

scientific knowledge of the dietetic value of the different food-stuffs, but a change in long-established national habits. I have, moreover, made no allowance for waste incurred through bad cooking or through imperfect digestion as a result of hurried or irregular meals. It should also be remembered that *all* muscular effort must be taken into account in estimating the amount of food necessary for efficiency. The Saturday afternoon walk or bicycle-ride, or the digging-over of an allotment-garden, must be provided for, just as much as work for wages.

My answer, then, to Mr. Hookham is that my standard of food requirements for physical efficiency is not, as he suggests, that amount necessary to bring the body into a state in which "all its members are capable of exerting the full power that their original constitution has made possible for them," but, on the contrary, the amount necessary for maintaining in health a person engaged on moderate work, and indulging in moderate exercise in his leisure.

Finally, in answer to Mr. Hookham's question, whether what the workers really want is more food or less work, there can be no doubt, in my opinion, that under reasonable industrial conditions they are entitled to both. At present the unskilled laborer is often expected, for too many hours a day, to do work which is at least "moderate," and frequently "heavy," on a diet sufficient only for "light" work, and often not even for that. Consequently, he is working upon capital, and it is not surprising that he soon grows old.—Yours, &c.,

B. SEEBOHM ROWNTREE.

The Homestead, York.
October 27th, 1911.

ENGLAND AND THE TRIPOLITAN RAID.

To the Editor of THE NATION.

SIR,—Returning to my home in Italy, I find a fresh occasion of writing to you and your readers on the subject of secret alliances, secret *ententes*, and secret arrangements. In the present case it is a "secret arrangement," and, this time, not with France, but with Italy. Certain of my Italian friends, who have not joined the appalling Jingo chorus (the word "traitor" freely applied to dissidents, and a boycott of the "Graphic" decided!), have considerably staggered me by the statement that, whatever the moral or immoral aspect of Italy's Tripolitan raid, that Tripolitan raid has not only been politically "necessary," but, what is a very different matter, has been made with the preliminary consent of "the Powers," and most particularly of England. Even the most absolutely Liberal among my Italian friends, an economist who had at first stigmatised the Tripolitan raid as madness, has since come to me saying, "This business may turn out to be folly on our part, but it appears that Italy was distinctly encouraged to go to Tripoli by England." And another friend, very conversant in diplomatic and Ministerial circles, whose similar excuse I thought I had silenced by a collection of leading articles from the "Westminster Gazette," now writes me as follows:—

"I will not enter into general discussions on the morality of nations, and I entirely respect your point of view. But I must assure you that we had a preliminary agreement with the other Powers. Never should we have taken such a step without it. I can understand the contradiction between this consent and the blame poured on us by the official—i.e., European and more particularly English press; there are times when a certain agreement has to be come to, even when one does not like it. You must bear in mind that if we had not gone to Tripoli, England, or Germany, or France, would have gone, and that would have upset things much worse; it would have been the spark lighting a universal conflagration. This is the only reason, I believe, why they have let us go."

Now, remark that this especially well-informed person does not say that these are the reasons why Europe has tolerated the Tripolitan Raid *after* it has taken place; the passage I have quoted refers to a *preliminary* arrangement:—

"The agreement with the other Powers was there. We should never have taken that step without it."

Now, supposing this Italian notion to be true, then either (a) the European Press (and more especially the English, including the Press like the "Westminster," which avowedly represents the Ministerial Party) has known all along of the permission given to Italy and, nevertheless (for Heaven knows what hypocritical motives!) has been slanging Italy

for doing precisely what Italy was officially allowed to do; or (b), European Governments (especially the English one) have secretly given Italy permission to raid Tripoli in the teeth of the unanimous opposition which even the Ministerial Press has subsequently expressed, and which those Governments must evidently have foreseen. Or is there a still more monstrous explanation: (c) that European Governments (especially the English one) have been so little in touch with the feelings and judgment of the nations they stand for as to give permission for the Tripolitan raid under the sincere impression that public opinion would back up Italy's action, and justify the hidden arrangements? Of course, my own belief is that such a "preliminary agreement" to raid Tripoli exists only in the uneasy conscience of the more scrupulous and thoughtful Italians, and in the Jingo imagination of the less scrupulous or less intelligent ones. But I think that the supposition is worthy of English Liberals' attention, just because it bears upon the subject of those secret international agreements, *ententes* (cordial or otherwise), about which I ventured to write to you recently from France, and of which your leader of last Saturday admonished a Liberal Government to make a complete end in the future.—Yours, &c.,

"VERNON LEE."

October 24th, 1911.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN PRACTICE.

To the Editor of THE NATION.

SIR,—I for one shall be glad to own that the humanity of women is not a ground for giving them immediate self-government as soon as Mr. Massie and other Anti-Suffragists will own that women are neither more nor less human than men.

The underlying creed of Anti-Suffragists is this: That there is something about the actual sex of a woman which is sub-human, links her with the ox and the ass and the other things that are *man's*, and separates her from the privileged males, giving him the right to govern her without her consent. That is the demoralising doctrine which the votelessness of women who live in a democracy is always tacitly preaching. If we were governed by an aristocracy, if we were members of a subject race, it would be absurd for us to claim the vote on the ground of humanity. But Englishwomen are members of a State in which both parties constantly appeal to the "will of the people." If the Liberalism of Mr. Massie and other Liberal Anti-Suffragists means anything to them, then their Anti-Suffragism means that women are not people.

And that is precisely what Suffragists claim that they are—not angels, not chattels, but people. We claim the simple comradeship of humanity; although for practical purposes we only ask, next session, for a vote for women-occupiers, we believe in our old formula—the vote on the same terms as it is, or may be, granted to men.—Yours, &c.,

ELEANOR ACLAND.

October 24th, 1911.

FLETCHER AND KIPLING'S SCHOOL HISTORY OF ENGLAND.

To the Editor of THE NATION.

SIR,—May I, a Radical, a Home Ruler, a thorough believer in democracy, and a constant reader of THE NATION, reply shortly to your article on "History for Children," in your issue of July 29th?

I have been reading this history with a form of twenty-five boys, average age thirteen, and with an experience of thirty years of history-teaching I can assuredly say that I have used no history previously which has left so clear and broad a view of English history on the boys' minds as this has done. There is a picturesqueness and vivacity and, at the same time, a simplicity of language which makes it more like a story-book than an ordinary class-book. The verses give excellent suggestions for lessons. Take the first one in the book, "The River's Tale"; it is not meant to be "literature," but it is full of suggestion, and the lessons learnt from it *stick*. The tide, history in names of places, geological changes, the old beasts, birds, and fishes, the pervading forests, the Phoenicians, Romans, Danes—the boys learn the poem, and ineffaceable pictures remain in