



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

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.

This simple but as yet altogether efficient agreement, promulgated under the presidency of James Monroe, is representative of an international "doctrine" which it is to be hoped may be perpetual between the two nations which subscribed to it.

In referring to this subject, however, I desire more particularly to call attention to the fact that the waters of the Strait of Magellan have also, since the year 1881, been internationally known as neutral. In compliance with the request made to the Department of State, several years after the above date, for the exact wording of the stipulation entered into between Chile and the Argentine Confederation, I received the following transcription (in Spanish) of the text of Article V. of said treaty:

"El Estrecho de Magallanes queda neutralizado en perpetuidad y asegurada su libre navegacion para las banderas de todas las Naciones. En el interes de asegurar esta libertad no se construiren en las costas fortificaciones ni defensas militares que puedan contrariar ese proposito." (The Strait of Magellan to remain perpetually neutral, and its free navigation assured to the flags of all nations. With the intent of securing this immunity, it is forbidden to construct on the coasts thereof any fortifications or military defenses which would defeat such purpose.)

In connection with this notable treaty, it is proper to state that it was largely effected through the good offices of the United States Ministers (both bearing the name of Osborn) at the capitals of Chile and the Argentine Confederation. Not only was the neutralization of the Strait secured, but a permanent settlement was reached of the long-standing dispute between the two republics as to their respective rights of ownership in the territory theretofore called Patagonia. Obviously the Anglo-Saxon had a hand in establishing that condition of assured amity between the republics which lately led them to make sale of their useless battleships, and to formally set up an emblem of perpetual concord on their Andean boundary line.

JOSIAH W. LEEDS.

WESTCHESTER, PA., March 27, 1905.

What the United States Should Do to Promote a General Treaty of Obligatory Arbitration at the Next Hague Conference.

[Hon. Richard Bartholdt's view as given in an interview in the *New York Tribune*.]

The first fruit of the recent congress of the Interparliamentary Union was the action of President Roosevelt in calling the international conference for some early date at The Hague. The next material result was the negotiation of the arbitration agreements with England, Germany, France, Italy, Switzerland and Spain, but this was nullified by the action of the Senate. Of course, the attitude of the Senate was based on the belief that the treaty making right of that body under the constitution would be violated if the Executive could take the initiative in the adjustment of international differences. If they are right in that interpretation, it is certainly regrettable that the constitution presents an obstacle to the advancement of the cause of international arbitration. It is a fact, however, that the very senators who felt

called on to defend the constitution are earnest friends of arbitration.

I was greatly depressed by the action of the Senate, and for a time felt that we had been set back a hundred years in the work for the world's peace; but I have come to entertain a different view of the situation. On Saturday last, accompanied by Hayne Davis, I called on the President, with whom we had a full and free interchange of views. I then said to the President that the practical rejection of the treaties by their amendment might not be such a calamity after all, but rather a blessing in disguise. I called attention to the fact that the treaties that had been negotiated were modeled after the Anglo-French treaty, which, for obvious reasons, would be somewhat restricted in its scope. Only judicial questions and those differences growing out of earlier treaty provisions came within the limitations of the agreements which are now regarded by the President as belonging to the category of closed incidents. It will now be possible, however, to formulate a treaty that will enumerate a large number of specific subjects, on which the contracting powers will be willing, if differences arise, to refer them for adjustment to the Hague Tribunal—questions that will not invade the inhibited field of national honor or independence or vital interest.

The subjects can, of course, only be determined by careful study, and the list may be utilized in variable measure—in whole or in part, as the contracting parties could determine. The result would be greatly to broaden the scope of the arbitration agreement, and enlarge its usefulness. This idea appealed to the President.

It would be my thought that the early appointment of the American representatives to the Hague Conference would make it possible for them to compare notes and propose subjects that could properly be regarded as admissible of arbitration. They could take the public into their confidence through the press, and popular sentiment would help to mould and refine the distinctively American view. Other powers would by this means also become cognizant of our attitude in advance of the conference at The Hague. I believe this means of enhancing the practical usefulness of international arbitration will appeal to the various powers already committed to the peace propaganda. I believe also that sympathetic action in the Hague Conference would go far to assure the subsequent exchange of ratifications, and that the cause of arbitration would so be broadened and its vital force extended.

A Business Man's View of the Senate's Action on the Arbitration Treaties.

[Mr. Arthur B. Farquhar, of York, Pa., Vice-President of the National Association of Manufacturers, a well-known manufacturer and political economist, and a most active supporter of the international arbitration and peace movement, has sent us the following communication which was recently published in the *Philadelphia Public Ledger*. We are very glad to reproduce it for our readers, the more so as Mr. Farquhar has recently become a member of the American Peace Society.]

The final consummation of a treaty is something that requires considerable time, under our form of government, owing to the necessity of a vote of two-thirds of the Senate in its favor to give it validity. More for that