

Philip Kerr

THE PREVENTION OF WAR

**PUBLISHED FOR THE INSTITUTE OF POLITICS
BY THE YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS**

NEW HAVEN · YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS

**LONDON · HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS**

MCMXXIII

PREFACE

The lectures in this volume were delivered at the Institute of Politics at Williamstown by two British authors, under the general title, *A British View of International Problems*. They are now published under what is a more appropriate title, *The Prevention of War*, because the first three deal specifically with the problem of ending international war, and because the other three deal with special aspects of the same problem. The lecture on *The Union of South Africa* describes the causes which gave rise to the South African war (1899-1902) and how they were finally removed. The lecture on *Responsible Government in India* sets forth the attempt which is being made in that vast country to effect the transition from benevolent despotism to self-government without the anarchy or civil war which has almost always accompanied that transition in the past. The third lecture discusses the relations between Europe and Asia, and the place of moral ideas in the progress of mankind to lasting liberty and peace.

PART ONE

BY PHILIP KERR

LECTURE I

THE MECHANICAL REASON FOR WAR

I propose to take war and the possibility of preventing it as the subject of these lectures, partly because nobody can escape the responsibility of doing what he can to prevent a repetition of the events of the past eight years, and partly because war is an essential element in international relations. In every other sphere of human relations, laws conceived according to the dictates of reason, justice and humanity can be invoked to settle disputes, and the appeal to violence is not only forbidden, but is treated as a crime. In international relations force is the only court of appeal, the only means of redress. There is no international legislature to define the law, no adequate court to interpret the law, no policeman to enforce obedience to the law. If diplomacy, which is simply another name for negotiations, fails, there are no alternatives between submission to what both parties probably regard as an injustice, and unleashing the savage hounds of war. Nobody can take a single step in the study of international affairs without being brought up against the question of war.

What I have to say may be of some interest to you because not only have I been a student of international politics for many years, but from the end of 1916 till a Year ago I was almost as close to the center of world affairs as it was possible for a man to be. There was no secret of the British government that I did not know, no paper that I did not or could not read, hardly any conference that I could not attend. I have witnessed from the inside the gigantic efforts made to win the war, and the hardly less gigantic efforts made to save the peace. What I have to say, therefore, is based upon some real knowledge of the way in which the affairs of nations are conducted, and is not, though at times it may seem to be, merely academic.

The question I have been asking myself for the last two or three years has been this: Have we, as the result of the terrible experiences of the late war, and of the victory of the Allies, any real security against a repetition of a world war? To this question I have to answer, No.

For the moment we have peace in the military sense, and there is no danger of a war such as that of 1914, because Germany is disarmed and the preponderance of military strength on the allied side is simply overwhelming. Further, I do not believe that the peoples who fought in the last war would submit to be driven to such wholesale slaughter again. They are, I believe, substantially immune from the kind of militarism which drove them to death by the million in 1914. The menace today is anarchy and economic chaos, involving local fighting about frontiers, with Europe retreating towards barbarism, as the habits of order, and the machinery of production and exchange, break down. These dangers are very real and are being discussed in the Round Tables. I believe that in time they will be overcome, for reason and common sense will eventually make headway against passion, ignorance and fear. In any case I do not propose to discuss them. What I want to do is to consider what are the fundamental underlying causes of world wars. For until we understand these

and deal with them, all the industry and zeal and good-will spent in repairing the damage wrought by the late war, and in restoring normal conditions, will not prevent such a war from breaking out again.

If we look back through history we shall see that what has happened in the last eight years is not a unique or isolated phenomenon. There was a world war for the first fifteen years of the last century, ending with the battle of Waterloo. Like the late war, it swept away some great abuses--for instance, European feudalism--and paved the way for better things. Before that, again, there was the world war which centered in the long struggle for the control of the New World and ended in 1763. There was the world war which was concluded by the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713, which recorded the failure of Louis XIV to establish an ascendancy over Europe. There was the Thirty Years' War, ended by the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, during which the population of Germany is said to have fallen from thirty millions to eight millions. And so we can trace back through the ages a steady procession of devastating wars, engulfing the whole of the then civilized world, followed by peaces of exhaustion, which in turn give way to new eras of war.

