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TO ABOLISH WAR

CHAPTER I

THE ALTERNATIVES BEFORE MANKIND

The abolition of war is no longer a counsel of perfection. Until two years ago it might have been regarded as the dream of a far distant goal. Centuries of slow social evolution then seemed necessary before it could be attained.

The present war has changed all that. It has converted a counsel of perfection into a practical necessity. It has precipitated the dream into an imperative duty. It has brought the distant goal into the forefront of political urgency.

The last two dozen months have shown that if war be not wiped out, and that right speedily, we shall be face to face with the most terrible consequences.

Either war must be abolished or civilization will be abolished. Nay, if war be not abandoned, it is a question whether the human race itself will survive.

War is now a conflict not of armies or navies, but of nations. Every available male subject of the contending Powers is forced into the ranks. Even Great Britain has adopted conscription. But before that step was taken, she had contributed by voluntary enlistment alone more than five million men to the cause of the Allies. It is the manhood of the nation that is being sacrificed wholesale.

Nor is it combatant manhood alone that is exposed to the peril of wholesale destruction. War is now waged ruthlessly on non-combatants. Defenceless towns are bombarded, merchant vessels are sunk at sight, the great floating cities that cross the ocean, with their thousands of residents, are plunged without mercy into the depths of the sea. Aircraft scatter death indiscriminately on the unoffending: women and children are done to death without compunction. The systematic desecration of womanhood is
deliberately adopted as part of a military policy of terrorism. No custom of decency, no prescription of humanity, no laws of war, no conventions of any kind are allowed for one moment to stand in the way of a supposed military advantage. War claims as its prey no longer professional groups of fighting men, or even the armed manhood of the nation. The whole population is involved.

Nor are belligerent peoples alone implicated. Neutral countries are more or less inevitably brought under the injuries and inhumanities perpetrated by the Central Powers. In fact, as the German Chancellor stated at the outset of the war, neutrality is a word. And in a world-war it seems to be a word with less and less meaning. Neutral ships are sunk at sight; neutral passengers are dealt with as remorselessly as enemy passengers.

But the most formidable peril which has been brought to light by the present war remains to be stated. Modern physical science was once supposed by its votaries to be the chief means of elevating mankind and relieving it of most of its misery. In the hands of war it now threatens to become the most deadly weapon yet invented for the massacre of men. Wells are poisoned; asphyxiating gas is added to the armoury of lethal horror; liquid fire is pumped on the enemy; high explosives are attaining something of volcanic destructiveness. And these are but the beginnings of what will follow from the application of science to the purpose of human destruction. A frightful hint of vast havoc was supplied on the Austro-Italian frontier: a deadly culture of the typhus bacillus was distributed in fragile tubes by aircraft and otherwise, amongst the Italians. Once the services of the pathological laboratory are invoked, there seems no limit to the ravages of organized death. The bacillus of deadly disease threatens to become a new arm of the service which will by its destructiveness put all other lethal expedients into the shade. An active culture of the bubonic plague, judiciously distributed in enemy camps and countries, might easily wipe out whole populations.

The conduct of the present war suggests that there is nothing that some belligerents will stick at, if only defeat can be thereby averted. No conscience, no scruple, will snatch from the hand of an almost defeated combatant any
weapon by which victory can be secured. It is no wild exercise of the lurid imagination, but simple common sense, to admit that if war goes on as it has been going it will prove to be something very like the collective suicide of the human race. Not the existence of civilization alone, but the existence of man himself, is threatened. This is not the nightmare of an alarmist. It is the deliberate verdict of one of the most cautious and clearheaded British statesmen.

In the *Chicago Daily News* of May 15th, Sir Edward Grey says: "Unless mankind learns from this war to avoid war, the struggle will have been in vain. Over humanity will loom the menace of destruction. The Germans have thrown the door wide open to every form of attack upon human life. All their scientific genius has been dedicated to wiping out human life. They have forced these things into general use in war. If the world cannot organize against war, if war must go on, then nations can protect themselves henceforth only by using whatever destructive agencies they can invent, till the resources and inventions of science end by destroying the humanity that they were meant to serve. Will the outstanding contribution of Kultur disclosed in this war be such efficiency in slaughter as to lead to wholesale extermination?"

"Back Numbers." The extinction of war can no longer be derided as a Utopian fancy. It is a plain business proposition, dictated by the most elementary instincts of self-preservation. The man who still derides it as a visionary hope or an impracticable ideal has not yet adjusted his understanding to the facts of the last two years. He is not up to date. He is a back number. He is thinking in terms that were current in 1913. He is immeasurably behind the psychology of 1916.

Let everyone at the outset of this inquiry face the stern alternative presented by the facts of to-day. Either we abolish war or we sacrifice civilization. Either war must go or the very existence of humanity is in peril.

In the presence of these fundamental facts there is little need of spending words on the defence of war, or on those who despair of its abolition. There are men who regard war as the school of all the virtues, the necessary tonic to national existence, the outlet for its noblest energies. The record of this war as a school of all the virtues is, to say the least, somewhat mixed. It has debased and befooled and frenzied whole popu-
The teaching which glorifies war has degraded and brutalized Germany. Nevertheless, no man with a spark of moral feeling in his breast can fail to be stirred by the splendour of self-sacrifice and heroism which this war has called forth, or to acknowledge the sublime unity which it has created in previously much-divided peoples.

That great moral qualities have been called forth by war, no one but a fool or ignoramus would deny. But that is no reason whatever for prolonging war. Scarcely a fire occurs in any city but it brings out the heroism of our fire brigades. Yet no one proposes to organize conflagrations to secure these moral ends. Never a storm litters our coasts with shipwrecks but enriches the annals of humanity with fresh deeds of altruistic daring. Yet would anyone try, if it were possible, to organize a succession of storms in order to evoke those high qualities which shine in every storm? Earthquakes and tremendous volcanic upheavals or depressions have rarely happened without adding a lustre to the story of human courage and self-sacrifice. Yet he would be a lunatic who would, therefore, endeavour to promote a succession of seismic and volcanic explosions. Just as lunatic is the man who, observing the high qualities called out by the frightful catastrophes of war, argues that we must therefore seek to perpetuate war, or at least organize for its recurrence.

The evolution theory and the struggle for existence have been invoked to defend war as a necessity to the further development of the race. As Sir James Crichton-Browne has trenchantly pointed out*, this theory is based on a total misunderstanding of evolution. Darwin condemned war, and regarded it as anti-evolutionary and a sort of disease arresting healthy development. “Natural selection comes about by the preservation of favoured races rather than the extermination of one race by another. It comes about also by the co-operation of races.”

There are those who are hypnotized by the long continuance of war on the planet. They say that war has been with us since prehistoric times, and how can anyone hope to eradicate so deeply rooted and so hardened a habit of mankind? They need only to be reminded that the same thing might have been

*In Bernhardi and Creation: a new theory of Evolution. Maclehose. 1/-.
said about torture. Yet legal torture has passed, in civilized lands, into utter desuetude. Precisely the same argument was used about slavery. It had existed from times immemorial. Yet it was wiped out from the planet as a legal institution in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Why should not war be wiped out in the first half of the twentieth century?

An objection more seriously advanced claims

War and Sin. theological and Biblical support. Men say, as long as there is sin there must be war, and until sin is banished it is useless trying to banish war. These good friends need to weigh the facts that once in Great Britain there was almost continuous warfare, castle against castle, noble against noble, kingdom against kingdom. Yet there has been no war between the constituent parts of Great Britain for more than 170 years. Yet, alas! though war has been banished from the island, the island is very far from having banished sin.

A less dogmatic form of the same argument is that human nature contains many tendencies that naturally lead to war, and until human nature is altered there is no hope of a world without war. Here again a dose of fact will purge out a paralysing prejudice. The British Empire is spread over one-fourth of the habitable globe. It covers lands in almost every latitude, and furnishes an equally wide variety of climate. It contains one-fourth of the human race, of every colour and almost every religion, and of wellnigh every grade, from the lowest savage to the most highly civilized man. Yet, with all the infinite diversity of motive and tendency comprised within its boundaries, the British Empire enjoys a peace—broken, it is true, at intervals, but for the most part only by what may fairly be described as police wars, wars for the suppression of mutiny or rebellion or other forms of disorder. Allowing for the mutability of all forms of Imperial rule, the Pax Britannica is a striking illustration of the possibility of the suppression of war over a vast area. What the British Empire has already accomplished for one-fourth of the human race, comprising the most motley array of peoples, cannot well be declared impossible for the remaining three-fourths.

To friends who interpret passages of Scripture relating to the latter days as predicting that wars will continue till the Second Coming of Christ, the simple answer seems to be, Try, then, to secure the abolition of war, and so hasten the coming
of our Lord. In any case, do not either actively or passively support the continuance of war and so delay His coming.

But all these difficulties and hesitancies and doubts have no standing ground in face of the two-fold option now offered to man: either dispense with war, or dispense with all that makes life worth living, if not also with life itself.

CHAPTER II
SOME PLANS FOR GETTING RID OF WAR

We have reached the conclusion that war must be abolished. But how? At once arises a host of competing answers. Some of the chief claim to be dealt with here. They fall into two classes: those who trust to moral influence alone, and those who, at the back of the moral power, would put the certain sanction of material compulsion.

I. First among the non-compulsionists may be ranked the anarchists of the Tolstoyan or kindred order. Compulsion of every kind their soul abhors. They may not all go to the extreme reported from an "ideal" farm colony. A Tolstoyan was asked to milk a cow. He went to perform the task. He returned with no milk. He explained that the cow was not willing to be milked, and it was against his principles to apply compulsion! But all alike are against the coercive State, or the compulsion without which government as we know it cannot exist. Their policy is to make war impossible by inducing as large a number as possible of individuals to refuse military service. Fine, imprisonment, death itself must not deter them from their quest of making wars to cease by inducing all men to decline to fight. This policy is often identified with the Sermon on the Mount. They claim to be the only consistent Christians. They evidently ignore or explain away the fact that our Lord Himself used physical violence on man and beast when he cleared the Temple of its throng of traffickers. Their interpretation of Christianity is the abstractly spiritual one. They forget that it is the religion of Incarnation. It dwells not in the region of pure ideals or abstract theories. "The Word became flesh." The spirit must control and use body and wealth and physical force. Half the misery of our industrial populations is due to the same abstractly spiritual notion of religion, which refuses to accept the authority of Christ in things so material as the distribution...
of wealth, or the claims of labour, or the obligations incumbent on the rich.

