NEW STYLES FROM PARIS THAT WILL GRACE THE EASTER PARADE

An afternoon gown by Paquin, Paris, made of dark blue moire and red and green flowered chiffon, showing a riot of colors that are now the rage in Paris.

This street costume is a Poiret creation. It is made of old rose broadcloth, with sleeveless jacket, Russian blouse style, of striped velvet trimmed with fur.

A street gown by Green, Paris, of blue charmeuse with green collar and lapels. Special features are the sash, very short jacket and draped skirt.

—Photo by Underwood & Underwood.

A dressy spring gown by Daumont, made of pink charmeuse, with draped skirt, black belt and small yoke of white chiffon.

The Late King George of Greece And His Autocratic Successor

BY EX-ATTACHE.

KING George of Greece, although he has left a very large private fortune, even according to American ideas, was up to the time of his assassination on Tuesday last, a pensioner on the bounty of three foreign powers, namely, Great Britain, Russia and France, which, throughout the half century which intervened between his election to the Hellenic throne and his death, have each of them contributed $20,000 a year to his civil list, that is to say, he received in round figures $1,000,000 from each of the three foreign governments concerned.

When after the deposition and flight of the Bavarian-born King Otho, the Grecian throne went begging, being declined in turn by King Edward's sailor brother, Prince Alfred, Duke of Edinburgh and Coburg, by several scions of Continental royalty, and by the sixteenth Earl of Derby, whose forbears had been kings of the Isle of Man, it was finally accepted by the then Crown Prince of Denmark, afterward Christian IX. of that country, for his second son, Prince William, then serving as a midshipman on an English man-of-war, and who was mastheaded as a penalty for some boyish delinquency when the representatives of the Hellenic nation arrived on board to intimate to him that he had been elected King of Greece. His father, however, was a cautious man, and aware of the condition of the national treasury at Athens, of its absence of any kind of credit abroad, and of the fact that Greeks were apt to regard the demand for the payment of taxes in the light of a personal insult, he insisted that his son, who had no money of his own, should be assured of at least a certain annuity, aside from the civil list payable to the crown. The great powers chiefly interested in the maintenance of law and order at Athens, namely England, France and Russia, agreed to this: the more so as they considered it advisable from an international point of view, that the young monarch should not be at the mercy of any fleeting parliamentary majority at Athens which might seek to bring pressure to bear upon him by holding up his civil list. So they each undertook to allow him $20,000 a year, making $60,00 per annum, all told, with the result that British, French and Russian taxpayers have for the last five decades been contributing to the support of the monarchy of Greece.

Made His Money in Grain.

It was to an American that King George was indebted for the greater part of his large private fortune, which really dates from 1876 and 1877. At that time the late Gen. Meredith Read was the United States envoy at Athens. Quick to realize that the war between Russia and Turkey would have the effect of closing the Straits of the Dardanelles to Russian shipping, and of blockading the Muscovite grain ports on the Black Sea, that it would in fact arrest all the export of grain from Southern Russia, he set to work to speculate in American grain and recommended King George, with whom he was on terms of exceptional intimacy, to do likewise. George followed his advice, operated on a bold and extensive scale, and by the end of the war had amassed a big fortune, wholly through his operations in American foodstuffs. This fortune he was subsequently able to increase tenfold by means of shrewd industrial and real estate investments, and by successful ventures on the European stock markets, mainly on that of Paris, where he confided his interests to the Albertis, who had also charge of the interests of his brother, the late King Frederick of Denmark.

Frederick had acquired great wealth through his marriage with the only daughter of Charles XV. of Sweden, and, possessed of a remarkable gift for finance, administered his wife's affairs with wonderful success. Indeed, all of the business undertaken by the Albertis for the two brothers—King George of Greece and King Frederick of Denmark—turned out well, and the two men, durring the last decade as multi-millionaires, cannot but sometimes have compared the affluence of the eventide of their lives with the terrible penury of their boyhood under their parents' roof.