Have we really any reason for thinking that wars are any less likely in the future than they have been in the past? An American historian, John Fiske, writing in 1894, declared that "since 1815, the civilized world has been more successful than ever before in keeping clear of war. It is close upon eighty years since 1815, and in this time Europe has seen about ten years of war, and the United States about six years; but in the eighty years before 1815 Europe saw about fifty years of war, and the United States as many as twenty years." Fiske wrote these confident words just before the Spanish-American War, the Chino-Japanese War, the Boer War, the Russo-Japanese War, the Balkan Wars, the Italo-Turkish War, and the Great War--twenty-five years of almost uninterrupted war.

Moreover, at the end of each of these eras of war, men, as in 1918, turned feebly to the creation of some machinery which would prevent the repetition of the catastrophe. In 1713 the Abbé de St. Pierre published *A Project of a Treaty for Perpetual Peace*," which exercised much influence on the minds of statesmen at that time. In 1795 Immanuel Kant, the great philosopher, published his treatise *On Perpetual Peace*," in which he proposed that the law of nations should be established by a federation of free states. A few years later, before he became intoxicated with imperial dreams, Napoleon thought of concentrating the great European peoples into a confederation with a central assembly modeled on the American Congress or the Amphictyonic Assembly of Greece to watch over the common weal "of the great European family." In 1814 the Emperor Alexander II of Russia, anticipating the disarmament project of his successor discussed at The Hague nearly a century later, came to Paris filled with the dream of uniting Europe in a League of Peace. Then, as now, men's mouths were filled with talk about preventing war. A League of Peace was actually created, and in the concert of Europe and the Holy Alliance, Europe had a piece of machinery which did prevent war for a generation. But as you all know, it gradually became an engine for reaction. England drew aloof. The promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine excluded the New World from its scope. The revolutionary movements of 1848 destroyed its waning power, and within a few years there followed the Crimean War, and the three wars which Bismarck waged to create modern Germany, and there began that era of competitive armaments which ended in the cataclysm of 1914.

When the next world war does come, what will it be like? As the last war shows, when the national existence is at stake every international rule for making war less horrible is ruthlessly swept aside. Some nation will enlist every latest discovery of natural science in order that it may save itself, and then every other belligerent will do the same in self-defense. It is the wildest folly to imagine anything else. You cannot humanize war. You can

only abolish it. So if mankind goes to sleep again, as it has done so often in the past, it will awake to find itself engaged in military operations, the basis of which will be the use of poison gas, aeroplanes dropping explosives and gas bombs far and wide over defenseless cities, submarines, and all the horrible refinements that radioactivity and other similar developments will introduce into the conduct of war. And just because every year modern invention shrinks the world, and every people becomes more involved with every other, in trade, in finance, in knowledge, in politics, the occasions of international dispute are rapidly multiplying, and every local war will tend all the more rapidly to become a world war. You can see the process in the contrast between the proportion of humanity engaged and the part played by the United States, in the world war which raged in 1812 and that which ended in 1918.

You may think that these remarks indicate pessimism. They are uttered in a spirit exactly the reverse. I believe that public opinion, the world over, has never been so opposed to war as a method of settling international disputes as it is today, has never been so anxious to find a way of preventing it, and has never been in a stronger position for giving effect to its desires. The real danger today is that people, appalled by the apparent complexity of the problem, led astray by a vague and wordy idealism which does not think the problem out to the bottom, and preoccupied by their own affairs, will drift on during the era of comparative peace which is now due, only to wake up to find themselves plunged in war again. This is exactly what happened to Great Britain in 1914. Despite the constant warnings of well-known writers and statesmen, it was not until after the German invasion of Belgium, and the General Staff frightfulness there, that the general public realized what was going on, and that it had no option but to go through with the war. And it was still more true of the United States. No nation thought less of war. No nation was more anxious to help to make peace. Yet gradually she found that she was faced with the inexorable necessity of going to war, because she had been asleep so far as the outside world was concerned, and there was no other way in which she could save freedom. I am not afraid of another world war if the leading nations really give consistent and constructive thought to the problem of how it may be prevented.