**A Remedy Negligible.**

But the spiritual life that will not use physical force in any form must simply leave this world. If it is to deal with children, criminals, savages—primitive or scientific—it must apply physical force to human beings against their will. The action of this school may possess the moral value of a protest against existing militarism. But even that value is vitiated by the prejudice and suspicion under which their unpractical counsels have brought the very names of peace and pacifism. As a force in practical politics their negative policy may be dismissed as negligible. For if we have to wait until the majority of men individually refuse to join the colours, the abolition of war will be postponed to a future indefinitely remote.

**Disarmament Instanter!**

Extremes meet. Those who want very much government and those who want no government at all agree in abstention from military resistance. The Social Democrats of Norway have committed themselves as a party to the policy of disarmament “without tarrying for any.” They would have neither Army nor Navy, and leave Norway defenceless against the world. They argue that such armaments as Norway possesses are insufficient to protect her from any Great Power that may meditate aggression. Rather than trust to ineffective material defence, they would trust entirely to the moral appeal of their military defencelessness. Their hope is that other nations will follow suit, until at last all nations voluntarily disarm.

**Tempting the Brute.**

Here again our admiration for the high ideals of advocates cannot close our eyes to the defect of the policy advocated. It would simply place the high-souled nations and the loftier civilizations at the mercy of nations that were brutal and unscrupulous. Does any sane man suppose that if Holland voluntarily disarmed she would not have been sooner or later annexed by Germany? Would not this voluntary disarmament of nations exactly suit the book of the Prussian military caste? They could then conquer without having to strike a blow. It is not enough to say any government is preferable to militarism. For do our Norwegian friends contemplate with equanimity the Prussianization of mankind? It is of little avail to say that the oppression
of Assyria and Babylon did not prevent Judah giving a momentous impulse to mankind, or to quote the adage about captive Greece taking captive her proud conqueror. The superior civilization of the rest of Germany has not mastered the brute in Prussia. Rather has Prussia systematically brutalized Germany. The same brutalizing process carried out with German thoroughness may be anticipated in the case of every nation that, by dropping its arms, fell an easy prey to the Prussian eagles. And every nation as it came under the yoke would have to take up the arms it had dropped and carry them as helots of the Prussian, like the Poles in the east, the Alsatians in the west, the Danes in the north.

In this case also the proposal is rendered futile by the exigencies of time. No nation is yet ready to lay down its arms without effective safeguard against invasion. Probably no nation will ever be ready. Certainly all the nations will not be ready in time to meet the urgent need of the human race to get rid of war. Such indefinite possibilities are beyond the range of our practical necessity.

There are some who trust that the horror of this present war will have created so deep and enduring a revulsion against war of any kind as to make a recurrence of hostilities extremely improbable. An aged American diplomatist has expressed the hope that as the Thirty Years War so disgusted the world with religious wars that there has been no religious war since, so the present war will make all war so hateful to mankind that mankind will never fight again. Another American has argued that many things are settled by war which are not fixed in statute or treaty. The American Civil War he cited as an example. It was an endeavour to assert the supremacy of the Federal Government over the sovereignty of the constituent States. When this endeavour was crowned with victory, it was not included in the terms of peace: it was not entered in the American Constitution. To this day each of the United States possesses nominally and legally absolute sovereignty. Nevertheless the war has made the Federal Government supreme, though that supremacy is not mentioned in the law or constitution of the great Republic. Similarly, he argued, the present world-war need not result in any stipulation, still less sanction, for the maintenance of international treaties, conventions, laws. Henceforth, he urged, the defeat of Germany would, by sheer weight of fact, make the control of international law inevitable.
This trust in the conscience of mankind does honour to those who hold it. But the memories of men are very short. Moral reaction against the present war may last for the lifetime of the present generation. But by later generations it may be idealized and surrounded with a halo of heroic memories that will make war not so awful a thing as we now feel it to be. Now is the time to fix the present acute hatred of war in enduring institutions, to cast into the mould of permanent international arrangements the molten indignation of mankind. When the heat passes, the cast metal remains. Though memories are short, institutions are long-lived. What might be left to the conscience and intelligence of a highly developed democracy like that of the United States, it would be neither wise nor right to entrust to the fluctuating sentiments and varying standards of the nations of mankind.

But what is decisive against this trust in the efficacy of moral revulsion is that it otherwise simply leaves the world in the condition in which the war found it, without relief from the terrible evils which then weighed down Europe—the ever-increasing strain of competitive armaments, the balancing of forces implicitly hostile, and of mutual suspicion. These positive influences would almost infallibly outweigh the forces of moral revulsion, and would again precipitate the world into the abyss of war. The abolition of war that is needed must rid the world of the crushing burdens of an armed peace.

Then there are a number of estimable persons, eminent as well as obscure, who trust to the efficacy of treaties alone. They hope that a network of treaties between pairs of nations will hold down war as the Lilliputians held down Gulliver. They point to the happily increasing number of such treaties. There are ordinary arbitration treaties, of which a large number have been signed, which bind the contracting parties to submit all disputes, except such as affect national honour or vital interests, to arbitration. This exception is inserted apparently of set purpose to enable any nation a loophole to escape from its treaty obligations. But there are some cases in which this fatal exception does not occur.

Then there is the famous scheme of Mr. W. J. Bryan. When I saw him in Washington, in March, 1915, there had been concluded treaties
in the terms of his scheme with no fewer than thirty Powers, including the Great Powers, Italy, France, Great Britain and Russia. The idea in each of these treaties is that the high contracting parties refer unsettled disputes between them to a commission of, say, five, one from each Government concerned, one nominated by each from some third country, and a fifth agreed upon by both Governments: the commission to report in a period of, say, one year, during which the Governments are obliged to refrain from hostilities. After receiving the report, the Governments are free to fight if so they choose. The commission once appointed may spontaneously offer its services.

The great advantage of these treaties is that they interpose the delay of several months during which dispassionate inquiry can be made and national passions allowed to cool. The report of the commission, though in no way legally binding either of the contracting Powers, might be expected to have some influence on the public opinion of both and on the mind of the world in general. It is indeed on moral influence that the value of the scheme depends. It is obviously of no small importance that with a Great Power like the United States such contracts should be formed. And in many instances the hope may be well grounded of the terms of the treaty being carried out.

But there is no sanction of any kind provided, nor any provision made for the enforcement of the scheme upon any treaty-breaking Power. The scheme would bind just those Powers that were in least need of being bound, and would fail to bind the Powers that it is most necessary to control. For example, if Great Britain and Germany had concluded a Bryan Treaty in the beginning of 1914, does anyone suppose that it would have averted war between these two Powers? When Germany invaded Belgium, the Bryan Treaty would require Great Britain and Germany to refer the case to their international commission to report, say, in six months: during which time Great Britain and Germany are to abstain from hostilities against each other. Germany, thus relieved from any immediate fear of war with Great Britain, would have gaily marched through Belgium and possibly have taken Paris. If at the end of the stipulated period the commission had reported against Germany’s invasion of Belgium, then forsooth Great Britain might have gone to war, when obviously war would have been six months too late! So the Bryan scheme would have failed utterly to prevent the greatest war on record. The delay which is the advantage
of Mr. Bryan's scheme would, in cases where prompt action was necessary, be fatal. It frees the hands of a belligerent for six months or a year, to devote himself exclusively to the war he has already entered upon.

Unfair. Of this fact, recent phases of the present war present a curious illustration. Great Britain is under a Bryan Treaty with the United States, Germany is not. The Washington Government has disputes with Great Britain over alleged infringement of the rights of neutrals. It has also disputes with Germany over the sinking of the Lusitania and kindred episodes. Great Britain can cheerily refer the dispute to the international commission and be quite sure that there will be no war with America during the stipulated period. Germany, however, not having signed such a treaty, is threatened with immediate rupture, and is thus placed at a disadvantage with Great Britain. On the other hand, if Germany had concluded such a treaty with the United States, she could have gone on sinking neutral ships and drowning American passengers, quite sure that there would be no war with America until the international commission had reported. It would have taken out of President Wilson’s hand his chief weapon, the threat of immediate rupture. Protracted inquiry is all very well in certain instances, to bring reasonable disputants to a better frame of mind, but is entirely out of place in dealing with a highwayman whose pistol is at your head. He won’t wait for inquiry. If you have pledged yourself to do so, he has the advantage. The most that can be said for Mr. Bryan’s scheme is that it may secure postponement of hostilities; and, as has been shown, even that advantage in the most serious cases turns out to be a grave disadvantage.

The events of the present war have been a conclusive proof that all such schemes as rely only on the good faith of nations, without any material sanction behind them, are powerless to restrain an international desperado of the Prussian type.