George showed himself very grateful to Gen. Meredith Reed, and, in fact, after 1877 always had a warm spot in his heart for Americans. At no court in Europe have General Reed's countrymen ever received quite the same degree of welcome as at that of Athens. There was an additional reason, however, for this. So intense are the political and social jealousies and rivalries in the Hellenic capital that the late King and the royal family in general found it not only inadvisable, but even injurious to the interests of the dynasty to manifest any preference among the Greeks. Even the most ordinary courtesies and acts of hospitality and kindness on the part of the reigning house to Greeks were denounced by their countrymen as favoritism and as indicating political leanings inconsistent with the impartiality of the throne prescribed by the terms of the constitution. Actually the invitations of youngsters to children's parties at the palace of the King and of the princes formed subjects of violent denunciation and newspaper abuse on the part of those whose progeny had not been asked to the entertainments, and in the end the members of the reigning family restricted their social relations almost exclusively to the Foreign Diplomatic Corps and to foreigners happening to visit Athens, contenting themselves with periodical great balls or receptions, to which almost every Greek with a decent coat to his back was admitted, so as to avoid jealousies. The consequence was that foreign visitors, particularly well-bred Americans, were always well received at the Court of Athens and encouraged to prolong their sojourn in the capital of Greece.

King's Wonderful Patience.

Conditions in Greece will be very different under the new reign, both as regards her international situation and her domestic affairs. George was possessed of the most extraordinary patience; a patience which led him to endure all sorts of affronts, not without dignity and without ever losing his temper. His elasticity of mind, as well as the wonderful amount of experience which he had acquired as a constitutional ruler of a particularly turbulent nation, singularly ill adapted for parliamentary forms of government, enabled him to look far ahead and to make concessions for the sake of the future. Sometimes these concessions went sorely against the grain, as when the Military and Naval Leagues, which, for nearly a year, usurped almost dictatorial powers, in defiance of the terms of the constitution, compelled him to submit to the removal of his sons from the army, and to their virtual exile from the country. It was expected that he would abdicate. But he refrained from taking any such step, being clever enough to see that the leagues in question would not last, especially when the foreign money markets intimated that their doors would remain closed to the Greek government as long as the latter was not run on strictly constitutional lines, and in accordance with the King's views. His premonitions were fulfilled even sooner than he expected, and while the two leagues were driven by the people from power the princes were invited back amid manifestations of public good will to which they had until then been strangers.

There have been, however, quite a number of other times when King George was desirous of abdicating in order to be able to enjoy his large fortune and the eventide of his busy life amid more congenial surroundings than he could find in his dominions, free from the trammels imposed by political exigencies and from the worries incidental to the rulership over a nation so restless as the Greeks. With this object in view, he had built for himself a magnificent palace, in the vicinity of Copenhagen, that is to say, his native land, and it was there that his most highly prized possessions and art treasures were preserved. Every year he managed to spend at any rate a few months there and he looked upon it as his principal home. But whenever he opened the subject of abandoning his throne Great Britain, France and Russia, convinced that he alone could manage Greece and prevent her from becoming once more a source of perpetual trouble and plague, to the continent of Europe, insisted upon his remaining at the helm of the Hellenic ship of state, reminding him that he was under obligations to them—financially and otherwise—and that he was bound to consider their wishes. If they were so anxious that he should continue on at Athens it was because they did not entertain the same degree of confidence in his son, the new king.

The New King Aristocratic.

King Constantine is in every respect a less able man. He, of course, cannot pretend to his father's statecraft, the result of half a century of experience as a ruler. He does not possess his wonderful powers of patience and self-restraint. He has but little of his father's charm of manner and conciliatory disposition. He is inclined to be autocratic, masterful and resentful, while, of course, he has little or none of that diplomacy of King George, which rendered the latter Greece's most influential ambassador abroad, investing her with a prestige and importance far beyond her merits, and due entirely to her ruler. The late Prince Bismarck, in particular, entertained the very highest regard for King George, and was wont to declare that he was the only man in Greece upon whom any reliance could be placed, adding, "and, therefore, we must take care of him." George was, indeed, a notable factor in European politics. In Paris, at Vienna, in London and at Rome his advice was sought by the rulers and the principal statesmen alike, and his words were heeded as coming from one who spoke with the authority of unrivaled experience. He made friends of them all and could count upon their support and personal good will. That his son and successor will ever receive these in the same degree is more than doubtful. He does not easily make friends, and has, perhaps, through his own fault, been treated in foreign capitals with a neglect which was rendered all the more striking by the sympathetic interest manifested in his father.

