

with the proceedings the railroads are grieving loudly over the slavery in which they find themselves to the owners of private freight cars! How the railroads, with their monopoly power, can be dominated by car owners without their consent, is certainly mysterious. The fact about the growing use of private cars is this, that their owners are coming more and more into the business of doing railroad work, while the owners of railroads are getting more and more to be mere landlords of rights of way. Especially is this true with reference to the owners of great terminals. The minor railroad rights of way not yet absorbed, are engaged in what their directors call "competition;" but in dealing with terminal people, the owners of private freight cars who have no terminal monopolies, are coming under a system of merciless rack-renting.

"No white man is allowed," says a news dispatch, "to take up his residence in the prosperous town of Boley, located on the Fort Smith and Western railroad in the Creek nation." This prosperous town contains, it seems, some "400 law-abiding Negroes," and although only a year old it boasts two churches, a schoolhouse, several large stores and a \$5,000 cotton gin, owned and controlled exclusively by Negroes. Another notable thing about this "inferior race" town is the fact that it is "the only town in the United States without any form of government." There are no regular Territorial laws to bother it, and the town itself has no municipal laws. Yet no serious crime or offense of any kind has been committed in the place. If that dispatch is not a canard, Anglo-Saxon civilization has something to learn of one race which it has outraged and abused and despised.

War is barbarous, horribly barbarous; but there are worse things than war, and one of them would be produced by Andrew Carnegie's proposition for abolishing war. In a letter to the International Peace Congress (p. 425), in ses-

sion last week at Boston, Mr. Carnegie wrote:

Suppose that Britain, France, Germany and America, with such other minor states as would certainly join them, should unite, prepared, if defied, to enforce peaceful settlement, the first offender (if there ever was one) being rigorously dealt with, war would at one fell swoop be banished from the earth.

That arrangement would reproduce the Roman Empire. Sooner or later all power would centralize, through the arbitration tribunal, first in the hands of the constable nations, then in the hands of a cabal of those nations, and then in the hands of the one that made its policies dominant in the cabal. To preserve international peace by military power is Napoleonic, but not conducive either to liberty or to peace. The centralization of power in the constable states would lead on to enormous injustice, and that in turn would produce revolts of the bloodiest kind. Peace is to be secured by peaceful means. Let arbitration courts decide, let public opinion and that alone enforce their decrees, and there will be little danger of injustice on the part of the tribunal and less of war between the nations.

#### WOMEN AND WAR.

One of the most tantalizing manifestations of that lack of logic which is popularly supposed to be the most charmingly feminine trait of the truly feminine mind, is the ability to be moved to emotion by isolated facts and single pictures, while ignoring utterly their connection one with another—the thread of thought and inter-relation which alone can give them their true significance.

To be absolutely frank, we should confess that this trait is not altogether a stranger to the superior masculine mind either; but it is certainly not so distinctively a sex characteristic as it is, unfortunately, with women. It is the trait that awakens hope within the breast of the ardent reformer who appeals to feminine tenderness and pity, only to receive a cold shower dash in the realization of an utter noncomprehension of his idea, in spite of

ready tears and real sympathy with the sad pictures he paints.

Take this matter of war, for instance, with its present political manifestations of imperialism and militarism. Advocates of peace who really understand not the sentimental significance only, but the actual political and economic meaning of the words "war" and "peace," find ready sympathizers among women when they paint the agony of the battlefield, the misery of the bereaved home. But in midst of their tears, a strain of martial music without will draw these same women to the window with enthusiastic exclamations of, "Oh, the gallant soldier boys! Don't they look fine!" They utterly fail to see the moral and ethical connection between the thing that arouses their enthusiasm and the thing that draws their tears; they utterly fail to realize that just as long as this absurd and unjustified glorification of brute force in the form of militarism continues, just so long will wars be fatally easy to enter into, just so long will imperialistic despotism and commercial tyranny find in the army a ready weapon for their selfish ends.

If women would stop weeping over the "silent, upturned face," and admiring the outer trappings that mark the licensed murderer, long enough to think a little about the connection between the two, the cause of peace would take a seven-league stride onward.

For the woman who thinks comes naturally first of all to think of the good of her sex, and to concern herself about questions pertaining thereto; and for a woman interested in the welfare of woman as a sex, this question of war and militarism is so fundamental that it is incomprehensible how so many can still be blind to its significance.

The mother, wife, sweetheart, and sister, weeping at home for the absent or the dead, are supposed to be the chief sufferers from war's devastations. In reality they are but a few isolated cases, whose sorrows are as nothing compared to what the sex as a whole has suffered from the sway of militarism throughout the ages, and the point of view fostered by it.