II. Compulsion, therefore, in some form or other is in the last resort necessary.

"League to Enforce Peace." This conviction is at the back of a number of present-day movements. It animates the League to Enforce Peace, at the head of which stands ex-President Taft. It is a further development of Mr. Bryan’s idea of ensuring postponement of hostilities. In place, however, of pairs of contracting parties undertaking not to fight until a commission has reported on the
points in dispute, Mr. Taft's League links up a number of nations bound to submit all justiciable questions to a judicial tribunal, and all other questions to a Council of Conciliation, with the further proviso that the League shall jointly use forthwith both their economic and military forces against any one of their number that goes to war and commits acts of hostility against another co-signatory Power before the questions in dispute have been so submitted. But the signatory Powers are at liberty, after the case has been submitted to the appropriate courts, to ignore the courts' verdict and proceed to hostilities. The League, it will be observed, only compels its members to go to court before they go to war. It is a League not to enforce peace. It is a League to enforce postponement of war. Happily, postponement is often tantamount to abandonment. But peace is not enforced. It is only made probable. This League is a private arrangement between its members. It does not include all the nations. Consequently those nations that are most likely to be guilty of aggression would almost certainly stand outside the League and be exempt from its compulsions. There is no automatic executive empowered to take action at once. There is only a group of nations bound together by the slow-working methods of diplomacy. This League is much more easily dissoluble than a combination officially representing all the Powers of the world, and has behind it nothing like the moral authority attaching to the latter. To get all the members of the League, bar the offending nation, to act together, to mobilize their forces, and to strike, would probably take a long time; and, as recent events have shown, the dashing marauder who trusts to a sudden rush on an unprepared foe is the Power against whom special precautions are necessary. Then, too, the objective proposed to the League is not of a kind to command universal interest and respect. It does not enlist all the nations to suppress all war. It takes only half a bite at the cherry. The need and the temper of the world to-day demand the more complete reform. Nor does the League follow out the actual line of historical evolution. It would be a new beginning, without availing itself of the tremendous powers that lie in continuity. But later news suggests that Mr. Taft's League is advancing. At a seventeenth Hague Anniversary meeting, Mr. Taft is reported to have stated that the League included the provision of an International Police. This step would obviate some of our criticisms, and suggests the hope that the League may develop into the advocacy of more drastic and immediately effective methods.
In this country the League of Nations Society is an advance upon Mr. Taft’s League. It advocates that as many States as are willing shall form a League, binding themselves to use peaceful methods for dealing with all disputes arising among them. Disputes relating to international law or interpretation of treaties must be referred to the Hague Court of Arbitration or some other judicial court or tribunal, whose decisions shall be final, and shall be carried into effect by the parties concerned. All other disputes are to be referred to and investigated and reported upon by a Council of Inquiry and Conciliation representative of the League. It is merely “hoped” that the League would ultimately, if not at first, pledge itself to accept the recommendation of the Council, as they would in any case be pledged to accept the decision of the Court of Arbitration. States are at present to be allowed to retain the right of going to war if they so please.

This Society escapes many of the defects of the League to Enforce Peace. In all justiciable questions it not merely would enforce the submission of disputes to the Hague or other Tribunal, but would enforce the carrying out of the decision of the Tribunal. It would also protect its members from aggression by non-members. But in cases that should come before the Council of Conciliation, which are the most fruitful sources of war, nations would be at present left free, after hearing the report of the Council, to fall out and fight. There is also no provision of an executive force ready at a moment’s notice to strike. We have always to remember that the most successful military nation of Europe in modern times has owed its rapid advance to the suddenness of its attacks on unsuspecting neighbours. A league of nations with separate armaments is a cumbersome machine to get into working order in time to frustrate swift onslaughts like those of Prussia on Austria in 1741 and 1866, on Schleswig-Holstein in 1864, on France in 1870, and on Belgium in 1914. Moreover, the League of Nations Society, like the League to Enforce Peace, does not follow the line of historical evolution.

CHAPTER III

THE ACTUAL HISTORICAL COMMENCEMENT

What is the right line of historical evolution? How has war actually been eliminated between what are now the constituent parts of any nation? The rule has been that the central power, whether
person or body corporate, has been invested with power ade-
quate to the enforcement of its decisions. The king, at first
holding a precarious title by favour of his nobles, has, in the
course of generations, secured force enough to prevent the
previously unruly nobles from fighting one another. The
king’s peace has been established throughout his realm by
increasing the power which is wielded by the monarch and
his ministers.

The obvious moral is to pursue the same course of evolution
among the nations as has been successfully carried out within the
nation.

The World
Attaining
Unity—

The world has already advanced far towards
attaining unity. The immense improvement in
means of communication has for many purposes
made the entire planet more of a unit than Great
Britain was two hundred years ago. The steam-
ship, railway, telegraph and other inventions or appliances of
modern science have brought all parts of the world nearer to each
other than many parts of France were in the sixteenth century.
Cables and newspapers have developed throughout mankind a
simultaneity of consciousness which a few hundred years ago was
beyond the attainment of any great nation. In the exchange of
its products, despite the artificial barriers imposed by tariffs, the
world is one market. To say that commerce knows no frontiers
would be untrue. But commerce only knows frontiers in order to
cross them, undermine them or circumvent them. All the great
mental products of the race are the common property of mankind.
Science is cosmopolitan. Despite all the differences of language,
the republic of letters is world-wide. Philosophy may never be
without its local flavour, but ever aims to be the organ of the
world’s thought. All the great faiths are now competing in the
endeavour to prove which is the one world-religion. But while, in
these and a hundred other relations, the world has
arrived at a very real unity, in its juridic and
political life it has woefully lagged behind.

Except in Civic Life.

For this retardation, the vested interests of
local official and dynastic kinds are chiefly to blame. Kings and
Emperors will be sovereign. The governing classes generally, in
any nation, resent the idea of being subordinated to any superior
authority. The volcanic tragedy of the present war is due to the
fact that the civic shrinkage of the planet has failed utterly to keep
pace with the shrinkage that has gone on so rapidly in the economic
and social world. Mankind is at present in a condition analogous
to that of a nation that is coming to be but has not yet developed a sufficiently strong national executive.

Happily, however, it is not entirely without a central organ of government, though that as yet is in a very rudimentary condition. No serious student of history or believer in actual evolution can fail to recognize the significance of the Hague Conference. The Hague Conference is the only body which has as yet emerged in history as the officially acknowledged mouthpiece of all the Governments of the world. In contrast to the host of fancy schemes, projected leagues and congresses, the Hague Conference is a fact imbedded in history. It first met in 1899, with representatives from twenty-six Powers. In 1907 it met a second time, and no fewer than forty-four out of the forty-eight supreme Governments of the world sent delegates. For seventeen years there has been established the Supreme Court of Arbitration, and many important cases have there been decided. A further stage was reached in 1913, when the Palace of Peace was opened at The Hague, a monument not merely of Mr. Carnegie’s munificence, but also of the voluntary co-operation of all the nations. The building and the grounds of the Palace are enriched with the most diverse freewill offerings from the various Governments. There is provided by the official consensus of mankind the seat and home of the world’s government.

The Hague Conference is the sole and substantial earnest that has yet appeared of the Parliament of Man and the Federation of the World. The Palace of Peace is the abode prepared for the rudiments of the world’s supreme judicature, legislature and executive. The legislature is there in germ in the Conference; the judicature is there in germ in the permanent court of arbitration; and the executive is there in germ in the administrative council which acts for the Conference in the intervals between its sessions.

On this fact, as on cliffs of granite, the waves of scepticism and cynicism dash themselves in vain. There is a widespread disposition to belittle, to deride or to ignore the Hague Conference. For this tendency there are many reasons, some good, some bad. Many people seem to imagine that the First, or if not the First then assuredly the Second, Hague Conference would forthwith make peace universal and perpetual. Every war that has occurred since 1899 has made men exclaim, What is the use of the Hague! The present war, which has through one or other of the belligerents
defied the decisions and ripped up the conventions of the Hague Conference, has vastly augmented the chorus of disappointment. The cry goes on, "The Hague Conference has failed to assert its authority. The Hague Conference has failed to see that its conventions were carried out! The Hague Conference has failed to prevent the most frightful breaches of the rules of war! The Hague Conference has failed to make Belgium inviolable! Therefore," runs the clamour, "let us have no more Hague Conferences!"" This kind of childish babble has unfortunately fallen from the lips and pens even of eminent men, who have bewailed in almost frenzied tones the "impotence" of the Hague Conference. It is as though there should be a howl of indignation because an embryo is not a fully-developed child, or a stripling a full-grown oak. If Rome was not built in a day, how do those dear deluded denouncers of the Hague Conference expect the World-State to be active and effective in seventeen years? The lesson of events is not to destroy the only organ of world-unity that has yet appeared because it has not yet accomplished all that in time one may hope it will accomplish, but rather to develop it, strengthen it, and give it such backing as will make it effective. The decisions and conventions of the Hague Conference are generally admitted to be in themselves desirable and an advance on what had gone before. Wherein they have failed has been in want of power to enforce them. The obvious duty before us is to remedy this defect by supplying the adequate force, and not to rave about the impotence of a body which everyone knew had not the power to enforce its conclusions. When a mill is fitted with machinery, and no power is laid on, no sane man gets into a rage with the machinery and demands that it should be forthwith scrapped as impotent. All that is necessary is to turn on the requisite power to make the machinery move. The machinery provided by The Hague only needs power sufficient to be laid on to make it actual and operative. Moreover, everyone who knows anything about the diplomatic communications that preceded the Hague Conferences, or about the proceedings that took place in committees at The Hague, knows that the chief hindrance in the way of making effective or obligatory the measures advanced lay in the opposition of Germany. Germany has all along been secretly or openly opposed to the idea of the Hague Conference. It has frequently prevented measures being brought forward by the threat of withdrawing from the Conference. The proposal to make arbitration obligatory was carried by a huge
majority, but was opposed by five Powers, and therefore lost. Of the five Powers three were Germany, Austria, and Turkey. That fact has received lurid commentary from subsequent events. There is no reason to expect, in future Conferences, that this obstructive factor will possess the power that it had before the war. It is not too much to say that the majority of mankind expects that the result of this war will be to enfeeble the militarist and non-pacific influence of Germany in the councils of the world.

The line along which the civic unity of mankind is to be sought leads through The Hague.

CHAPTER IV

THE ALTERNATIVE BEFORE EVERY NATION—BUT ONE: A LITTLE LESS NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY—OR. NONE

If the world is ever to become one civic whole, there must be subordination of the parts. If there is to be a world-government, national governments must abate some of their claims to sovereignty. This is just as obvious as is the necessity of citizens surrendering some of their independence to the local State.

