

The American Woman takes an Inventory:

period whether it is
at The end of a year, a decade, a century
a ~~generation~~, calls for a balancing of accounts. How much
~~we~~ we ask of what we set out to do in a particular undertaking.
have it ~~has been done.~~ Consider the American woman. *in 1848* They have been
very busy in the last few months estimating *her* the gains and
losses in two particular periods. The first of ~~these~~ - the
twenty years since *the* she was granted *in 1848* suffrage; The second -
roughly 17 years the hundred years since she set out consciously and with
determination to secure for herself a free entrance into what
~~was~~ *she* called "the man's world" ^{a free entrance} /with training and use of all
his tools.

Roughly speaking the outcome of this balancing
of her budget gives two striking results. The first is - the
^{numerical} enormous/strides that women have made in the rank and file of
all of man's activities. Second, the numerically poor showing
that she makes *at* the *work* *if there* activities. Take the world of
arts and sciences - See Page 7

*the point of
creation shaded*

voiced by women who under her program of emancipation have achieved distinction, certainly proved themselves the equal of any man in their various fields.

A forthright challenge of the American Woman's achievements came a few months ago from one of the most distinguished of our women writers, honored not only for her artistry but for the integrity and the fearlessness of her mind and character - Pearl Buck. ^{It is a challenge which does not down, nor will it.} Mrs. Buck sees us with a fresh eye. An American reared in China she had accepted as reality idealistic notions of women's place in the United States. They, she was told, were educated, free, not subjected to their husbands, led their own lives, did things.

Since her return to America Mrs. Buck has given herself every chance to test our freedom, to measure our advancement. In a recent magazine article under the scornful title, "America's Mediaeval Women" she records her discouragement with what she finds. She contends that our education is getting us nowhere. However good we prove in business or in the arts and professions we are not taken seriously, not respected for our work. Only a shockingly low percentage of us are finding places in spite of all the talk about equality of opportunity, having a man's chance.

Pearl Buck places blame for these results squarely on man. He does not want educated women about, he tolerates them but does not marry them. Like Talleyrand he wants a head on his pillow not concerned with the affairs of Europe and the great majority of women back him up. What they want, Mrs. Buck claims, is not equality, ~~they~~ but privilege.

This indictment of man as the real stick in the wheel of feminine progress has ~~ample~~ backing from *many* observing women. They know that boiled down men as a *rule* ~~whole~~ prefer not to have women mixed up ^{at the W. Co.} with their business and professional affairs. One finds corroborating evidence in unexpected places. Not long ago in a certain large Western co-educational university I found the girls as a class (not as individuals!) so unpopular that young men were arranging their studies to include only subjects which no girl, or only an occasional one, selected. "Why?" I asked a disgusted young man. "We don't want the queens always underfoot," he grumbled.

I often hear men claim that women create special problems in an organization. A large firm which in the past I knew to have given women every opportunity has recently determined to weed them out of the offices as fast as possible. Their explanation is that women gossip, flirt, intrigue. In the interest of peace and efficiency the management decided there was nothing to do but to cull out the women contingent.

If we give full due to the inevitable difficulties in breaking up established ways and relations and replacing them by the new and untried, if we count the time that even a superficial reading of history shows, it takes men and women uprooted in one place and transferred to another, trained to one set of operations and ideas and forced to adopt a new set, we shall, I think, take a less pessimistic view of what women have accomplished under their program of rights.

I am inclined to think that all things considered the present disillusionment of women with their program is though by no means entirely largely/unjustified. I suspect that in certain quarters the situation is over-emphasized from a hope of awakening women to greater efforts. A common method of reformers and politicians is to paint everything the blackest in the worst ~~eye~~ possible of worlds. It is dishonest, but reformers and politicians in their zeal for their causes are usually more or less dishonest. I know here what I am talking about. I have done it myself.

A Compare what women are doing today with what women were doing when they first announced their program of rights. One finds authoritative material for comparison in Dr. E. F. Fish's "The Rise of the Common Man", an analysis of American life from 1830 to 1850, the period of the rise of the women's rights movement. Dr. Fish reviews

Reyn
h

among other things the status of American art, science and literature and tabulates the leading figures. He mentions no woman painter. He finds no woman worthy to ^{name} ~~rank~~ in sculpture or in music.

In his tabulation of scientists he does recognize Maria Mitchell; in literature Margaret Fuller Ossoli. Anyone who knows the period knows that the list of women actually doing creditable things in these fields was much longer, though perhaps under Dr. Fish's scheme the woman gets her proportional share of notice.

When it comes to leaders in reforms a much more impressive case is made out for women. A fine list of names - Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Julia Ward Howe, Lydia Signourney, Dorothea Lynde Dix, ~~Clara Barton~~.