He Dislikes the Kaiser.

Some of the obituaries of King George published on Wednesday last described Constantine's accession as destined to increase the influence of Germany at Athens. Quite the contrary is the case. It is perfectly true that he is married to one of the sisters of the Kaiser. But just because of this he has been dragged into Hohenzollern family squabbles which have served to embitter the political differences which have arisen from time to time between Berlin and Athens. The most humiliating phases of his career were the ignominious defeats sustained by the Greek army in the war with Turkey in 1896, which would have culminated in the seizure of Athens by the Moslems had not their victorious advance been stayed by a threat by the Czar to intervene in behalf of Greece. True, the disastrous showing of the Greek troops in that campaign was entirely owing to the gross insubordination of the generals and colonels under his command and their failure to obey his orders. But he can never forgive or forget the fact that the Turkish troops on that occasion were led by German officers; that German was the language spoken by the headquarters staff of the Ottoman army, and that the first officers of the latter who rode into Barissa at the head of the victorious Turks held commissions from the Kaiser. Moreover, Emperor William did not hesitate to send messages congratulating the Sultan and the commander-in-chief of the Turkish forces, couched in the most enthusiastic language, on their victories over the Greeks.

Then, too, in the differences between the Kaiser and his mother at the outset of his reign, Constantine sided with Empress Frederick. Another quarrel of a very violent character ensued when the Crown Princess, now Queen Sophie of Greece, joined the Orthodox Greek Church, to which her husband and children belonged, abjuring Lutheranism. This, too, without asking her eldest brother's permission. Years afterwards a reconciliation ensued between brother and sister; but there has never been any complete rapprochement between Constantine and William, and when a couple of years ago the then Crown Prince had been forced by the Military League at Athens to leave Greece, and to quit the Hellenic Army, with, as he believed, no prospect of recall, he took steps to join, not the army of his brother-in-law the Kaiser, but that of his cousin the Czar, even going so far as to give orders for the dispatch of all his belongings from his palace at Athens, and his country place in the vicinity, to St. Petersburg, where he announced his intention of making his home. He was summoned back to Greece before these plans could be put into execution. But they showed pretty well the fact that his foreign leanings were towards Russia rather than Germany, and consequently to the Triple Entente more than towards the Triple Alliance. For it is difficult to be friends with both, excepting by means of the exercise of an amount of diplomacy which King George possessed, but in which Constantine is lacking. These pro-Russian proclivities of King Constantine, who has shown himself a very able commander in the present Balkan war, are of more moment than ever just at present. For the enormous armaments to which the Kaiser has committed the German Empire since the beginning of the year, are directed, by common consent, far less against France than against Russia, which from henceforth in her military operations is likely to be able to rely upon near a million seasoned troops of the Balkan Allied States.

Queen Sophia has sometimes been criticised in Greece for being too aggressively German. In fact, her popularity in the land of her adoption is at a very low ebb compared with that of the new widowed Queen Olga, and of the wives of all the other Greek princes of Greece (save Princess George, nee Bonaparte, of Monte Carlo). Appreciating this, Sophia spends as little time as possible at Athens, dividing her time between Germany and England—so much so, that something very much akin to a separation has long existed between herself and her husband. The political differences, especially in the matter of foreign leanings, have doubtless contributed to the disunion of the couple. They are now likely to become more and more accentuated, especially since their eldest son has reached a marriageable age, and no one need be astonished to learn of a complete estrangement between the two.

[Copyright, 1913, by the Brentwood Company.]

Spring

By PERCY SHAW.

LET others sing in terms of praise
Of Spring and her erratic ways,
Her petulant and pouting ways
I scorn all that—
For Spring's a sorry time with me,
No blossoms bud upon my tree;
In fact, the only thing I see
Is Helen's hat.