But nations are very sensitive on the subject of national sovereignty. A noted American pacifist said that nations would never consent to part with their claim to be supreme. Rather than yield to such a subordination, he said that certain Central European monarchs would arm not merely every man, woman and child, but every cat and dog, and see them all perish before they would yield. He therefore advised that though international regulations would necessarily involve each nation parting with some of its sovereignty, the less said about that fact the better. The thing might be secured in essence if it were not explicitly so described. This may be good counsel for diplomats. But the average plain man will prefer to call things by their right names. Let each nation face the alternative before it, and the terrors now associated with any surrender, however slight, of national sovereignty will be dispelled. If the option were between retaining national sovereignty as at present, and surrendering some of it to a world-government at The Hague, national pride might prefer things as they are. But things will certainly not remain as they are: and the option given by the future will turn the balance of preference the other way.
Let us suppose that nations prefer to continue the old regime of ever-increasing competitive armaments, with spasms of world-war. What will be the consequence, even if destructive science applied to war has not swept the planet clear of mankind? Auguste Comte, speaking of the ancient world, said that a regime of war ends in the general ascendancy of the most powerful military nation. The wars of the ancient world ended in the supremacy of Rome. Similarly to-day, if war is to go on, sooner or later the empire of the world will pass into the hands of the nation not necessarily best fitted to rule, but best fitted to win in war. This conviction evidently lay at the back of much modern German thinking. Germany being the foremost military nation of the world was thereby destined to become to the modern world what Rome was to the ancient world, the mistress of the nations. British jingoism may, in their turn, hold that the supreme power on the planet inevitably passes not to the greatest military but to the greatest naval Power: and recent events give colour to that belief. But if war does not end in there being no nations left to fight, then victory in war will fall to the State which has best developed its powers of conquest. The process by which one Power, like Aaron’s rod, will devour all its competitors, will be hastened by a feeling that it would be better to be slaves of one Power than to spend our lives in war or in constant terror of war. But the supremacy of one conquering State over all the nations means that all national sovereignty goes by the board. One Power becomes despot of all the rest. Even the equality that would so be obtained at the expense of national existence would not be perpetual. Rome having conquered the western world, broke up, in its turn, into rival Empires, and then into European nations. Germany could not hope to be more eternal than Rome. But for generations, it might be, the paramountcy, the universal despotism, of one Power would mean not merely the sacrifice of national sovereignty by all the other Powers. It would even amount to the destruction of separate national existence. So if the nations obstinately refuse to relinquish any part of their national sovereignty, they may find themselves with no sovereignty at all and no national existence.—The other alternative would preserve intact their national sovereignty in all internal affairs, and would only require a surrender of that small portion of sovereignty which can wage war or carry
on policy leading to war with other nations. If nations will now consent to make this comparatively small and honourable surrender of sovereignty, they will thereby save themselves from war and from the universal despotism with which war unchecked threatens the world. Every man in the affairs of common life recognizes the wisdom of giving a little in order to retain all but that little, rather than of refusing to give up anything and in the end losing everything. The more sensitive nations are about retaining their national sovereignty and independence and existence, the more disposed they will be to accept a measure of subordination to a central authority now, with the blessings of perpetual peace, rather than risk for every Power but one suppression under alien rule, inevitably incurring meantime the horrors of competitive armaments and ruinous war.

—The Nation More Secure.

Sovereignty
Actually
Lessened—in
U.S.A.,

But, as a matter of fact, nations have already renounced some elements of their sovereignty. Already great civic unities have been effected by a comparatively trifling renunciation of sovereign powers. One instance has already been cited. The United States of America consists of forty-eight nominally sovereign States. But all these sovereign States have so far compromised their sovereignty as to recognize the supremacy of the Federal Government. The British Empire is a still more colossal illustration of the unity that can be obtained by a renunciation of local sovereignty, ranging from a renunciation that is microscopic in its infinitesimal smallness to absolute renunciation. The sovereignty of the Crown colonies and of the Indian Empire has been wholly absorbed by the Imperial Government, whereas the sovereignty of the self-governing Dominions is almost complete, though certain powers, judicial, legislative and administrative, are still in the hands of the Imperial Government. This minimum of subordination on the part of Canada, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand has secured for them the priceless privilege of participating in the Pax Britannica. Though there will doubtless be, at the close of the war, a readjustment both of co-ordination and subordination in the various constituents of the British Empire, all parts of the Empire are agreed in relinquishing such local freedom as may be necessary to secure an effective Imperial unity. This object lesson should not be lost on the remaining three-fourths of mankind. If, for example, France and Germany and Russia possessed as much freedom within the World-
State as New Zealand, Australia, South Africa and Canada possess within the British Empire, and at the same time enjoyed immunity from war and preparations for war, only dynastic pride and the petty conceit of particularism could raise any objection.

—in the Anti-Prussian Entente, Powers, and for some time these Powers have so far abrogated their separate sovereignty as to be, in things pertaining to war and finance and even other interests, practically one State. Yet each of these Allied Powers feels its own sovereignty enhanced as well as secured against overthrow by Germany. What can be done to a great extent in order to repel aggressive war might surely be done to a much lesser extent to prevent the recurrence of war.

Every international arrangement involves some measure of renunciation of national sovereignty.

—in Postal and Other Unions. The postal union is one of the most familiar instances. Each nation keeps its own postage and General Post Office, but limits its freedom somewhat by compacts with the other Powers. The same principle is illustrated in the riverain, railway and telegraph unions.

International laws of every kind, whether maritime laws, laws of war, rules of diplomacy, or whatever they may be, all impair to a certain extent the absoluteness of national sovereignty. All that is wanted is that for the political union of mankind a little further sacrifice be made.

The question before us is really the issue of the present war. Germany stands for national sovereignty, absolute and uncontrolled. National ascendancy is to her the supreme law. All international laws, treaties, conventions, are, if they run counter to the national ascendancy, of no account. The nations that are arrayed against her are standing for something higher than national sovereignty, which finds some expression in observance of treaties, humane conventions, and other forms of international law. It is this same idea of something higher than national sovereignty which has called the Hague Conference into being, and which is endeavouring at The Hague to embody itself more perfectly.

The same super-national aim is comprised within the avowed ideal of all Christian peoples. And these ideals are not of yesterday. They are deeply rooted in the ages; 2,600 years ago the prophets Isaiah and Micah looked forward to Jerusalem becoming the juridic...
capital of mankind. All the nations would flow to it. There judgment would be pronounced between the nations, and decisions concerning them, “and they shall beat their swords into plough-shares and their spears into pruninghooks. Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.”

It may be retorted that this meant the ascendancy of one people, the people of Judah, over the rest of mankind. But if any correction of this particularism were needed, it was given in the vision of Daniel. There the people of Judah appears not as son of Abraham or son of Israel, but as “one like unto a Son of Man.” It is the Man and not the Jew in Israel which was to supersede the brutal world-Empires and reign over all the peoples, nations and languages. With Jesus the hope of the Kingdom is absolutely freed from the limitations of Jewry. As the Son of Man He proclaimed a kingdom which is not of the world but is over the world, which is to be announced to all the nations, and which is open to every childlike soul. To Him as the Christ all authority belongs, in heaven and on earth. The Kingdom of God includes the world as One State comprising all peoples, nations and languages. It is at once omni-national and super-national.

The sneer is ready, These are but religious ideals, far away from actual life. Nevertheless, upon all people calling themselves Christians the teachings of Isaiah, Micah, Daniel, and above all of Jesus, should have at least as much influence as the teachings of Nietzsche and Bernhardi have had upon the people of modern Germany. The war has roused Christendom to a sense of the frightful perils involved in disregarding its inspired teachers. There is a widespread feeling that to avoid similar world-catastrophes, if from no higher motive, the nations must pay more heed to the authoritative ideals and requirements of the Christ. The world is undergoing a great “change of mind,” and feeling after “works meet for repentance.”

There is a great opportunity before the Churches. They have been heavily blamed, rightly or wrongly, for having allowed such a war to become possible. Their best answer would be to throw all their energies into the quest of realizing the Christian (as opposed to the Stoic) conception of the world as one State. Such an endeavour to realize the international ideal of the Kingdom of God is everywhere needed and everywhere possible.
The Kingdom of God is the authoritative negation of the national egoism which Bismarck pressed upon his fellow-countrymen. It cannot tolerate absolute national sovereignty. It is the creed which is openly and often officially professed by the vast majority of the forty-eight Governments that at present rule the planet. It is a fact and a force that must be reckoned with in practical politics. The Kingdom of God is just that super-national Something for which the millions of men ranged under the colours of the Entente are now risking and laying down their lives. They may define it variously, but there is only one super-national community with authority to control and direct the action of nations, and that is the Kingdom of God.

On all these grounds, the nations of the world would be well advised to part with the little national sovereignty required to found the World-State, and so to secure the obliteration of war.

Diplomatists may use such phrases as will gain their ends with the least friction and antagonism. But in these pages, where it is of the greatest importance that the idea should be not cloaked or muffled but laid bare and clear to the public mind, I shall use the words that correspond most truly to the notion before us. I will speak of the World-State, the World-Parliament, the World-Judicature, the World-Executive, the World-Armament: and I will treat of them as centred in The Hague. I shall describe the child by the name he will bear as a man.

CHAPTER V

PREPARATIONS FOR THE THIRD HAGUE CONFERENCE

The Second Hague Conference displayed much wisdom in arranging for its successor. It suggested that the Third Hague Conference should meet about the same interval after the Second as the Second after the First—that is to say, in 1915. It entered in protocol its recommendation that two years before the next Conference an International Committee should be appointed to prepare procedure and programme. It also agreed that two years previously each Power should appoint a National Committee to prepare suggestions for the International Committee. These wise provisions were unfortunately not carried out, though many nations did appoint their own committees.

These lengthy methods, admirably adapted for times of peace,
are out of place for the next Hague Conference. For that World-
Parliament ought to meet as soon as hostilities are over. The
resettlement of the world cannot be left in the hands of belligerents
only. It is possible that the main terms of peace may be left
to the belligerents, but it is conceivable that many points must
be left over to be settled by all the Powers assembled at The
Hague.

The steps to be taken in preparation for the Third

**Begin at Once.** Hague Conference must therefore proceed with
great rapidity, and they must begin at once.

First of all, the peoples of the world should be asked without
delay to think about the next meeting of the Hague Conference,
what should be its business, and to make up their

**Think—now!** minds as to what is to be expected from it.

There is an impression prevalent in certain

**An Impossible** quarters, high and low, that so long as the war

**Monomania.** lasts we must not so much as mention The Hague
or any plans to secure a lasting peace. The

peoples of the world, and especially the belligerent peoples, are to
perform the psychological impossibility of thinking of nothing but
the war and how to win it. Members of the British Government,
Bishops of the Church, even leading Labour Members, have
declined so much as even to mention in public the Third Hague
Conference. They are afraid that it may be construed by the
enemy into a weakening of purpose in the war and an indirect flag
of truce! One truculent critic denounced any allusion to The
Hague as a "mischievous futility." In France they are not so
timorous. There one of the leading statesmen told me that he saw
no reason in the world why agitation in preparation for The Hague
should not go forward, so long as it was made perfectly clear that
our proposals related to the period after the conclusion of the
present war. I am told that large masses of Frenchmen are look-
ing to The Hague to complete the abolition of war.

