-minded. The truth of it is, however, that the premise is all wrong. Industrial women both can be and are organized. According to the National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc., the number of women workers organized into trade unions more than quintupled from 1910 to 1920:

"In 1910 the female membership of American trade unions totaled 76,748, among thirty-four organizations. In 1920 the total was 396,600, among thirty-seven organizations.

"All organizations but two, the musicians and the brewery workers, had a larger membership at the close of the decade. Three important new organizations, not in existence in 1910, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, the Amalgamated Textile Workers and the telephone operators' branch of the Electrical Workers, contributed practically 100,000 members, or nearly one-fourth of the total rise."

The organization of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers alone affords sufficient testimony to establish women's ability to organize. Not only does a large percentage of the membership of the Amalgamated consist of women, but among these members many are foreign-speaking and very young. They are precisely the type that our opponents claim cannot be organized, and yet they have been organized in one of the strongest and most idealistic unions in the world. In addition, they have raised labor standards in their industry far beyond anything that has ever been achieved by protective legislation. These are the facts, but apparently they mean little to the opposition.

Constructive Revolutionists

By Sue White.

Editor's Note: This address was made by Sue White, LL.D., Tennessee Chairman of the National Woman's Party, on the 193rd anniversary of the birth of George Washington.

TODAY is Washington's Birthday. A nation of a hundred million souls honors him who led the way out of a status quo into a new order—a man who asked in his day: "Are the powers that be the powers that ought to be?" and who had the courage to stand against those powers and to fight them. The revolutionary movement among the colonists was a *revolution*. Let us not forget that. The patriots—we call them patriots now—were revolutionists. King George's adherents did not call them patriots. They were traitors in the minds of the royalists, and if the American Revolution had not been a successful revolution, the leaders would have been tried for treason under the English law and the people living in this land might now be keeping the birthday of, say, the Prince of Wales rather than of George Washington, the revolutionist.

Most of us know our United States history, and I need not carry you into its details. We learned to call the roll of patriots so long ago we have forgotten the names of some of them, but we know there were the fiery young radicals of the Patrick Henry type, as well as the intellectual radicals of the Jefferson type and the parlor radicals of the type of Washington and Adams. All of them were revolutionists, remember, and, therefore, radicals in the minds of the royalists. While we may suspect that there were some economic considerations in the minds of such men as Alexander Hamilton, we know that the *spirit* of 1776 was the spirit of change, the spirit of militant protest against oppression as expressed in the Boston tea party, the burning of the picture of King George on Dover Green and the burning in effigy of his agents who were attempting to collect his taxes. It was the spirit of fundamental human freedom as immortalized in the Declaration of Independence. Such are the roots of the only kind of Americanism worthy the name.

There were Tories among the colonists in that struggle, of course, and they were in control until the revolutionary movement was all but won. They simply could not see the logic of any change in the royalist policy. Their interests, their love of the power that was theirs under the existing institutions blinded them.

And so it is always in every movement for freedom. The idea of change meets the idea of rigidity, movement meets immovability, progress meets reaction, the liberal meets the Tory.

The promulgators of our Constitution wrote into it as an inherent part of the original document a provision for its future amendment. The logical conclusion,

in view of this provision in Article V, is that our forefathers were less arrogant in judging their ability to say what should be the law of future generations than some of our contemporaries. Almost immediately they exercised this amending power ten times over in the first ten amendments, and throughout the succeeding years the power has been used from time to time.

The National Woman's Party has taken as its immediate task the procuring, as a constitutional amendment, of a provision that men and women shall have Equal Rights throughout the United States and every place subject to their jurisdiction.

What could be more innocuous than such a demand in a country like the United States, founded upon a Declaration of Independence with equality and freedom as corner-stones? What is it we are asking for? Just simple equality. But the Tory says: "No, you cannot have equality; it would somewhat disturb the existing order in which I am so secure," and then he proceeds to bring the sky down upon his own stupid head because his opposition to so simple a thing will throw women into a more compact whole, stir them into a protesting resentment, expressed in a closer organization and a more feminine use of their ballots. It may mean a political revolution when women, already armed with the ballot, are driven to consider the denial of so simple a demand as this.

What might such a political revolution be like, and what are the possibilities that it will result? Surely, here is a field for speculation.

