

. . . A lady correspondent writes us that "the club woman today who thinks that 'war is necessary to the cultivation of manhood' or that doing away with war 'would lessen manhood' is so great a novelty that we feel sorry for her when she expresses herself thus, either privately or on the floor of a convention." We hope that is true of the women in all the States of the Union. A militaristic, jingoistic woman is even more to be dreaded than a man to whom these adjectives may be appropriately applied.

. . . The meeting of the German and Russian Emperors on the Baltic, on July 6, seems, from the somewhat veiled statements which have been made about it, to have had no further significance than to give "a fresh proof of the steadfast friendship of Germany and Russia and the peaceful aims of the two empires."

. . . Dr. Philander P. Claxton, National Commissioner of Education, gave an address on arbitration and peace at the vesper service of the summer school at the University of Virginia on Sunday evening, July 28. The address was listened to with great interest by at least a thousand of the students of the summer school.

•••

British Relations with Germany.

In a debate on Foreign Affairs in the House of Commons on July 10, Sir Edward Grey, the Foreign Secretary, made the following statement:

Our general foreign policy remains unchanged. The starting point in any developments in European foreign policy is the maintenance of our friendships with France and Russia. With that as our starting point, let us have the best possible relations with other countries. (Hear, hear!) When we see France or Russia coming to an agreement with another European power and being on good terms with it, as was emphasized by the meeting between the Russian and German Emperors recently—when we see that we have every reason to congratulate ourselves. I am convinced that France and Russia are as loyal to the friendship with us as we are to our friendship with them. Nothing which took place on occasions such as the meeting in the Baltic the other day is going to take place to our disadvantage. Just as if there were difficulties between France and Germany or Russia and Germany, that were going to exercise a disturbing influence on diplomatic relations between ourselves and Germany, so anything which removes difficulties between France and Germany or Russia and Germany—as the Morocco settlement did last year, and as the recent conversations between Russia and Germany might have done—smoothed the path of relations between Great Britain and Germany, too. A very significant statement had appeared in the official *communiqué* published after the meeting of the Emperors in the Baltic the other day. It was this sentence: "There can be no question, either, of new agreements, because there is no particular occasion for them, or of producing alterations of any kind in the grouping of the European powers, the value of which for the maintenance of peace has already been proved." I entirely endorse that statement. I have always felt that though there must be separate groups, they need not necessarily be in opposing diplomatic camps. Our own relations with the

German government at the present moment are excellent. (Cheers.) We are perfectly frank about all questions of mutual interest. I believe that when questions come up, whether, for instance, in connection with the two countries' respective interests in southern Africa or whether in connection eventually with the Bagdad Railway, both governments are convinced that their mutual interests can be fairly reconciled. I have done all I could to establish such relations. On the question of China, for instance, and the action of the six powers, I have been perfectly frank in expressing this country's views, believing that thus it would be found there was no real opposition. So I will conclude by saying that separate diplomatic groups there are, as has been recognized in the *communiqué* I have read, but I do not think that ought to prevent frankness and the exchange of views upon questions of mutual interest. If that takes place, the separate diplomatic groups need not necessarily mean opposing diplomatic camps. (Cheers.)

•••

International Peace Through the Voice of Women.

Address of the Baroness von Suttner before 1,500 Club-women in the First Congregational Church, San Francisco, Cal., July 2, 1912.

Through the voice of the women will come international peace. Not until that voice is raised will the federation of the world in brotherly love be accomplished. I consider the army of women—especially when possessed of the vote, as they are now in happy California—I consider this army predestined to win the battle which this generation has begun against the systematic massacre called war.

As war, all war, is hell, your Secretary of War is a secretary of hell, and your War Department is a department of hell. Your great generals and military men are hell lords, perpetuating barbarism.

You probably know that I am myself an old warrior in this struggle for an understanding between nations. Since you have called me, it proves that you are not only platonically in sympathy with the peace cause, but that you are to take it up and work for it. And when you begin to put your heart and soul into it, you will recognize that it is the great fundamental question of this century. In its magnitude it embraces all other questions of human needs. We peacemakers, as individuals, need be modest, but we are not modest in the world-wide appreciation of our cause. It is so universal that the personality of its adherents disappears in the ether.

When I go home and tell them in Europe about this Western country they will hardly believe me. When I tell them about the vigor, the heroic size, the beauty, and mental alertness of your women, they will think I am exaggerating. I consider the American women by far the most perfectly developed, mentally and physically, and I feel that they are a powerful influence and will continue to have even a mightier power in the progress of civilization. Teach the young men today that good will is a greater protection than armies and navies. In these days of war we are not giving the best things in life—our best education, our best wishes, our greatest patriotism, and the flower of our youth—to the family, but to the "watch-dog."