It is just when we feel most painfully the horrors

**Goads of Pain** of this war that we are most likely to make up our

**and Hope.** minds on plans to obviate any repetition. It is
just when we have the greatest effort to make to
beat the foe that we need the inspiration of the goal beyond, the
use to be made of our desired victory. It is the hope of a happy
hereafter that inspires nations as well as individuals. To a bishop
who urged that the discussion of our project would weaken the
nation’s resistance to German aggression, I replied, Would the
Bishop decry the promise of heaven as weakening a man’s resist-
ance to sin on earth? While armchair politicians at home declare that no patriot can think of anything but the prosecution of the war, it is pleasant to hear from our brothers at the front that they are cheered in the dreadful ordeal through which they are passing by the prospect of the World-Parliament at The Hague decreeing the abolition of war. The testimony of men who are hazarding their lives in the prosecution of this war counts for far more than the timid reticence of non-combatants. A chaplain at the front, kept in his hut on a Sunday by a slight sickness, writes: "The whole weight of the Christian Churches should be given you in support. You will have the support—especially if it can be organized immediately on their return—of every man out here. As a chaplain, I am often asked by Christian people at home if the men who have faced death will return to join the Churches. I believe that if the Churches will do something definite, even daring, to make it impossible for a handful of ambitious men to mobilize millions, mostly men of goodwill, to kill one another, the men will unite with them. But if not, some of us who are in, who feel that under God we owe all to our Church, are more likely to go out as a protest. The peace programme of Christ is being branded on my heart and brain by this hell-fire. Be of good cheer. Those who live to return will be with you. Be ready to use us, to lead us."

A Message from the Front.

Now is the time for the peoples to speak out. Now is the time for them to set their Governments in motion. Otherwise, if no one thinks about these matters until the end of the war, they will be left in the hands of the official class, the discredited diplomatist, the military and naval expert, the professional lawyer. "The dreams that nations dream come true," says the poet. The sooner the nations are encouraged to dream dreams of ultimate peace, the sooner will their dreams come true.

Speak—now! By the time hostilities have ceased, the peoples of the world should have their minds well made up as to what their Parliament at The Hague should accomplish. As soon as the last shot has been fired, before the terms of peace have been decided on, pressure should be put upon the Governments of the world to prepare for the Third Hague Conference. Each should have its own proposals ready, and each should communicate them to the rest. Much popular enthusiasm and determination will have to be put into the movement to ensure that the diplomatic preliminaries shall be full of vigour and progressive purpose.

Hague Proposals Ready.
To the Third Hague Conference, as to the Second, all the Powers without exception should be invited. Victors and vanquished should have the earliest opportunity of meeting together in common counsel. Should a defeated Germany refuse to attend a conference which was expected to devise methods for the suppression of war, she must take the consequences and be treated as a defaulting suitor in a court of law.

The time at which the Conference should assemble should be fixed at as early a date as possible after peace has been concluded. A very great deal depends upon the Power that shall convene the Conference. In the early months of the war I urged that the United States, as the only Great Power not participating in the present war, should be convener. As, moreover, President Roosevelt had waived his intention to convene the Second Conference in favour of the Tsar, the Tsar might perhaps be moved to return the compliment by nominating the American President as convener of the Third. When I was at Washington in March, 1915, I was assured in quarters most able to speak authoritatively that the decision had already been made, and that the United States would be convener. A short while ago it seemed not improbable that the United States would no longer be classed among the neutrals. There would be a sort of poetic justice if the Conference which was to initiate the formation of the United States of the World were convened by the United States of America.

There are certain points on which a general agreement ought to be arrived at through diplomatic negotiations before the official summons is issued. It should be agreed that the Third Hague Conference must have legislative power. It must claim the authority to pass laws in the interests of mankind. It must also be invested with power to provide for the enforcement of its decrees, decisions, laws. Its resolutions must no longer be without "sanctions."

Diplomacy under popular pressure would also have to prepare proposals on rules of procedure. Complete unanimity must cease to be necessary to the decisions of the Conference. The rule of the majority would have to be established, with the requisite safeguards. The question of the proportion of representation to be assigned to each Power would inevitably be raised. Should the principle be followed, as at present, One State One Vote, putting the Republic of Haiti on an equality with the British Empire?
Should this anomaly be preserved, in view of the fact that the smaller Powers almost inevitably represent the conscience of mankind, as justice is their only safeguard? How far they might be amenable to methods of corruption or intimidation by greater Powers would also come up for consideration. In this connection the rules of representation of the Powers at the International Conference on Weights and Measures may be borne in mind. These questions diplomacy could raise but could not decide. That could only be done by the Hague Conference in full and plenary session.

CHAPTER VI

THE DELEGATIONS TO THE HAGUE

It is of the utmost possible importance that the delegations sent by the Governments of the world to the Third Hague Conference should worthily represent the peoples in whose name they speak. The exceptionally momentous nature of the proposals which ought to come before the Conference requires in the first instance that every Power should be represented by its strongest statesmen. The late Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman expressed his desire to represent the British Empire at the Second Hague Conference. Unfortunately, his wishes were overruled, and in place of him was sent an aged lawyer, who was not in touch with the times and carried no great personal weight. Mr. Asquith ought to go to the Third Hague Conference, as his chief and predecessor wished to go to the Second. With Mr. Asquith should go Sir Edward Grey. No two men could speak with such authority and power on behalf of the whole of the King's Dominions.

The minor members of the British delegation should not, as in previous years, be merely diplomatic, legal, military or naval experts. Such delegates are doubtless necessary. But the national interests, which diplomacy, law, army and navy exist to protect, should not, as in previous Conferences, be conspicuous by their absence. The British Empire outside of the United Kingdom should not merely be consulted, but should, through its leading men, be present. Among those we send to The Hague must certainly be included strong representatives of our self-governing Dominions, preferably their Prime Ministers. For India an eminent Indian should go. The organized labour of the Empire should be represented by a leading exponent. Were Mr. Thos. Burt well enough to go, he would be the man. Failing
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him, some other Labour leader should be chosen who is more prominent in the Trade Union than in the partisan Parliamentary world. The Associated Chambers of Commerce, who represent the next greatest British interest, should be invited to nominate a delegate. Nor should science be omitted. The Royal Society might be asked to nominate one of its Fellows. If the organized religion of the self-governed portions of the British Empire were able to agree on any one representative, he should be nominated. Considering that the questions of war and peace to be discussed most intimately concern the mothers of the race, the organized womanhood of the Empire have a just claim to nominate a woman to a place on the British delegation. The splendid way in which British womanhood has acquitted itself through the war entitles it to this tribute of respect from the authorities. The Government would, of course, be responsible for the appointment of the delegates from lists of nominees sent them. It would not be difficult to select those who would represent each of the great interests mentioned, and at the same time be persons for whom the British Government would accept full responsibility.

In every country where there is a Parliament it would be well for the Government to submit the names of the appointed delegates, and so enable the people’s representatives to express their mind. The knowledge that Parliament would have its say would, consciously or unconsciously, affect the choice of the Government in the more popular and progressive direction.

Every pains must be taken to prevent the Third Hague Conference consisting merely of members or creatures of the Foreign Offices of the Powers. Our own Foreign Office has been described as the last ditch of official reaction. They are certainly not the bodies that should be most in evidence or in influence at a Conference when the world is called upon to adopt the most progressive and most drastic policy. The Foreign Offices will, of course, fight hard against the new order. They regard any attempt at control on the part of their own Parliaments as an intolerable intrusion into the preserves of the privileged few. Much more vigorously will they kick against the idea of a World-Parliament which shall be above them all.

But though possession is nine points of the law, and the Foreign Offices are strongly fortified by their connections in the privileged
classes, they are not strong enough to defeat or even to circumvent
the combined determination of our oversea Dominions, organized
labour, associated commerce and associated science.

Similarly in other countries where the Social
Democracy has power, it is to be hoped that the
old policy of aloofness from all things govern-
mental will not lead the Social Democrats to miss
this great opportunity of realizing their best world-ideals. In every
country where they are strong they should insist on one of their
most trusted exponents being sent with the nation's delegation to
The Hague.

CHAPTER VII

PROVIDING THE CONFERENCE WITH AN APPROPRIATE
ENVIRONMENT

Not merely is it necessary to see that the World-Parliament
assembling at The Hague be really representative of the peoples of
the world: it is necessary to provide that great historic gathering
with a social atmosphere conducive to the best ends which it is
hoped will be there attained.

First of all, each delegation should be supplied
with a liberal grant from the national treasury in
order to enable it to carry out a policy of festive
hospitality. Dinners, receptions, balls and other
functions should be freely used to make the members of the World-
Parliament personally acquainted with each other. Great service
was rendered in this way at the Second Hague Conference by the
American delegation. At the Third the British delegation, which
represents one-fourth of the human race, should be freely furnished
with the means to make the British headquarters a centre of con-
tinuous festive fraternity among the delegations. Eminent men and
women should be franked in order to add their distinction and fascin-
ation to social gatherings. If only all the delegates could get into
personal friendly relations with each other, the advance to the
cause of world-unity would be immense.

But something more than the atmosphere of
officialdom, however generous and hospitable it
may be, will be required at The Hague. For this
purpose it would be very desirable to arrange that
during the session of the World-Parliament there
should be convened at The Hague a number of international con-
ferences outside the governmental sphere. Mr. Samuel Gompers
has suggested that there should be an International Congress of Labour meeting in the city at which the terms of peace to end the present war were being discussed by the plenipotentiaries of the belligerent peoples. In this way he believed the voice of Labour would make itself heard even in the conclave of statesmen. The project would be better realized at The Hague. If only the Trade Unions of the world would select as their representatives not the noisiest and most extreme members, but level-headed men representing the sober judgment of the working-classes as a whole, the deliberations of such an assembly would be a valuable contribution to the environment of the World’s Parliament. Similarly, and at the same time, the Chambers of Commerce of the world might arrange to hold a conference at The Hague. The British Association is able to meet in various parts of the Empire. It should not be difficult for all recognized scientific bodies to send delegates to an International Science Congress during the momentous months at The Hague. If the world’s motherhood could be represented by intelligent mothers rather than by single or childless women, such a conference would supply one of the very best influences—and one which has been conspicuously absent in and around the council chambers of the world.