In the first place, we understand that at present the National Woman's Party is not a political party in the usual sense of the word "party." It has no general platform and puts no ticket in the field. But it has a Declaration of Principles and a definite program.

Its Declaration of Principles is, in short, that women shall no longer be discriminated against in any field—in law, in custom, in business, in the professions, in government employment, in education, in industry, in the home, in politics. Its program contemplates a steady advancement in all these fields, with especial emphasis on the removal of legal disabilities, as a tangible approach, through the Equal Rights Amendment. Upon that Amendment its campaign is centered. And it is to be the center of education and po-

litical action. It is recognized, of course, that there are other phases of the woman movement. The Declaration of Principles and outline of campaign adopted in November, 1922, leave nothing to be said along these lines.

The participation of women in politics is an important part of the program, and I want to speak of that for a moment. Quite aside from any connection with the Equal Rights Amendment, I believe I can say there is not a member of the Woman's Party who is not glad to see every advance that women make in active political work, regardless of party affiliations, and in the State machinery as well as the National machinery. We would be glad to see more of them in State Legislatures, in Governors' chairs, at the heads of executive departments in State governments, on cabinets, in the diplomatic service—we would be glad to see them, as Judge Florence Allen recently said, more than mere "cheer leaders in a game in which they do nothing but the cheering." We are not going to criticize any of them for inheriting their husbands' jobs. No doubt they have every right to inherit them. Death and impeachment have served the woman's cause, but that should not be the only way.

We are tired of lobbying all men and no women for our Equal Rights Amendment and our bills. It is a disgrace that there are no women in the Senate, only two in the House of Representatives and hardly a hundred sitting in State Legislatures out of a total membership of probably eight thousand throughout the country.

That brings us back to the proposition that the Equal Rights Amendment is to be the center of political action for this organization and the determining factor in the Party's support of individual women. Any other policy would defeat our end. I do not wish to be misunderstood. I have believed, and still believe, that a well-directed campaign for women in public office would afford a tangible means of approaching the feminist question, but I have never been so sure that it would be as valuable a point of concentration, for the present at least, as the Amendment. With the Amendment as an objective, the well-directed campaign for women in public office will inevitably follow as an incident to the Equal Rights campaign, and more effectively so than without such an objective.

And so I repeat that the Amendment would be an empty enactment if the educational campaign for it did not carry all these other things, and especially the entrance of women in legislative, judicial and executive positions in greater number and influence than at present. We should

not be content to go on begging men for Equal Rights when it lies within the power of women, by the use of their ballots, to place a few of their own sex in positions where they can grant this equality to themselves and all women. We should not be content to go on appearing before platform committees where men are in absolute control. We should not be content to face the possibility that after the enactment of our Amendment it shall be interpreted by men alone. No, we will

not be content with these propositions. If we could be content with them, we would not be here, discussing the position of women in politics.

From what I have said, it will be seen that I do not seek to divert any interest from the Amendment, but rather to follow all of its implications through. I have said that the Amendment is an innocuous thing to ask, and so it is, if it could be had for the asking. But it is not to be had that way, and because it is not,

The Institution of the Surname

I HAVE been listening, this afternoon, to one of your greatest men, Mr. Taft, speaking on the importance of the common law of England and of America. May I remind you that the common law is an old, old thing, and that surnames themselves are a mere modern device of which one doesn't hear until such a late time, say, as the Norman conquest?

Surnames did not come into use in England, generally speaking, until about the time of King Edward I. The common law is much older than surnames as an institution. And, therefore, you had under the old English polity husbands and wives who did not bear the same surname for the very excellent reason that there was no surname to bear. That is really all that there is in the question. When surnames did come in, the idea of the woman's taking the husband's surname in marriage could only have crept in relatively late and as a mere sort of temporary convenience. It never was a matter of statute law, and there are many historic conceptions to prove that it was a mere matter of personal preference and individual choice.

The earliest case I have been able to find on surnames in very early times was that of a lady who was Countess of Gloucester in her own right in the reign of King Henry II. The King proposed to her a particular husband, and she said to him she did not like the surname which her children would presumably bear and that she would not marry the man unless he were given another title. The interesting point about it is that in no point of her conversation did she remotely suggest that she would bear his surname.