Compare this showing, even if it were stretched as it well might be, and you have a meagre result indeed compared with what the hundred years has brought. List the women who today are active in art, science and literature and you have literally thousands of names - some of distinguished achievement. Sculpture was not supposed to be woman's field, but eight years ago when the Field Museum of Chicago sought a group of sculptors to make a series of studies of the types of men now inhabiting the globe the choice fell on a woman - Malvina Hoffman - not for a part but for the whole. Malvina Hoffman is but one of a group of distinguished women sculptors.

In the field of journalism two of the wisest and most influential of the present race of editorial commentators are women - Dorothy Thompson and Anne O'Hara McCormick. *Wm* In the field of business women have gone steadily towards the top. *nice* *12/1* *2* *A* They brought to the new system of production a traditional training in executive work. Under the old order the great majority of women managed big or little households, some of them very big indeed. Housekeeping was conducted on principles very like those of modern business. An inherited executive quality shows itself frequently when a woman takes hold of a job the public believed only men could handle. The newspapers recently tell of a woman chosen over several male competitors to be a buyer for a big industrial combination. Promptly and without noise she brought in an order running into six figures. *See (11)* *A* This woman's expressed attitude towards her job is worth noting. It shows an interesting difference, common if not universal, in men and women's point of view as to what they want. *house* This lady said flatly that the opportunity to place big orders was not what she wanted of life, she was willing to do this only until she had earned enough to get a comfortable house in the country, then she would never have anything more to do with business. *A* *th* *W* *4* In all this appraising of women's achievements under the new order of things this natural and essential desire of the woman for security and independence - her own "little white house" - with all of the

White Fox

social and personal obligations and interests that ~~that~~ involves must be taken into account.

A turn to
~~In the world of politics there has been for a large body of idealistic women disillusionment as sweeping as Pearl Buck's over the place that women are taking in the arts.~~ When the 19th Amendment was declared ratified on August 26th, 1920, a great body of ^{women} ~~these idealists~~ felt genuinely that a new world had been born. One of my ardent suffrage friends told me how she went home after a midnight jubilation over the ratification and awakened her husband declaring, "The millennium has come. You'll see what a world we will make."

~~"Women will not begin to find themselves in the political field in less than fifty years,"~~ I told her.

~~"You are a bad woman,"~~ she declared.

~~Today this same woman is in the depths of despair,~~ completely disillusioned and it is quite useless to argue with her that it takes time to bring a great undertaking to fruition.

This disappointment is not due to lack of interest in the ballot. Women the country over do vote, almost as freely as men do, but rarely does the women's vote change a result. Women have proved conservative and regular. The great mass who decide the issue choose from the candidates in the two major folds. That is, they vote as men do.

~~And this for idealistic women is discouraging.~~ *not true* Women
~~have not~~ contributed the fresh creative impulse expected
~~of them.~~ *two* They have ~~not~~ proved that woman as a mass are *not* more
 righteous than men *not true*

The result is not because *they* women have been kept
 out of office. Figure that it is only twenty years since
 the ballot was open and they were admitted into the political
 machines they have been generously treated in the matter of *We have*
 office. We have them in the United States Senate and House *them in*
 of Representatives; *we* have them in both, if not all the State *diplomats*
 Legislatures - all sorts of lesser positions. And they are *in the senate*
 represented on every National and State and local council. *may*
 and finally we have by appointment a woman in the Cabinet -
 Madam Secretary Frances Perkins; six years now in the most
 difficult cabinet position, as it turned out Mr. Roosevelt
 had on his list.

It ought to be a satisfaction to women interested
 in the political side of the movement that Madam Secretary
 Perkins received her appointment because she was fitted by
 experience to deal with labor situations. This is much
 more than can be said for the majority of men who make up a
 Presidential Cabinet. Skilled as they may be in general affairs
 they have no special knowledge of the materials in their
 portfolio, and some of them it must be said never look very
 thoroughly into that portfolio. They turn that over to

assistants and under-secretaries. But Madam Secretary of Labor did know her job.

Moreover, she has kept her head in the bitterest and most widespread labor war that has ever ravaged the ^{life} industrial/of this country. The Department of Labor was geared to arbitration in case of trouble, but the machinery was swept aside by the hasty arrogant hands, ~~hands~~ of rival labor leaders. Unhappily the administration did not, as it had the right, apply a firm disciplinary hand, insisting on negotiation while industry went on as the only civilized way of dealing with ^{industrial} trouble inside a Democratic state. Madam Secretary Perkins ~~could do nothing~~ under these circumstances more than to sit tight, keep as level a head as she could ~~in the confusion~~. Her great achievement has been to keep her head, control her tongue. No cabinet head when the Department was under fire has made as few breaks as the Secretary of Labor.

Women have penetrated every department of government service. Of the four million in that service at least a million are women. Mayor La Guardia recently said that as efficient servants as the city had were women and he only wished there were more of them around.