A daily newspaper devoted to the needs of all these conferences, and above all to the World’s Parliament, would be a most desirable addition. Perhaps it is Utopian to hope that, say, three leading newspapers belonging to each of the Powers assembling at The Hague should combine to run this first World-Gazette in the principal languages and expressing the leading lines of public opinion in the various countries. It would not be a paying investment, any more than the Conferences already described. But it would contribute far more to the progress of the world than a mere conference of editors. It would be an international assembly of editors, mobilized and in action. Failing this somewhat unlikely arrangement, private munificence or Government grant would have to supply the daily newspaper.

CHAPTER VIII

THE WORLD-PARLIAMENT: COMMITTEES AND OUTLINE PROGRAMME

After credentials had been presented and Acting-President with other officials appointed, the first work of the World’s Parliament would be to decide questions already canvassed in diplomatic com-
munications, relating to the vote or votes to be assigned to each of the Powers, the amount of majority necessary to bind all the nations, and other matters of procedure without which the Parliament could not proceed to business. Next would be the appointment of committees to deal with the chief items of the programme to be considered at The Hague. These may be here shortly stated.

1. The development of the Hague Conference into a World-Legislature. This would simply give effect to the conclusions arrived at in previous diplomatic intercourse. To make the change more palatable to sensitive susceptibilities, the names would probably be different from those that I am now employing. But the essence of the change should be as I have suggested.

2. The development of the Hague Court into a World-Judicature with two courts—the Court of Arbitration, and the Court of Conciliation.

3. The development of the Administrative Council into a World-Executive, its mode of appointment and powers.

4. A solemn covenant imposing on all Powers in the world the obligation of submitting all disputes, without any exception, which diplomacy has failed to settle, to the final decision of the Courts at The Hague.

5. The enactment of a decree abolishing all war excepting police war within the national boundaries or authorized by the World-Executive.

6. The adoption of sanctions, or means of enforcing the decisions of the World-Parliament and of the World-Judicature:
   
   (a) The World-Interdict, or Economic Boycott;
   
   (b) The World-Armament, or International Police Force.

7. National Disarmament, universal, simultaneous, obligatory, leaving only to each Power the armament required for purely police purposes.

8. A law limiting the production of munitions of war to factories under national or international government.

CHAPTER IX

THE WORLD'S SUPREME COURT OF JUSTICE

There are in the main two classes of questions arising between nations. One is concerned with the interpretation of contracts, conventions, laws, which are producible in documentary form. This is a comparatively simple kind of question, for the documents are there to be interpreted. The second class is of a much
more difficult and elusive kind. They are questions on matters about which there is no written contract or convention or law. They represent not the clash of contending claims under a given document, but the collision of national interests, which is regulated by no official documents and must be settled by bringing into view a whole host of considerations, historical, economic and moral.

For the first class of cases a Standing Court of Arbitration is required, such as was proposed at the Second Hague Conference. For the second and graver class of dispute the so-called Permanent Court of Arbitration, with its list of arbitrators to be called upon, suggests a nucleus. It would be a court of investigation and of conciliation. Its endeavour would be to bring the disputing Powers as near as possible to agreement, and then issuing a report deciding the remaining margin of difference. The likelihood of the formation of two such courts was evidently present to the mind of the architect of the Peace Palace. He has provided for two court-houses, a large one not merely for the meeting of the Conference but for the greater trials, the smaller one suited for the purposes of the Standing Court of Arbitration.

The decision of both Courts should be final. Their business is to settle disputes and not to leave them unsettled. Any nation refusing to appear before the World-Tribunal when duly summoned would, of course, have judgment entered against it by default. Any nation refusing to submit to the decisions of the Courts as conveyed to it by the World-President, through the World-Ambassador, should be subject to the penalty required to bring it to submission.

CHAPTER X

THE WORLD-EXECUTIVE: POWERS AND MODE OF APPOINTMENT

The Hague Conference is not, as some people imagine who ought to be better informed, an occasional gathering representative of all the Powers, each distinct and unconnected with the others. On the contrary, the Conference is always there at The Hague, not only during the assembly of the Administrative Council, Powers, but in the intervals, long or short, between the assemblies. It is there in the form of a body known as the Administrative Council. This Council consists of the Ministers or Ambassadors of the world's Powers, accredited to the
Court of The Hague, with the Dutch Foreign Minister as ex-officio President. A special chamber in the Peace Palace is assigned for the sessions of this body. It is in effect the Cabinet of the Conference, and acts for it when the Conference is not in session. In other words, it is the interim executive of all the nations. Here, then, is found the germ or suggestion of the World-Cabinet, or central executive. There need be little alteration in order to develop the Council in the desired direction. The World-Executive might consist of the diplomatic body at The Hague as at present. But its rise in status would ensure that the Ambassador sent by each Power to The Hague would be their strongest international statesman. A diplomatic post at The Hague would be the blue ribbon of the profession.

One change would have to be made. The Dutch Foreign Minister for the time being would simply take his place in the Administrative Council along with the representatives of other Powers. The post of President of the Council or Cabinet would have to be filled on other than grounds of diplomatic courtesy. In view of the momentous duties that will fall to his lot, as practically the World-Premier, the President of the Council would have to be chosen by vote of the World-Parliament in plenary session assembled.

The powers with which this Administrative Council or World-Cabinet would be invested is a very difficult and delicate question. They might be in general described as the powers of the World-Parliament exercised when the World-Parliament was not in session. They would be the powers of a national Cabinet when the national legislature was not sitting. The aim of the desired evolution of Hague Conference being the abolition of war, it follows that if any unauthorised war broke out between the sessions of the World-Parliament, the Executive must have powers to stamp it out at once: or, still better, it should be empowered to anticipate the outbreak and prevent its occurrence if necessary by one or other of the sanctions of which more will be said later. The Head of the Executive, or World-Premier, must possess the authority to put an offending Power to the ban by declaring an economic boycott or waging war against the rebel. In the case of disputes submitted to the Hague Courts, it would be the duty of the President officially to notify the Powers concerned of the Court’s award, and to require compliance within a given period.
The World-Army and Navy would be at the disposal of the Central Executive. Its commander-in-chief would receive his instructions from the Chief of the Executive. These are vast powers to entrust to any man or Cabinet. An exceptional training, and a previous career open to the knowledge of the entire world, would be most desirable qualifications for the position of Chief of Executive.

Considering that the United States holds within its frontiers large numbers of almost every nation under heaven, the President of the American Republic is known to the world as having occupied the highest elective position of governmental responsibility on the face of the planet. Possibly ex-Presidents of the United States would therefore probably be among the first of the World-Premiers. Lovers of curious coincidences will note that the number of the United States of America nominally sovereign, and the number of the sovereign Governments of the world, is the same, namely forty-eight.

In order to carry out its work as Executive of all the Powers, the World-Cabinet would have to have its eyes and ears in every one of the nations. It should have its World-Ambassador in every capital, with an Intelligence Department that would keep him and his Cabinet at The Hague in constant touch with everything that was going forward in that particular country, so far as it was likely to affect the peace of the world. Any attempt on the part of any nation to evade compliance with the requirements of The Hague would at once be known and communicated to headquarters at The Hague. The World-Ambassador would also be a centre for the diffusion of the international idea. It would be his business to foster all that helped to make the world one, in action or in thought.

An official World-Gazette would also be necessary, circulating from every World-Embassy in the language of that country, with a national supplement dealing more fully with the relation of the country to the World-State.

CHAPTER XI
SANCTIONS: (1) THE WORLD INTERDICT

The great step forward that must be taken by the Third Hague Conference is to provide sanctions for its decisions, whether of a
forensic or legislative order. In other words, the decisions of the World-Parliament and of the world's Supreme Court of Justice must be enforced.

Moral Force is undoubtedly the power by which the World-State controls the constituent nations. But the moral force must, if need arise, express itself through material force. In this world of spirit and matter moral power, if it be wielded in earnest, must express itself sooner or later in physical terms. The use of physical force to make effective the moral will of society is no repudiation of morality. As every father and every constable knows, it is the vindication of morality.

Moral Force Must Become Physical.

The present war has brought home to the conscience of mankind the absolute necessity of proving its loyalty to the highest moral principle by supporting international law with physical force. This conclusion has been variously voiced by some of the foremost statesmen of the present hour. Sir Edward Grey in the Chicago Daily News of May 15th said he hoped for a league of nations that would be united, quick and instant to prevent, and if need be to punish, violation of international treaties. "As footpads, safe-breakers, burglars and incendiaries are suppressed in nations, so those who would commit these crimes, and incalculably more than these crimes, will be suppressed among the nations." Mr. Balfour in a statement to the American Press on May 18th said: "Law is not enough. Behind law there must be power. All the precautions are mere scraps of paper unless they can be enforced. What is needed now is the machinery for enforcing them." President Wilson, speaking at Washington on May 27th, after the British statements quoted above had been published, expressed his conviction that the people of the United States would wish their Government to move along the lines of "a universal association of nations," which would be a virtual guarantee of territorial integrity and political independence. A "universal association of nations" is evidently President Wilson's veil for the Hague Conference. He went on to say: "I feel that the world is even now upon the eve of a great consummation when some common force will be brought into existence which shall safeguard right as the first and most fundamental interest of all peoples and all Governments, when coercion shall be summoned not to the service of political
ambition or selfish hostility, but to the service of common order, common justice, and common peace.”

