

MRS CATT ON LEAGUE OF NATIONS

AND THE

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

To the Editor of the Woman Citizen:

I have been requested by several subscribers to the Woman Citizen to express my personal views concerning the League of Nations and the political snarl in which it seems to have been entangled. Perhaps my known non-partisan attitude may have led to these requests and and the inquirers may have hoped that I might point a way for safe passage to definite conclusions through the bewildering controversy. I do not know that I can help any one to a clearer understanding, but with your premission I will try. It will be my aim in so doing to discuss the question in a strictly non-partisan manner.

I am myself a firm believer in the League of Nations. I am no new convert. I endorsed the idea many years ago when I read that such a plan had been proposed intermittently for some centuries, and always hoped it might come in my day. I feel toward those who claim to believe in a league but not in this one as I have felt toward those who professed to believe in Woman Suffrage but found the times never ready for it, or the method quite unsuitable.

When the Covenant came from the Peace Commission, I confess to disappointment over some of its provisions, but I, having had considerable experience in efforts to get many minds, including those of differing races and nationalities, to come to agreement, understood better than many that no covenant can be made quite satisfactory to any one person or nation, since its composition must come by compromise of many differing views.

To me it was a wonderful achievement that any sort of League of Nations eventuated from the war. Just as a mother thinks a cross-eyed baby is better than no baby at all, so do I regard the League of Nations "in the hand" as a great advance over a League "in the bush". Cross eyes can be straightened in these days of science; and the covenant may be amended.

I believe in the League: 1. Because war is an atrocity which should be eliminated from a world calling itself civilized. 2. Because men are too belligerent to make an end of war without the aid of some war abolishing agency. 3. Because all proposals ever offered for the avoidance of war have been tried and have failed except one—a League of Nations; therefore let it be tried. 4. Because the Covenant of the League proposes a union of all the world for the very definite purpose of making an end of war. 5. Because it provides for the substitution of arbitration for the killing of men as a more civilized method of settling international differences. 6. Because it provides for an International Court which may interpret international law and to which international questions may be referred. 7. Because it provides for the reduction of armies and navies to the smallest force necessary for the maintenance of national safety. 8. Because it provides for the abolition of compulsory military training and vast armies which always tend to bring on wars. 9. Because it provides for an economic boycott to bring recalcitrant nations to terms, with force used only as the last resort. 10. Because it provides for the abolition of secret treaties which have been one potent cause of war. 11. Because it imposes an obstacle against the spread of imperialism, or grabbing territory of rival nations, as Germany and Austria stole Schleswig-Holstein from Denmark, and England seized portions