

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.