One of the foremost French statesmen has declared his belief that sanctions there must be affixed to the decisions reached at The Hague. What kind of sanctions these will be would depend on the issue of the present war, but sanctions there must be. Most remarkable, however, is the utterance which appeared in the *Berliner Tageblatt* of January, 1916, emanating from none other than the ex-Secretary of State for the German Colonies, Dr. Bernhard Dernburg. He said: “The weak point of international treaties is the lack of what is known as sanction, that is, power behind them to enforce their observance. International agreements must be backed by material force; but this does not necessarily always consist exclusively in force of arms. We perceive to-day what a boycott of trade and intercourse may mean. It would be a deadly weapon as soon as all the Great Powers took part in it. I feel that the work of The Hague must be taken up again and carried further, and the prejudice against any sort of international agreement be overcome.” He concluded by pleading that international law should be placed upon a foundation transcending the individual States, under a suitable and adequate sanction, based firstly on the moral conscience, and ultimately on the material resources, of the civilized world. The moral sense and the statesmanship of mankind combine in insisting on the necessity of sanctions.

There are two principal forms of sanction advocated at present. One is passive or negative; the other active or positive. The negative enforcement would be an economic parallel to the ancient ecclesiastical interdict. Any nation refusing to submit to the decisions come to at The Hague would be put to the economic ban; it would be boycotted. No imports would pass into it from other countries; no exports would be received from it by other countries; no mails would be sent to it or received from it; all telegraphic communication would cease—excepting perhaps wireless, which might enable the central authority to be apprised of what was going forward in the boycotted nation.

The tremendous power of such a weapon is suggested by the present economic isolation of Germany. The shutting off of Germany from...
maritime communication with the most of mankind has so far been the most terrible punishment that has yet fallen upon the violators of Belgium. Were the whole of the rest of mankind simply to abstain from every kind of communication with a recalcitrant Power, the effect in most cases would be terrible in the extreme.

The worst of it is that to inflict such a penalty on the guilty nation would cause much suffering to the innocent. To refuse to trade with one's best customer is to hurt oneself as well as him. To induce, for example, Denmark and Holland and Belgium, under normal circumstances, to boycott Germany would be a difficult matter. But a Ministry of World-Traffic might be able to mitigate the suffering of innocent nations by diverting to them compensating trade that had previously gone to the offending Power. Methods of this kind with a vindictive motive have already been advocated in the British Empire as a practical consolation for the intended loss of German trade. In the larger market of the world, and without vindictiveness, the same principle could doubtless be effectively carried out. In any case the injury caused to the unoffending peoples would not be so great as would follow from war.

On learning that a certain nation had declined to comply with the requirement of the World-Parliament or the World's Supreme Court of Justice, the World-Executive, through its President, would warn the recalcitrant Power that if by a given date there was no evidence of compliance he would pronounce upon it the sentence of economic boycott. Notice to this effect would be circulated through the World-Embassies to all the Powers. If on the arrival of the date assigned the contumacious Power still declined to yield, then the World-Interdict would be launched. But once the offending nation saw that the temper of the world was to resort unhesitatingly to this decisive step, it would probably, in ninety cases out of a hundred, back down. Perhaps at first the actual infliction of the boycott would be necessary, to make the rebel people aware that the world was in earnest. But once the boycott was found to work, the mere threat of it would, in most cases, be sufficient. So without shedding one drop of blood even the strongest nation could be brought to its knees, to confess its readiness to obey the demand of the rest of mankind.
CHAPTER XII

SANCTIONS: (2) THE WORLD-ARMAMENT

The weapon of economic boycott or world-interdict is one which even in its scabbard would be effective. In rare cases it might be drawn. Still more rarely need it be used. The fact that it was there, ready to be applied, would be in the vast majority of cases a sufficient sanction to the authority of the World-Executive.

But cases are conceivable in which even a boycott would fail. Some self-sufficient realm, able to support itself and to live as a self-sufficing oasis in an economic desert, might defy the decision of the World-State, either by declining to comply with a given award or by waging war on its own private account. Then armed force would be necessary: and armed force must therefore be at the disposal of the World-Executive.

Rare Need of Armed Force. It is conceivable that some nation sufficiently powerful adjoining the contumacious nation might be made a mandatory of the world, as occasionally one or other Power has been made a mandatory of the European Concert. The suppression of the slave trade was undertaken on behalf of mankind by the navies of France and Great Britain. But there are grave dangers attaching to the use of any national force as agent of the supreme international power. We may have to come to that. But the larger scheme should be aimed at. In order to wield, in the last resort, the armed force necessary, the World-State must have at the immediate disposal of its Executive a standing army and navy. As the purpose for which this armament would be used is entirely to prevent war and maintain order, it has generally been called an International Police Force. Under this name it has been advocated by the South German Social Democrats, by the American Socialist Party, by the International Peace Bureau (the last asking only for naval police force), the American Women’s Peace Party, the New York Peace Society and other bodies.

A Mandatory Nation? The nature, numbers and composition of this World-Force are questions simply bristling with innumerable difficulties. They can be answered only by the wisest statesmanship and the kindliest international goodwill, supported by a terrified readiness to accept any effective means to save mankind from another inferno of world-war.
The World-Armament should be supplied by all the Powers of the world. But in what proportions? "Ay, there’s the rub."

Factors. If the World-Parliament adopted the principle of One State, One Vote, equality in voting power could not carry with it the principle of equality of contribution to the international police. To exact equal contingents from Haiti and the British Empire would be an absurdity. Some principle of proportion would have to be adopted.

Population. An impatient democrat might perhaps demand that the populations of the various nations should be the chief consideration in deciding each nation’s quota. Let him come to figures. Let us suppose that an army of a million men is required. First, the population of the planet is estimated at 1,600 millions. Mere arithmetic proportion would suggest that each nation contributed 1,600 of its population to the World-Army. But population alone soon breaks down as a criterion, for it would involve that the British Empire with a population of 410 millions, and the Chinese Republic with a population of 400 millions, would between them supply more than one-half of the world’s army. It would be idle to expect other Powers to acquiesce in this arrangement.

Area. Second, the area of each of the contributing nations is another consideration—the extent of which, measured in territory, each nation would benefit by the protection of the International Force. A vast territory sparsely peopled might require more protection by the World-Army than the same number of inhabitants densely packed on a small territory.

Sea Coast. A third point to be considered is the extent of sea coast. A nation with long lines of shore would naturally be expected to contribute more largely to the world’s navy, and consequently less heavily to the world’s army; while a nation with little or no coast line would be looked to for a larger number of soldiers and a smaller (if any) number of ships.

Income. Fourth. The size of the national income, the amount of exports and imports, are also elements that would have to be considered in apportioning each nation’s military contingent.

It would be quite impossible to balance with any exactness all these considerations quantitatively. They represent elements to be weighed rather than counted. No mathematical solution can
be expected to the problem. But for the salutary dread of another world-war, the problem might be pronounced so difficult as to be practically insoluble. But the urgency of the need will compel the adoption of some rough and ready expedient.

The trouble is that almost every criterion suggested would make the British contingent to the army by far the largest. And the stupendous length of the British sea coast again would require the largest naval contingent. In view of its naval needs, its military contingent might be proportionately reduced. Russia, in view of her small accessible coast line, might be let off with a very small contribution to the World-Navy but might be reasonably asked to go beyond her numerical proportion for the Army. China would need her forces more for the establishment and maintenance of internal order than for co-operation in the general task of policing the world, and might be asked for a smaller contingent. The United States, considering its comparative immunity from previous wars and her enormous wealth, might contribute more than her share.

**British Empire.**

Of this World-Army of, say, a million, a sufficient guard should be placed in Holland to defend The Hague. Other forces should be encamped on internationalized territory, or by the side of international waterways. The disposition of the World-Army and Navy would depend upon the possibly varying needs for the presence of an effective police.

**Russia.**

I would suggest that the soldiers of this Army of Peace should be the very pick of every nation, men well educated and widely trained, with a special knowledge of the international idea, the international constitution, and the international spirit. These troops should be well intermingled. Companies of different nations should be put together into the same regiment. Officers ought also to be interchanged: for the danger of the national *esprit de corps* conflicting with the international *esprit de corps* should be carefully avoided.

**China.**

The Peace Army should occupy its leisure in mutual education. It should be something of a mobilized international university. Its members should take the opportunity of learning the languages of the nations most largely represented, and study the customs and character of other peoples. Wherever stationed they should be expected to introduce the spirit and plant
the seeds of a genuine international culture. In backward regions
the army of occupation would become an army of education.
Arrangements should be so made that after serving their term of
years the soldiers should return home, thoroughly internationalized
men, agents and apostles of international unity.

Much that has been said of the World-Army holds
good, with modifications, of the World-Navy. It
would be stationed at the most important strategic
points in the world's ocean highways. As with the World-Army,
its personnel should be composed of the very flower of the naval
manhood of the contributing Powers. The World-Navy should be
a floating school of internationalism, to carry into all backward
ports suggestions of the latest appliances for docks, wharves,
harbours, lighthouses. It should supply advice to shipbuilders for
the improved construction and equipment of their ships. It
should try, in a word, to level up the mercantile marine of the
world to the highest standard. Great care should be taken to
avoid either Army or Navy regarding itself as simply a fighting
machine.

The cost of this World-Armament might seem a
formidable problem. But once the problems
already mentioned had been solved, expenditure
might be allocated by a very simple device. Each nation would be
asked to meet the cost of its own contingent. The other expenses
of the embryonic World-State might be defrayed by tolls levied
on international waterways.

CHAPTER XIII
NATIONAL DISARMAMENT

Disarmament by mutual agreement was the first idea in the mind
of the Tsar when he originated the First Hague Conference. It
ought to be the crowning achievement of the Third Hague
Conference.

As long ago as February, 1894, I stated publicly:

Twenty-two Years Ago.

"The one condition of settled peace remains the
same: the establishment of a Central Court with
power to enforce its sentence. Disarmament by
mutual arrangement seems scarcely possible or wise unless accom-
panied or preceded by this condition. Until a man knows that the
law is strong enough to protect him from injury, he can hardly be
expected to give up carrying arms; and until nations know that
behind the High Court of International Justice there is material
strength enough to prevent or punish the international aggressor, they are not likely, in any fit of amiable enthusiasm, to disband their armies and dismantle their fortresses. That condition observed, the difficulty ought not to be insoluble."

"The One Condition." Had that truth been kept in mind, the world would have been spared much futile though splendid eloquence, and we should have been saved from the recoil of disappointment when impossible hopes proved impossible.

