

have bred distress calling for charitable relief. If all charity were dispensed by the State instead of private institutions there would be a stronger disposition to abolish the need of it. The mothers' pension act is a step in that direction. Perhaps that explains why opposition comes from sources where no objection is urged to other forms of Charity as a substitute for Justice. s. d.



Feeding Europe.

America has been succoring the people of outraged Belgium almost from the beginning of the war. Later it was called upon to supply devastated Poland and harried Serbia. It is now announced that representatives of the United States will be permitted to inspect the prison camps in Great Britain, Germany and Austria, and presumably France and Russia, to learn and report the condition of the prisoners and "distribute supplies among the prisoners." Will the logic of this lead to our supporting the civil population of the belligerent countries, while the men continue the fight? s. c.



Women at The Hague.

When Victor Yarros was asked, during the darkest days of the first Duma—after it had been stripped of almost the last vestige of authority—what he thought of the prospects of representative government in Russia, he answered that it did not matter how much a tyrannical government oppressed the members, so long as the Duma itself was allowed to sit and go through the forms of legislating. "For," said he, "when the Russian people have come to think of the Duma as a part of the natural order, they will gradually obtain control of political affairs." The same thing is true of the Peace Conferences at The Hague. The announcement of the first Conference, called by the Czar of Russia, was hailed with derision by the jingoes and militarists. Its apparently meager results provoked merriment. But the first Conference led to a second Conference, to a permanent Court of Arbitration, to the settlement of international disputes, until today The Hague has fixed a new thought in the minds of men; and that thought will continue to grow until it overshadows all nations.



Nothing has happened since the breaking out of the present war that is likely to have greater influence upon the destinies of mankind than the calling by certain women of Holland of an inter-

national conference of women from neutral and belligerent countries to meet at The Hague in April. This conference will get such attention as no other has; and even though hostilities do not cease at once the world-thought will receive an indelible impress from its conclusions. The glories of war have departed, the profit of strife has proved vain; nothing is left but its sordidness, its cruelty, and its shame. Men will welcome an excuse to turn from their senseless course. That excuse will be found in its most acceptable form in the plea of the women. It needs not the gift of prophecy to see that when peace does return the Court of The Hague will be a power in the world; and among the judges who pass upon international affairs will be women. s. c.



A Useful General.

Whether Brigadier General Hugh L. Scott, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, could with the forces at hand repel an invasion of the combined nations of Europe may never be known; but he has demonstrated his ability to do what few other generals can do: Make peace without killing his opponents. He has repeatedly pacified Indians who have taken to the warpath. Recently he settled the trouble between the Villa and Carranza forces, who had persisted in firing across the American line. And now in Utah he has succeeded in quieting the Piutes, who had taken to the warpath.



What must the European generals think of a country that sends its Chief of Staff to pacify Mexicans and Indians? What, indeed, must the militarists of our own country think of such undignified proceedings? How much better it would have been, they will think, to have sent an army of several thousand men to round up those Indians in Utah, shoot some, imprison others, and so impress upon their minds the fact that no one can tamper with the dignity of Uncle Samuel. By throwing an army into Mexico we could have taught those miserable people that shooting across the border was a serious thing.



How does our General pacify men without killing them? Why did the Mexicans stop firing across the line at the request of General Scott, when they would not in the face of the army? Why did these Indians yield themselves to the law at the request of this man whom they had never seen, and whose language they could not