Women may have penetrated everywhere but they are not holding in the second decade since the granting of ^{the top position} suffrage/~~what~~ they won in the first. Ten years ago according to the National League of Women Voters there were nine women

in Congress, today there are five. There is a falling off, too, in the number of women in State Legislatures. Can it be that women themselves are discovering that this is not what they want? *Roll 13-P. 17* *see h Buh p 74*

B There are ~~reasons~~ ^{causes} for this. One is that of the lady who could place an order in six figures, but as soon as she was able to get her house in the country she was done with business. Women as a class are not adventurers, do not want change. By necessity they must conserve the essential ^{social} unit, the family, and to do that they cannot be running around the globe exploring; they cannot be trying out machines which upset things. They must hold steady the great conservative forces of the world. They do not get to the top faster because the ^{lower} ~~clerical~~ positions give them the economic assistance they want in holding together what they regard as ^{more important} ~~the essential~~ and desirable things in their lives. Feeling in this way they only occasionally give that ~~essential~~ creative force which is necessary if they are to get to the top. *They give that force to continuing & raising the life in the earth*

Certain it is that in this twenty years of office holding, good and faithful servants as they have ^{proved} ~~known~~ themselves, they have contributed no fresh creative force, done nothing notable of which we can say "only a woman could have ever done this." That she has it in her to do so, I firmly believe, but not so long as her ambition is to think and act like a man.

*shooting in
ch-lan-
most plants
stays*

sees

14 A

1

The brilliant numerical showing in the rank and file, the comparatively poor numerical showing at the top, the indifference to the top which great masses of the rank and file show, the failure when they have reached the top in politics, particularly, to ~~give it any~~ make any really creative contribution is causing not a few women who have

proved themselves equal of any man in their various ~~ways~~ ^{fields} ~~importance~~ ^{quality} of the about the emancipation which women have achieved.

^{it has been} seems not to be what it was cracked up to be. (See Page 2 A)

is to double
it and if it is

The sorriest disappointment in ^{woman} her public life has been her seeming impotence in strangling wars. Go back to 1919 and in all the plans for permanent peace the part women would play stands out. The suffrage was given her in England and in the United States so promptly after the war, largely because she had co-operated so finely with men in carrying it on. Great numbers of men declared, "give woman the tools and she will put an end to war." ^{complacently} She thought so herself. And now, twenty years after, see what we have. We adopted all man's peace implements, propaganda, organization, petitioning, talk; we walked by his side in parades and sat in conventions made after his pattern, and doing what he has always done come out where he has always come - another war. ^{see 8 A}

Has woman nothing of her own to offer? One woman at least has recently offered something worth the gravest consideration, something which brushing aside all the political and mechanistic contrivances for ending war lays bare its roots. This is Virginia Woolf in her essay, "Three Guineas."

Miss Woolf is answering the man's demand that woman help him put an end to war. Putting an end to war, ^{large task} she agrees, is one of the three great aims of the educated woman. It is essential to achieving her first and second aims which she sets down. 1) Freedom of movement in the

whatever sins may be behind the sufferers. They instinctively seek to soften wretchedness. It is one of their most precious, natural attributes. W

Roll — Nevertheless, Miss Woolf has reached the roots of the trouble and her call to the ^{educated women} individual to blast these roots out of her scheme of things is the only sure way to make a ^{reach} lasting contribution to peace. ^{See 200 A}

Wm I do not mean to ^{intimate} say that all this petitioning and organizing and agitation we have been doing has meant nothing. As a matter of fact I believe that it is largely responsible for the present insistent and widespread demand for peaceful settlement of international problems. But the demand is hazy, trusts too much to words, too little to the destruction of those roots which Miss Woolf so relentlessly hunts to their lair in our daily living. It has little of the scientific persistent effort that men give ^{to} for preparing for war. ^{See 15 B}

We hear a great deal of talk about the need of a spiritual regeneration as a road to peace. What do we mean by a spiritual regeneration? Is it any more than a fine consoling phrase? If it is to be useful it must be more than that. The business man calls for the return of spirituality. Does that mean that he is willing to cut out his predatory competition, help rather than hinder his competitor? The

labor man writes, "down with war" into his platform. Is he willing to end the Civil War he is waging these days against his fellows as well as his employers?

It is a beautiful thing to talk about - this return to spirituality - and it is the only way out, but it means a program of readjustment of conduct in practical life which few of us have ever dreamed.

What Miss Woolf prescribes for daily life is the Christian essence - the Golden Rule. Wherever the end of war is talked it comes down finally to just that - the Christian way is the only way out. Even the bellicose Mussolini years ago laid that down. 'War is an atrocious business,' he declared, 'but the nation that rules it out is lost.' And he went on to say:-

"There will never be a period of peace until the peoples shall have abandoned themselves to a Christian dream of universal brotherhood and shall be able to extend their hands to each other across the oceans and the mountains."

Here then is one of the most threatening of present day dictators preaching as the Pope preaches, as the Bishop of Canterbury preaches, as every thoughtful person who lives long enough and watches men performing long enough must preach. Nothing will bring peace but the substitution for the will to war of what Mussolini calls "the Christian dream of universal brotherhood."