I dread the passing of the frost;
I feel dejected, blue and lost;
I wonder what the thing will cost,
Each little while.
And when she waves her hand "good-by"
I tremblingly avoid her eye
And once outside the door I fly
With sickly smile.

The Spring hat toxin, well I know—
I feel its symptoms come and go
I see its fever ebb and glow;
It starts like this:
"My love, how well you look today,
"I hate to have you go away.
"Sometimes I hope you'll always stay.
"Give me a kiss."

And then returning somewhat late,
Wax in the hands of ruthless fate,
I hear her say, "Of course I wait,
"You patient dear,
"How weary you must be, but there,
"Let me pull up your easy chair,
"No, never mind, I'll brush your hair;
"You sit right here."

The soup's just right, the meat is fine,
The salad nothing but divine,
Ah, if I always thus could dine
On feasts like that;
I light my pipe, the bell rings free;
Helen comes radiant to me—
"I had it sent up C. O. D.
"Look, here's my hat."

Here's a Member of Parliament Who Champions the Militants

BY CHARLES A. McCURDY, M. P.

BEFORE the beatified dead in the Roman Church could take their place in the calendar of saints a trial used to be necessary to adjudicate upon their claims to that distinction. Counsel appeared to plead the cause of the departed, and in order that both sides of the case might be fairly argued there was assigned to the devil an advocate of his own to say anything that could be said from Satan's standpoint.

The militant suffragettes have not even a devil's advocate to say a word for them in the press today.

It is unusual for revolutionaries, however violent—even Nihilists and regicides—to lack sympathizers among us, so long as their activities are confined to other countries. For violence at home the English people have no stomach, as the men of Ulster may some day find to their cost.

Arson and bombs, broken glass and shattered houses may form a striking background to political aims viewed from a comfortable distance, but in the foreground they fill the picture so completely that we can hear nothing but the explosions and see nothing but the smoke. Any political significance is lost in the noise of people shouting for the fire brigade and the police.

The suffragist politician of a peaceful and prudent turn of mind, like myself, feels inclined to wash his hands of the whole matter, go home to bed and prepare to establish his own alibi.

Consequences Serious.

For the consequences threaten to be serious. It is no question this time of a few weeks in the second division. Imprisonment in a criminal lunatic asylum, banishment for life from these shores, are only samples of the punishments demanded by a public justly irritated by outrageous attacks on property, and perhaps still more irritated by the obvious difficulty of securing adequate punishment. We have had tried kindness tempered with the second division; we have employed persuasion coupled with the stomach tube. She remains as unsociable as M. Du Chaillu's gorilla. It is no use reasoning with her; she is dead to argument. In vain have scientists told her that her brain is some ounces lighter than that of man; she replies that she pays the same taxes. A distinguished physiologist has explained in the plainest language that she is subject to sexual disturbances which at times unfit her for the exercise of calm judgment or reflection (so essential in a votor). She asks whether the same might not have been said of Nelson, to say nothing of lesser men. If you tell her that the place for woman is the home, she will reply that there are some millions of women in our country engaged in factories, workshops and other employments who have no home in which to find their place.

She Always Has an Answer.

Assure her that the interests of her sex are better safeguarded by the chivalry of the male voter than they could be by herself, and she inquires why the average wage paid to women workers is 7s. a week, while the enfranchised male gets four times as much pay for the same hours of labor.

It is useless to reason with the suffragette. We can only deplore the limits of her intellectual powers.

The suffragette has not kept pace with Liberalism in the development of this democratic ideal. She stands by the old Liberal doctrine and adds quite logically, "A government which denies all right of representation to women has no more right to punish than to tax." This is not insanity, but reason, which on the lips of a woman can be almost as irritating.

She destroys property, not from an unreasoning rage for destruction, but from the rational standpoint of an intellectual anarchist, who wishes to demonstrate to a public who distrusts logic and do not know what a syllogism is, that she has been left outside their scheme of representative government and finds herself an outlaw in her own land. For that purpose she decides to break their laws, and as passive resistance proved a broken reed in the hands of the aggrieved Nonconformists, she selects more striking and dramatic forms of lawlessness, much to the embarrassment and annoyance of her friends.