The question has been raised: What can women do to serve the cause of peace? I have to say that the women of today can do much, indeed, in the States of America where they have the right to vote; they can do as much as, or more than men. If women who have the right to vote will cast their votes only for those in public life who stand for peace, then you will have a Government which stands for peace. In those States of your great America in which women do not vote, let them join peace societies, let them sign petitions, let them use their influence, and in this way serve the great cause.

It is indeed only too natural for the women to detest war, for they are the ones who appreciate the horrors of warfare—they who stay at home and view the terrible conflict which takes from them those whom they love most dearly.

To you, intelligent American clubwomen, I can suggest that your power for the good cause rests in your organization. You can raise a demand that humanity be made more worthy of the name, for humanity needs peace. War is inhumanity.

To me America is the land of promise, at least in the sense of ideals and peace. You Americans are full of strength and courage and daring, while we Europeans are filled with a struggle that never seems to attain that for which we struggle.

The strides you have made toward peace in America are immeasurable. You have organized your whole country for peace, and have federated all branch societies. Even your War Department is busy, working for the peace movement.

If I were to tell this to a European audience they would not only disbelieve my statement; they would laugh at me in derision. When the women of Europe speak to me of the future, I tell them, Go to America and look at the future, for there the future has already arrived. Americans are fifty years in advance of us ethically.

It would be good if Europeans, eager to learn and to know, might be turned to America in such throngs as Americans pour into Europe. The nations have much to learn from one another. That is better than for them to blow each other into the air. America is the only nation which, as a nation, stands for peace. The European nations think only of war. Americans do not as a people realize the position of Europeans.

The position of the European is an inherited one, like his religion, his titles, and the rest. Europeans have the need for war fastened into their vitals by the dictum of the past, and to speak for peace is considered unpatriotic and almost traitorous.

American people are interested in rooting war out of Europe, not only for ethical reasons, but as well for the reason that their coasts are a tempting target for every full-armed, jealous European government. This makes armament necessary to your welfare, and throws that useless tax upon a free people which already has the extra expense of regenerating Europe's human products of war and poverty into useful citizens.

You in America hear reports of our activity for peace. This activity is not reported in our own press, except to ridicule us as cranks. The fact that there is such a movement has not yet penetrated the brain of millions of Europeans. Our best women are all for war and its

glory. Parliaments and court circles are dominated by paid diplomats in the hire of the gunmakers, who cook up scares and serve them on toast in every capital.

We Europeans will look to you American women who advocate peace and are in a position to make peace possible. To us who work in Europe for the cause of peace, America is the young nation which shall, as a regenerative race, lead the lion of European militarism and the bleeding lamb of the populace to a cessation of armament and the unendurable blight of war.

We Should Stand for Peace and Good Will on Earth.

Speech of Hon. Joseph E. Johnston, of Alabama, on the Naval Appropriation Bill, in the United States Senate, July 5, 1912.

Mr. President: Instead of entering into competition with foreign nations in building battleships, one for every two of England and one for every one of Germany, France, or Japan—instead of being governed in our expenditures or following the pace set by these nations, it would be far better, both for ourselves and for the burdened taxpayers of foreign nations, to endeavor to provide treaties that would put an end to these struggles for supremacy and these vast and unnecessary wastes of public funds. The burden of every appropriation, the final incidence of every dollar expended by this Government, falls upon the citizens, rich and poor, of the United States. The glory that was Rome's, the games and largess of its emperors, made many a Roman holiday and bent with toil many a Roman citizen or else extinguished the light of happiness in provincial cottages. A nation has no riches by inheritance or by speculation. The last cent of its revenue is taken from the pockets of the people. Great ships do not spring from mere ideas of grandeur, but are slowly constructed by the sweat of a nation.

Whenever we build a war vessel England builds two, and Germany, France, and Japan build one; thus six ships, not one, are involved when the Congress of the United States increases its Navy by one. At least \$75,000,000 of energy are wrung from five nations and wasted as utterly and remorselessly as by fire. Some, in the face of this fact, advocate that we shall build enough battleships to command both the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, which, even if England stood still in her construction and addition to her navy, would require the expenditure of billions of dollars, would extend the income tax into every home, take its toll from every wage and income, and abolish for all time the bright dream of tariff reduction. In 1900 our appropriations for the Navy were about \$55,000,000. Last year they were \$120,000,000, and with all the paring down of a Democratic House, and after eliminating extra battleships, the present House bill calls for \$118,547,137.48, and this bill adds over \$15,000,000.

When are we to stop? How long will it take at this pace to saddle upon the backs of our people burdens they can only bear by denying their families the necessities of life? Very few of our people, with sound minds and sound appetites, would have their hunger assuaged by the knowledge that we had the second