Not until the steps outlined in previous chapters have been taken will it be desirable, or even possible, to relieve the nations from the burden and waste of competitive armaments. But when a World-Parliament is in being, with a Supreme Court of Justice, and a World-Executive commanding a World-Army and a World-Navy, the nations can be expected not merely to submit to disarmament but eagerly to welcome it. Be it clearly understood that no compulsory disarmament should take place until the World-Executive has at its disposal adequate force for the maintenance of international order. Nations might indeed, and probably would, anticipate that moment and begin voluntarily laying aside their arms in confident hope of no longer needing them.

The armies of the nations would henceforth be Obligatory, Universal, Simultaneous. The World-Armament would be sufficient to prevent the menace of aggression and the lesion of frontiers. Armed men would only be needed within the nation for police purposes. When the ordinary unarmed constabulary is likely to be overpowered by lawless crowds, the military must be called in. The Third Hague Conference, having adopted the measures previously prescribed, should proceed to the enactment of the universal, simultaneous and obligatory disarmament of the nations down to the point of leaving to each nation only sufficient armament for police purposes within the nation. It is obvious that compared with the millions upon millions of men trained and ready to protect frontiers or to invade a neighbour's territory, the number of soldiers required for the purposes of home police would be small indeed.

Limit Fixed Internationally. But the number of men and ships required for these humble duties cannot be left to each individual nation. It is a very delicate matter to suggest, much more to prescribe, to any nation the
amount of armed force needed to make its police effective. But unless this amount were fixed by international authority the door would be left wide open for the re-entry of military ambition and competitive armament.

By the time the Conference has reached the question of disarmament, it should have received at least a preliminary report from the committee on this subject, appointed at the very beginning of the Conference. This report, subject to confirmation by the more extended inquiries of an International Commission, would have suggested what amount of land and sea force is needed for home duties by each Power. The elements to be considered are various. First there is the number of the population to be policed; second, the extent of the territory; third, the distribution of territory—whether compact like the German Empire or consisting of scattered islands and sections of continent like the British Empire; fourth, the state of economic development—whether an empty land like the Canadian North-West or Rhodesia, or a completely settled and highly developed land like Belgium; fifth, the character of the people—whether habituated to order, or still in the untamed exuberance of wild life—whether in the stage, that is, of Switzerland or of Mexico.

The figures so submitted by the committee, Exceeding the Limit a Crime. by the International Commission, would be considered by the World-Parliament. The decision arrived at would then become law, binding upon all the nations. Any nation might, if it so pleased, fall below the figure prescribed—excepting when its territory was so badly policed as to make it unsafe for international travel. Then remonstrances might fitly be addressed to it by the World-Executive. But to exceed the limit prescribed for Army or Navy would be an international crime, to be at once checked by warning from the World-Executive, and, if that were unheeded, by boycott, and in the last resort by war.

The World-Ambassador resident at the capital of each nation would have at his disposal an efficient staff for intelligence purposes. These officers of his would keep him trustworthily informed of the number of soldiers and sailors, and of the ships and all warlike apparatus, prepared by the nation. Any attempt to exceed the prescribed limits or to evade the law would be at once reported to the World-Executive. Any attempt to do as Prussia did after the
Treaty of Tilsit, and, by training relays of men each up to the prescribed limit, to have a very much larger army in readiness than was intended, would thus be rendered futile. For the Government endeavouring so to evade the law would be reported to The Hague, tried at the Hague Tribunal, and, if found guilty, condemned; its superfluous armaments would doubtless be confiscated for the use of the World-Army or Navy.

A part of the process of disarmament used to include the dismantling of frontier fortresses. But the present war has proved the futility of even the most massive fortification. Just as personal armour was rendered useless by the advent of gunpowder, so high explosives and big guns have literally exploded the age of big fortresses. Hastily improvised trenches are found to be as effective as the most massively constructed fortresses. The more readily, therefore, may the Powers be expected to acquiesce in the gradual disarmament of fortresses, beginning with those which were least likely ever to be turned to their ancient use.

Each nation would, of course, dispose of the immense amount of metal previously locked up in armaments that would no longer be required for fighting purposes. This would go to the exchequer of every country as a sort of bonus, a first instalment of the rich rewards that would accrue from mankind daring to abolish war. For the positive gain consequent on this great advance in the world's life would begin to appeal with only less power than the horror of the loss by war of life and treasure and happiness. The positive motive would reinforce the negative. The streams of wealth that formerly flowed into the unproductive abyss of military and naval expenditure would form a reservoir of plenty for the supply of the innumerable wants of an advancing civilization. In the year before the war the United Kingdom expended on its armaments some 70 millions. The armament required for home police would surely be vastly over-estimated at one-tenth of that amount. That would leave over 60 millions a year free for other purposes. One of these purposes would, of course, be the British share in the maintenance of the World-Army and Navy. But the balance left available for the purposes of, let us say, the abolition of poverty, the advance of education, hygiene, housing, improved agriculture, inventive industry, would offer the strongest inducement to the people to welcome the great change.
Another asset which ought to make the nations in
World-Parliament assembled the more ready to
hasten the change is the liberation of the inventive
genius of men hitherto devoted to devising more
and more cunning instruments of slaughter. The amount of
human brain at present concentrated on sheer destruction is
appalling to contemplate. What the same amount of brain
might effect for the good of the race, when the need of the
present destructive application has ceased, is a prospect
altogether fascinating in its attractiveness.

CHAPTER XIV
THE MANUFACTURE OF MUNITIONS

One thing has been made perfectly clear, both by the events lead-
ing up to the present war and by what has trans-
pired since the war began: and that is, no private
firm should evermore be allowed to supply munitions of war. The German Reichstag was electri-
fied by the discovery that agents of Krupp’s were at work in
different countries, stimulating panic with the sole view of increas-
ing the amount of orders for munitions from the Krupp Works. It
was found later that something of the nature of an armament ring
existed in many nations, the interest of which was to promote in
every way possible the demand for munitions. The brisker the
demand for engines of war, the greater the profit and the higher
the dividend. Each shareholder in an armament firm had thus a
direct personal advantage accruing to him from the increase of
suspicion and hatred and fear between the nations. The larger the
number of shareholders, the wider were the ramifications of poten-
tial hell. The same danger is multiplied by every man and woman
employed in these private munition works.

Since the war we have had mournful experience of
the greed with which manufacturers of munitions
put the welfare of the nation in this supreme
struggle for all that is most sacred in civilization far away behind
the increase of their own profits. Men will stand out for 200, even
300, per cent. profit rather than accept a lower figure for the bene-
fit of the nation. Compared with the exorbitant demands of these
moneyed men, the occasional strike of underpaid miners for a small
portion of the enormous income of their masters seems sheer
innocence.
The Third Hague Conference, therefore, should peremptorily require from all the constituent nations the absolute prohibition of private munition firms. If the public opinion of the world were sufficiently advanced, it would be desirable to go a step further and prohibit even the national production of the weapons and engines of war, restricting the output of this dangerous material to factories and shipyards owned and controlled by the World-State. There would thus be a further check upon the possibility of any nation attempting to exceed the armament allowed it by international agreement.

The precise method by which the private firms already engaged in the production of war material should be dissolved is a question that should, of course, be left to each particular nation to decide. There is no fear of their interests being insufficiently recognized. Their wealth and position will secure that adequate justice be done to them. And the community would not grudge any reasonable expenditure by way of compensation in order to get rid once for all of the organized temptation to otherwise reputable business men to found their hopes of larger profits on hatred, fear, and possible slaughter among the nations.

EPILOGUE: THE SUPREME OPPORTUNITY

Again let it be said: the changes in the life of the world suggested by the foregoing chapters are of such colossal dimensions as to be entirely unattainable without equally tremendous motives forcing them upon mankind. Of the presence of such a dynamic these pages have borne frequent witness. Every man and woman to whom has come home the horror and iniquity of war, or on whose heart has dawned the glory of the prospect of a world without war, are thereby called and commanded to use every available moment of time and ounce of energy in persuading their fellows to support the demand for the abolition of war. With a peculiar and awful urgency this imperative duty descends on those who have lost their nearest and dearest in this war to end war. It is theirs to complete the work for which the noble young lives were so freely sacrificed. It is theirs to be not less profuse of time and energy than their fallen heroes in the pursuit of this Divine aim.
If anyone is discouraged by the magnitude of the task before us, or daunted by the shallow sneers of the cynical or the hesitancy of "practical" minds, let him think of what our sons and brothers are going through in the trenches for the same high end, and doubt and fear and despondency will vanish.

In this civil campaign to rid the world of war everyone can be an effective combatant. Let him act as an apostle of the movement in his own set, his church, his workshop, his social circle, whether narrow or wide. But let him never either shrink or falter till the goal is gained or his work is done. Anyone willing to help, either as "Hague-worker," or as distributor of leaflets, as writer or as speaker, should communicate with me at 29 Grosvenor Park, London, S.E.

Let it never be forgotten that the overwhelming majority of mankind is on our side. Left to their own free, undoctored choice, men and women everywhere would vote almost solidly for a world for ever without war. We have only to elicit, organize and focus this tremendous preponderance of public opinion in order to prevent the few, whose interest is in war, from retaining or obtaining control of the governments of the world. But there are more than human forces behind us. Let everyone remember that these seismic changes in the political configuration of mankind are not and cannot be the result of any individual wills. The great Forces of social evolution that have brought the race up to the present are driving us forward. The Power which called this world into being and has advanced humanity thus far is pressing with illimitable energy towards this next step. To link ourselves with that Power in purpose and in unremitting prayer is to make ourselves invincible. In the absolute confidence that these endeavours of ours are but the slight forth putting of the Omnific Energy, we can dare or bear or conquer all things.

"How of the field's fortune? That concerned our Leader!
    Led, we struck our stroke, nor cared for doings left and right:
    Each as on his sole head, failer or succeeder,
    Lay the blame or lit the praise: no care for cowards: fight!"
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A World-Anthem

GOD make the World one State!
   All nations, small and great,
       One civic whole!
Self-rulled each people be!
All peoples linked and free!
Glorious in unity
   From pole to pole!

One World? one destiny!
One Race? one family!
   One God above!
All States upheld in one.
All laws excelled in one,
All lives impelled by One,—
   One Life, One Love.