A very great English woman, who bore her name from her birth to her death, was the celebrated Nicoli Delabair, who was High Sheriff of Lincolnshire in the reign of King John. She married two husbands, but not simultaneously. One was a Prince. One was named Decalmel. She assumed the surname of neither. She kept her own surname until she died.

There is very interesting historic proof of her surname, because when King John lay dying and was dictating his instructions as to how the government of Eng-

Editor's Note: Excerpts from the speech of Helena Normanton before the Lucy Stone League in New York. Mrs. Normanton is the English barrister who has kept her own name against great opposition and who came to America on a passport bearing that name.

land should be carried on in the first years of his little child son, who would be King at the age of nine, he expressly recommended that Nicoli Delabair should go on holding the position of High Sheriff of Lincolnshire, whether she wanted to or not. She refused to do so, but the King called her an excellent servant, she was a great warrior and ever faithful, and he confirmed her appointment under the name of Nicoli Delabair.

Now, at Romany the English representatives of the Church and the barons had a little controversy about King John, and the general result of it has been to leave in history the impression that he certainly was a tyrant. That may have been so, but, at any rate, his tyranny never took the form of depriving a married woman of her own surname.

I could name you another noble lady—Aris Dumontesque—and I can't help feeling a little bit of pride that I am personally descended from her. She had a long controversy with the King. From the year 1407 to 1431 she kept it up, and she won every point that she asked. She was the Countess of Salisbury in her own right, and she asked that her husband should have the title of Earl of Salisbury and that he should sit in Parliament and represent her and her Earldom and that the county should advance him enough money to keep up those dignities—which I think was a wonderful point that she got—and, also, that he should assume her surname. And she won all of those points.

I don't know why people talk about the feudal ages and the dark ages as ages in which women were depressed. Anything but! They could look after themselves remarkably well.

I will come down to another personage. I am sure you have all heard of King Henry VIII. And I might allude to a little habit he had of removing his wives, either from the throne by divorce or from

we may see a political revolution when women will take from men the power that denies so simple a thing. It is innocuous in the light of principles of democracy, but it is concerned with injustices that women feel keenly, and they will see it through. If that means that it is fraught with danger for those who would deny it, so be it. If the skies are to fall upon them in order that women may have light and freedom and equality—let them fall. They have fallen in other days.

life by removing their heads from their shoulders. But, tyrant though he may have been, he did not remove from his wives their personal surnames. You have never heard one of Henry VIII's wives called other than whatever her Christian name may have been. I am sure you all learned in school that he married three women of common rank—Anne Boleyn, Catherine Howard and Catherine Parr. All those women, until the day of their death, were known by their own surnames. Catherine Parr married again after Henry's death, but she did not assume the name of her husband. She was Catherine Parr until she died.

Another extremely well-known instance—you must have all heard of little Lady Jane Grey, the Girl Queen of England, who was Queen for nine days and was then beheaded by order of Queen Mary. She was always known as either Queen or Lady Jane Grey. You all know that she was married to Lord Guilford Dudley. I know of no historian who ever called her Lady Jane Dudley. She kept her maiden name.

There have been many, many instances. The roll is a very, very long one. Don't think that because I have given you only celebrated historical women that it was not done by the ordinary women. It was.

And now let us all in the Lucy Stone League give thanks and praise to a poor pauper woman of England over whose head, so to speak, was decided the great test case. The case was called, "The King versus the Inhabitants of St. New Town."

It is what is called a pauper settlement case. Two parishes were each striving against the other to get rid of a particular pauper, because they didn't want to maintain her. She had married twice, and she had married her second husband not in the name of her first husband, but in her maiden name. And that was how the whole controversy came out. Was it a legal marriage? If not, of course the particular parish of the second husband could shift out of the burden of maintaining her. The case was fought, like a great many cases of names in England, not exactly on the point of the name, but on something collateral in which the name

comes up and is decided. And the law was laid down by three judges of the Court of Appeals most decidedly in the early eighteenth century that a woman had the right to bear her maiden name, although married. And one of the judges said, "And it is a well-known fact that at the present day many women do so." Now, what can you have plainer than that?