It is this spirit of militarism, the glorification of brute force, and this alone, that has kept woman in political, legal and economic bondage throughout the ages, and there is still enough of it remaining in our enlightened twentieth century to make the idea of woman's participation in public office and public life a thing to be scoffed at by the majority, ridiculed and opposed.

It was not any manifestation of superiority of the masculine mind that first threw the chains of political serfhood around one-half of humanity; it was merely the fact that in the dark ages of the world's history brute force, i. e. militarism in one or another form, reigned supreme. Where brute force was lord, woman with her differently constituted muscular development was considered an inferior being simply because she did not bear arms.

It was not that she could not fight, but that instinctively, even in the "dim red dawn of man," prehistoric man felt that giving life was greater than taking it; and woman, as the giver of life, was to be kept back from the possibility of unnecessary physical danger.

From this feeling, become n-thinking and uncomprehended tradition, grew the idea that woman was inferior in bodily strength, and could not bear arms; and therefore was an inferior being.

Nineteenth century man, as far as he began to think at all, began to understand that brute force was not everything, began to find it necessary to discover another reason for woman's political and legal position; and thus was born the legend of woman's inferior mentality.

Medieval man was far more honest in his brutal "Only man, who bears arms, can have a voice in the affairs of his country's politics." Medieval man was consistent, too, and excluded even that part of the male population that did not bear arms from public estimation and from public affairs. Modern man has grown more enlightened with respect to his own sex, but enough of militarism still lingers to make very hard the path of the woman struggling for legal, polit-

ical and economic rights for her sex.

The wonder is that so many, even of these women, do not understand the point of view born of the traditions of centuries of militarism that still opposes them in the solid front of the unthinking conservative mass.

While the military ideal holds sway in our modern world, woman suffrage and the attainment of full legal and political rights for women will remain a Utopian dream. The military state is the state in which woman has no place; the military mind is the mind that sees in woman only a drudge or a toy, and gives her the one right only to existence—the possibility of bearing sons who will in time become soldiers.

Women may work for the improvement of their minds, they may open schools for their sex, they may make their way in art, in commerce, in the professions, they may prove in a thousand ways their fitness to take part in public life; but it will avail them little so long as one vestige of the tradition and the point of view born of militarism remains in the civilized world. The military point of view is that of contempt for woman, of a denial to her of any other usefulness than that of bearing children.

This is not an exaggeration, for although the military mind, being an anachronism in our modern world, must of itself be illogical, it has certain instinctive forms of thought which are born of strictly logical reasoning.

The most cursory survey of civilized nations to-day will prove the truth of this. The inferior position of women in Germany is not by any means due to a lack in the mentality of the German woman, nor to a lack of educational facilities for either sex in a country justly proud of its magnificent school system. It is simply and solely due to the fact that at present the "nation of poets and thinkers" has for a time sold its birthright of mental pre-eminence for a mess of pottage—military glory and rampant imperialism.

What is it that has made the American woman the admiration of all civilized nations, the envy

of her sisters elsewhere? She was not sent down fresh from Heaven in her present state, nor did she spring full-grown from the head of Jove. She was the daughter of mothers born in the military-ridden states of Europe. But now she is the product of several generations of freedom from the military idea. This, and this alone, has given her a measure of freedom beyond that attained by women anywhere else.

Let American women think seriously on this matter of war and peace, on this question of imperialism and militarism. If our nation should by any unfortunate but highly improbable combination of circumstances take her place amid the army-ridden, land-stealing "world powers" it would mean much more to the American woman than a succession of wars that would bereave her of her loved ones, or send them back to her crippled or afflicted with loathsome disease. It would mean for American woman as a sex the loss of much she has gained by her happier circumstances of the past two centuries, and it would place the goal of perfect political and legal equality she still desires, far, far out of reach in a cloudland which even the most hopeful could scarcely vision.

American woman's being what she is, is our greatest safeguard against the evils that appear to threaten us; but the trouble is, the American woman is what she is only instinctively and unconsciously as yet, and there are far too many of her in the ranks of those who look upon these threatening evils as something good to be desired.

GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

#### THE MARRIAGE PROBLEM—POLYGYAMY AND "FREE LOVE."

Whether or not we concede the eternity of human life, and therefore the eternity of marriage, there is no reasonable escape from the conclusion that the essential principle which must constitute eternal marriages if they do exist (p. 421), points to the essential principle of temporal marriage. The mystical is here paralleled by the sensuous. Look upon the nature of marriage as we may, whether as continuing upward and inward to the heart