Merits of the Case.

But our annoyance and our resentment of the methods adopted cannot forever prevent us from considering the merits of her case, however irregularly presented.

When arrested she puts in a plea somewhat unusual in our courts of law. She objects to the jurisdiction. She denies our right to punish or even to try her. We cannot ignore her plea, when in the formula of the law courts she is asked if she has anything to say why judgment should not be passed upon her. We may reject the plea, but we are in honor bound to give our reason.

By what right then do we claim to impose our laws on these women, and on what principle of good government are we entitled to punish them?

For my part I find the questions difficult to answer.

The basis of democratic government is the consent of the governed. Under our Constitution this consent of the governed in all important matters, changes in the law, the imposition of taxes, and the like, is expressed by the representatives of the people sitting in the House of Commons.

Women are neither asked nor allowed to consent. They are no parties to the social contract by which the enfranchised assent to the making and administration of the laws.

The only principle put forward for our justification is the doctrine that the government represents, and ought to represent, the physical force of the country, and that as the possessors of physical force the male adults are entitled to impose their will upon those who are weaker than themselves. I cannot understand how any man can hold this view and at the same time call himself a Democrat. Government by a minority of the adult population who deny any right of representation to the majority is certainly not democracy, whatever else it may be called.

Her Plea Logical.

As a Democrat I find her plea logical and unanswered.

But, it is said, this is not a question of principle, but of expediency. Great statesmen, for whose opinion I have the most profound respect, believe that the enfranchisement of women would be of no benefit to themselves and an injury to the state. The same argument was urged against every extension of the franchise to further classes of male voters. It may well be that the enfranchisement of women involves some risk, but it seems to me just the kind of risk which a consistent Democrat is bound to take. If we dare not trust the people we have no business to call ourselves Democrats at all.

And the suffragette has a further plea why judgment should not be passed upon her—that we have closed all lawful ways to the constitutional redress of her grievance.

Whether she is right or wrong in her claim to be treated as a citizen for all purposes or none, no one will deny that women are entitled to have their case fairly argued on its merits and a true verdict given by the Supreme Court of Parliament. Our record is, unfortunately, not very good in the matter. Seven times in the last 25 years the House of Commons, after full debate, has given judgment for the women by passing the second reading of a suffrage bill.

"The will of the people as expressed by their representatives in the House of Commons shall and must prevail," said Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, and the Parliament Act makes statutory the doctrine that the decision of the House of Commons thrice repeated after due intervals for reflection must have the effect of law. Can women be blamed if they demand that effect shall be given to the decision of the House of Commons seven times given in their favor? Is not their resentment natural when they at last realize that never in this Parliament will effect be given to those decisions? When they see their supporters divided into hostile camps, profoundly swayed by questions of tactics, motives of expediency, considerations of party—by anything, in fact, but the merits of their case?

Militancy the Only Way.

Militancy, deplorable as it is, is perhaps only the inevitable consequence when a great political movement backed by 50 years of strenuous agitation finds all channels blocked, all safe outlets stopped up, all hope of a successful issue denied.

There is only one way to deal with militants.

Let us open our eyes to the fact that they are neither hysterical nor insane; that they are, with relentless logic and remarkable fortitude, pursuing a course which means to them much unhappiness and often physical anguish for ends which are neither foolish nor dishonorable. Make plain and easy for them a better way to take. Show them that there are still methods by which they can have their case fairly heard by the democracy of this country, and justly decided upon its merits without unreasonable delay, and they will gladly turn from methods of lawless propaganda, nauseating to themselves as they are abhorrent to others. But if it is not within the wit of man to give women's suffrage a fair chance of success, free from cross-currents and party considerations, let us at any rate refrain from unnecessary abuse of women who suffer imprisonment and great personal discomfort in trying to advance a perfectly legitimate cause by methods which are wrong and deplorable, but to which we are unable to offer any reasonable alternative.—The Chronicle.

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc4150_1_215-0553