Now, if I may come on to more modern times, I should like to mention to you an English woman who is still living, although of somewhat advanced years. Her name is Mrs. Fenwick Miller. And, old as she is and frail as she is now, she was kind enough to swear an affidavit as to all her own circumstances, which she thought might help women in this country. Mrs. Fenwick Miller married many years ago a gentleman by the name of Ford. She was already at the time of her marriage an elected member of the School Board for London. She still sat on that board in her maiden name. She never assumed her husband's name. But, in due course, the particular board's tenure of office expired and she had to present herself for re-election. She did so still in her maiden name of Fenwick Miller. She was elected.

Objection was then taken to the validity of her election. The point was referred eventually to the law officers of the Crown, and their opinion was taken as to whether an action to unseat this woman could have any possible chance of success. Their advice was entirely in the negative as to that. And Mrs. Fenwick Miller, for many years after, sat and was re-elected again and again, still in her maiden name.

Now, I would like to turn your attention for a moment away from this chain of magnificent women who come to us down the centuries to another aspect of the situation, which is this: that in the old history, which is as common to you as to me and belongs as much to you as it does to me, it has been considered that whenever anyone has been deprived of his name, it has been an act of State. Never, even in the most tyrannical times of English history, has a particular individual ever taken upon himself the right to say what a woman's surname should be, or, indeed, that of anybody else.

Any of you who are of Scottish extraction will hardly need to be reminded of the great case of the Clan MacGregor. I apologize to any descendants who may be present, but I must say that for two hundred years the MacGregors were a set of wild outlaw bandits in Scotland. And it was considered necessary that the power of that clan should be broken. Their power, in particular, was maintaining themselves by robbing anybody in the neighborhood. And the method deliberately chosen by the Scottish Parliament was to proclaim the clan outlawed and to deprive them of their surname. It was

made death to bear the name of MacGregor. It was made death to speak to anybody bearing the name of MacGregor. But it was done by Act of Parliament. It was not done by an individual. Some of you have read Sir Walter Scott's beautiful poem of the MacGregor clan—"The clan has a name that is nameless by day."

There was in Ireland a terrible rebellion in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. And an Act of Parliament was passed against the tribe O'Neils. And the chieftain of the tribe O'Neil was deprived of his surname. And again it was made death to bear the surname of O'Neil. But, again, that was done by an Act of Parliament. It was not done by an individual.

Now, we have always understood in English law that Magna Charta conferred upon everybody the right not to be interfered with, except by due process of law. It may be trial by a jury, but one thing it never means is interference by a State official. You have an amendment, I understand, to the Constitution which embodies all the principles of Magna Charta in a short phrase or two, and yet you are letting this thing go by you. You are allowing individual officials to tamper with your surnames in a way that has never been tolerated or permitted in those extremely effete and worn-out monarchies. Why do you do it, you daughters of a Republic, you daughters of a revolution? Why do you tolerate it?

What you have to do is to think carefully and consult your legal advisers and find some way of bringing it home, possibly in a heavy action for damages against any State official who dares to crash right through the common law, who dares to crash right through the history of centuries and then who gives such a reason as that this practice, which is as old as surnames itself, is anti-Christian.

I resent the fact that any individual in this country should say that the right of a woman to bear her maiden surname is against the practice of Christian countries. I consider that I come from a Christian country. As a matter of fact, I cannot possibly see the faintest connection between the subject and Christianity in any way whatever.

If we need to search religion for precedents, if we need to turn to the text of the sacred Scriptures, there we shall find due warrant for considering the subject of names as of very considerable importance. For do we not remember how many times the nomenclature of an individual has been a subject for divine indication of choice? "No longer shall thy name be Sariah, but Sarah," said God Himself. "Her name shall be Eve, for she is the mother of all living." "His name is to be John." We have over and over again in the Bible indications of the divine choice of names for an individual chosen for a great mission. That, I should think, would alone suffice to re-

move this question from any realm of petty ridicule into the great realm, if you like, of religion and of history.

We have in our great, immortal poet, Shakespeare, many a reference to the subject of names. I know he said that "a rose by any other name would smell as sweet." But would it sound as sweet? It would take a long time to invent such a lovely word as a rose if any of us set about doing it. And we have, again, his great statement about names—"He who pilfers from me my good name robs me of that which enriches him not and leaves me poor indeed."

