

Congress of fifty thousand dollars to entertain the delegates to the Interparliamentary Conference at St. Louis, the outspoken and ardent support of arbitration by the President and the Secretary of State, are a sufficient interpretation of the advanced position of the nation on this great issue.

These special treaties of obligatory arbitration, with the one exception, lack much of being ideal, as they run for but five years, and provide only for the reference to the Hague Court of questions of a judicial order and those regarding the interpretation of treaties. With the exception of the Danish-Netherlands treaty, which has no limitations either in regard to time or to classes of cases, they all exclude from their operation questions which affect the vital interests and the "honor" of the signatories, very vague and indefinite conceptions. But in spite of their limitations, they mark a great step forward. The simple fact that great and mighty nations have become willing to pledge themselves in advance to submit important classes of disputes to a disinterested tribunal, the creation of their own joint action, speaks more eloquently than any words can possibly do of the growing international respect for law, of the more rational and humane attitude which the nations in general now bear toward one another, an attitude before which war with its unspeakable cruelties and its conspicuous failures of justice cannot long survive.

In South America, whose states are not yet parties to the Hague Convention, arbitration has made just as great progress as elsewhere. Ten of the republics, at the Pan-American Congress at Mexico City, in addition to recording their adherence to the Hague Conventions, signed a treaty for the arbitration of all disputes between them. Chile and the Argentine Republic, after settling their long-standing boundary dispute by arbitration, concluded in June, 1903, some months before the signing of the Anglo-French treaty, a general treaty of arbitration to run for five years and covering all disputes except such as might involve the national independence. This was noteworthy as the first treaty of obligatory arbitration ever concluded between two nations in the history of the world. There resulted from it a still more remarkable treaty, namely, one under which the two governments undertook to reduce,—and have reduced,—to a considerable degree both their armies and their navies—the first treaty of general disarmament in the history of the world. Treaties of obligatory arbitration have also been concluded between some others of the South American states.

It is clear from the array of facts here cited, setting forth the progress of arbitration between the nations within a century—and their force could be greatly increased by further detail—that we are rapidly approaching the day of the culmination of the movement in a complete and universal system. Unless history reverses its processes the Hague Court is in a comparatively short period to become a world-court, in which all the nations great and small will share on equal terms. The present movement for special treaties of obligatory arbitration which has accomplished so much within fifteen months, will eventuate in a few years in a general universal treaty solemnly signed in a great world conclave by representatives of all the independent states of the earth. There is already prospect that this will be one of the

two or three chief items upon the program of the new International Conference at The Hague, which the government of the United States has already taken the first steps to convoke, and which is certain to meet within a year or two.

In spite of the sanguinary conflict in the Far East, possibly all the more because of its horrible lessons, the twentieth century has every prospect of seeing, before it is very old, arbitration by a high court of the nations take permanently and universally the place of "grim-visaged war."

Women and War.

BY GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

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 non-comprehension of his idea, in spite of ready tears and real sympathy with the sad pictures he paints.

Take the 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 the 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, up-turned 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,—that is, 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 unthinking 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.

Mediæval 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." Mediæval 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, political 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 preëminence 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.

— *The Public.*

One Other Neutral Water Way.

The article appearing in the current number of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, under the heading "Neutral Zones on the Atlantic," cites, in support of the resolution of the Massachusetts State Board of Trade favoring the extension of "what may be called the 'ferry ways' of the great commerce passing over the Atlantic," the neutralization of the Suez Canal, and, likewise, the practical neutralization of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River, through the operation of the beneficent agreement of 1817 between Great Britain and the United States.