Fortunately, the world is moving forward. And in reassertion of an age-long privilege, women are meeting with the support of the best of men, who think that it is a right thing, a proper thing, a good thing, and who see no reason whatever for objecting to it.

When I was to be called to the English bar, it became a matter of discussion and some care with the benches of my own Inn as to whether it would be exactly professionally proper for me to practice under my maiden name. But they never made to me, at any moment, any suggestion that it was illegal. They said it was a matter for careful consideration. And the Joint Council of the Four Inns of Court did consider it. And I suppose you would hardly find a more conservative-minded set of men in the world. But after considering it carefully and looking up all kinds of authorities, they reported to my own Inn that there was no objection whatever to a woman practicing the law in her maiden surname at the English bar.

Then why, in the face of all this long-connected story of a right which is as old as surnames are old, should there be in a great Republic like this this petty, bureaucratic, tyrannical interference with an individual right?

It is a thing which is almost incomprehensible. We have to cling fast in these days to every remnant of liberty which is left. We have to guard it. You can look around and see so many nations which believe in bureaucracy and dictatorship and do not believe in liberty.

We have heard so much from the mouths of American lawyers lately of the great importance of preserving the common law. That is all very true, absolutely true. Then why should there be an attempt in America to introduce an innovation upon the old common law, which is of not the slightest practical use, which irritates many and which is in itself, I think, from a great State, an exceedingly undignified act?

I do hope that the women of this great country of America, for which I have the most enormous affectionate admiration, will cling fast to this great struggle they are making and never rest until they carry it through, as I am sure they will, to an entirely victorious conclusion.

News From The Field

ALICE BEALS PARSONS, writer on peace problems, and one of the staff members of *The World Tomorrow*, will speak at National Woman's Party Headquarters on March 8 on "Modern Feminism in Relation to Peace." Mary Gertrude Fendall of the Women's Peace Union will preside.

At the first of the March open forums, held at headquarters under the auspices of the District of Columbia Branch, Mina Van Winkle, director of the Woman's Bureau and the House of Detention of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia, spoke on "Policewomen as Preventive Agents." Margaret Whittemore, vice-president, presided.

On March 15 Mrs. Helen S. Rapley of the Indian Bureau will speak on "The Status of Women Among the American Indians." Mrs. Lucy C. Shaw will preside.

THE New York City Committee is holding luncheon conferences on the first and third Thursdays of each month at the Town Hall Club. Until the recent opening of the Town Hall Club the luncheons were held at the Women's City Club.

Mrs. Cornelia Bruere Rose, Anita Pollitzer and Mrs. Dana Brannan went to Albany last week to discuss the National Woman's Party bills with the committeemen. The interview with Anita Pollitzer, given in the New York *Evening Post*, February 21, was so clear and direct that her inspiring personality could be felt when reading it.

Florence Bayard Hillis will speak at New York meetings on March 5 and 6. On the afternoon of March 5 Mrs. Cornelia Bruere Rose, chairman of the New York City Branch, will give a tea for Mrs. Hillis at her home, 1 Lexington avenue. On March 6 Mrs. Alfred S. Rossin will give a luncheon for Mrs. Hillis, to be followed by a meeting. On the evening of March 6 Mrs. Hillis will speak at a general meeting, notice of which will be sent to all New York members.

A benefit for the National Woman's Party will be held at the home of Mrs. A. C. Bossom, 270 Park avenue, on March 12. Edna St. Vincent Millay will read from her poems. Mme. Ratan Devi will sing a group of Oriental songs in costume and Doris Stevens will speak on "What Is Feminism."

The Vanity Hat Shop

Original and Imported Designs

MRS. KLEIN PETER

727 Seventeenth Street
WASHINGTON, D. C.

THE California Branch of the National Woman's Party held a Susan B. Anthony luncheon in honor of the anniversary of the birth of the pioneer suffragist on February 15. More than twenty-five women were present. Mrs. Elizabeth Keith, one of the pioneer suffragists of the State, was unable to attend, but sent a message wishing success for equal rights measures introduced in California. Miss Z. Clements, president of the State Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, and Phoebe Hearst Bannister, chairman of the California Students' Council, both spoke, as did other women leaders in the State suffrage campaign.

Genevieve Allen, State organizer, told the women celebrating the memory of the pioneer suffragist that she felt sure that Susan B. Anthony would like as a birthday present the Equal Rights Amendment, and asked support for the bills before the California Legislature.

At this meeting Dr. Lillian J. Martin became a founder of the Woman's Party.

When Olga Petrova, who is a founder of the party, opened in San Francisco in "The White Peacock," she had as part of her audience a party of Woman's Party members filling three boxes draped with purple, white and gold. This feature of the opening brought forth much attention in the newspapers.

Mme. Petrova spoke at a tea at the Fairmont Hotel February 20 on "The Present Development of the Status of Women."

Mrs. Allen has organized a Community Property Committee of the California National Woman's Party.

VIVIAN SIMPSON, a law student at George Washington University, Washington, D. C., will address the students of Richmond College, Richmond, Va., on the Equal Rights Amendment on March 8. Mrs. Sophie Meredith of Virginia arranged for the meeting. Miss Simpson is a member of the Students' Council of the National Woman's Party.

The Ugly Duckling Tea House

(Opposite Library of Congress)

115 B Street Southeast

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Special Table d'Hote Dinner 75 Cents
Vegetable Dinner 60 Cents
Luncheon Tea

DAY PRINTING COMPANY

Printers

LIGHT AND LOMBARD STREETS
Entrance on Balderston Street
BALTIMORE

Two Million Dollar Fund

Treasurer's Report

SHELDON JACKSON, Treasurer

NETTIE TRAIL: C. P. A., Auditor.

RECEIPTS of National Headquarters, December 7, 1912, to February 22, 1925, \$1,293,084.58.

Contributions, membership receipts and other receipts, February 22, 1925, to March 1, 1925 (Half of membership fees are retained by the State Headquarters. The half of these fees sent to National Headquarters is listed below):

Per Buffalo (N. Y.) Branch:	
Mrs. M. W. Tift.....	\$5.00
Miss Mertie Farquhar, D. C.....	1.00
Mrs. M. Henrietta Smith, D. C.....	50.00
Mrs. Emily Parks, Cal.....	1.00
Miss Eleanor Calnan, Mass.....	30.00
Mrs. Alice Randolph Purdy, Pa.....	1.00
Dr. Lillian Martin, Cal.....	50.00
Per New York City Branch:	
Mrs. Elden Bisbee.....	50.00
Mrs. E. R. A. Seligman.....	5.00
Mrs. Hugh Grant Straus.....	5.00
Mrs. Porter Bowles.....	5.00
Miss Adolfine Kainzbauer.....	.50
Mrs. Alissa Franc Keir.....	.50
Miss Louise Shaefer.....	.50
Per Kansas City (Mo.) Branch:	
Mrs. Fred E. Sutton.....	.50
Miss Sanoma I. Shell.....	.50
Miss Louise M. Byers.....	.50
Mrs. W. F. White.....	.50
Mrs. Harry O. Mittong.....	.50
Mrs. J. C. Blenn.....	.50
Mrs. Genevieve Thomas Wheeler.....	.50
Anna Fuller Craig.....	.50
John Emerson Bennett.....	.50
Cash collection at Sunday afternoon meetings.....	5.85
Sale of literature.....	.70
Sale of photo.....	2.00
Cash collected, per Mabel Vernon.....	67.00
Per Equal Rights Committee:	
Mrs. Lawrence Lewis, Philadelphia.....	10.00
Total receipts, February 22, 1925, to March 1, 1925.....	
	\$294.55
Total receipts, December 7, 1912, to March 1, 1925.....	
	\$1,293,379.13



A Magic Memory Training

When you see this face, always think of a good diamond. When you see a good diamond always think of

BERTL

DIAMOND EXPERT

4446 Springfield Avenue Newark, N. J.

Serving three generations of happy brides

KANSAS WOMAN'S JOURNAL

Topeka, Kansas

Published in Interest of Women,
Children and Home.

By—LILLA DAY MONROE

\$1.00 a Year

"Join Our Journal Family Now" Adv.

Jelleff's
1216 F St. N.W.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Announces a New Service for Discriminating Women in the Establishment of

A Fine Apparel Shop

featuring fashion garments from

HICKSON, Inc.

FROCKS SUITS WRAPS NOVELTIES

1216 F Street Northwest.