Mr. Curtis, in his last lecture, has pointed out that liberty rather than peace is the true goal of human activity; and that he who seeks peace merely to save his life will never find it. There is profound truth in these statements. War is not the worst thing in the world, as you can see from your own Civil War, and as half mankind was driven to see in the Great War. Progress is the law of life, and sometimes, when the barriers of reaction or the forces of oppression are very unyielding, liberty has had to arm itself with the sword.

But the question I wish to discuss today is this: Is war really necessary to human progress? Must we continue to submit to a regular recurrence of these appalling evils every few decades as the price of winning more freedom for humanity? Is war, so to speak, a law of nature? Or is it, like duelling, or ordeal by fire, or stage coaches, or sailing vessels, an expedient, natural, perhaps, in a primitive age, but one which can be superseded by something better as common sense and clear thinking and good will are brought to bear upon the problem?

I would answer unhesitatingly that war is barbarism, that it is not inevitable, and that if it takes place between civilized powers, it is because they have failed to create an alternative system whereby their disputes, or the great issues involved in human progress, can be settled by other and more sensible means.

The causes of war are legion. There have been wars of conquest, of religion, of race, of nationality, of liberation, in the past. There are wars of race and nationality and color, and

of trade and commerce, looming up in the future. Can anybody who surveys the world today, with Africa just stirring into life, with Asia once more on the move, with Russia Bolshevized, with the Mohammedans beginning to unite, with the all-pervading question of the color line, with half the nations of Europe profoundly aggrieved by the results of the war--can anyone believe that we can afford to fold our hands, and enjoy our little pleasures and vain amusements and dreamily hope that all will be for the best? Can these terrific forces be adjusted or dispelled without the collision of war, by sitting still and doing nothing? Will not the old enemy inevitably engulf us again, if we do nothing to chain him up?

Nor shall we abolish wars by passing pious resolutions, or having processions against war, or saving ourselves from the torture of hard thinking by subscribing liberally for the relief of those who have suffered from war, or even in the long run by international conferences at Washington or The Hague. All these are good, provided they are recognized as a process of getting up steam for the real thing. Lord Balfour once said to me that he was almost more disturbed by peace movements than by talk about war. "For," he said, "these demonstrations do not deal with the real causes of war. They just put up a paper screen painted to delude the people of good-will all over the world into thinking that something is really being done to prevent war, while in reality behind the paper screen the forces of militarism are sharpening their knives all the time." I shall never forget seeing a United States warship sail into Plymouth harbor in the autumn of 1914, crammed with toys from the children of America for the suffering children of Europe. It was a tender and a kindly thought. But the same people who thus showed their humanity directly the need was there, later found that if the freedom they prized most highly was to be preserved upon the earth, they had to send a vast armada of war vessels to this same port and an army of two million men across the seas.

Today the civilized world is standing in relation to this problem of war exactly where England and America stood in regard to the Great War, before 1914. It is talking about it, but it is not thinking about it. Still less is it doing anything about it. It made a feeble effort in the Covenant of the League of Nations. It has run away even from this slender hope. It has now come back to passing resolutions against the use of poison gas, resolutions which will be just as effective as the resolutions of the Congress of Paris in 1856, which disappeared like snow in the face of the fierce heats of the World War. It is again at its old amusement of building paper screens. Inexorably, all the time, the forces are piling up which years hence will drag new armadas and fresh armies across the waters of the world, in order to save by human slaughter what could be secured by other and better means. The only question is, Is it going to take another and a worse world war to wake the nations up to the necessity of taking action, or are they going to allow wisdom to lead them in time to take the steps necessary to prevent it? To my mind these alternatives are inexorable. The issue is squarely up to us, and if we or our children do drift once more into a world war, we shall have only ourselves to blame.

What is the fundamental cause of war? I do not say the only cause of war, but the most active and constant cause. It is not race, or religion, or color, or nationality, or despotism, or commercial rivalry, or any of the causes usually cited. It is the division of humanity into absolutely separate sovereign states. That humanity should be so divided seems natural, almost a law of nature. That it can ever be otherwise seems almost impossible. Yet it is by all odds the greatest cause of war, and until it is overcome wars as frequent and terrible as those of the past will continue to scourge the earth. In my judgment every movement for the abolition of war which does not recognize this fundamental fact and deal with it, will fail, as every peace movement in the past has failed, because it ignored it.

In order to illustrate what I mean, let us compare the situation in the world today with that which existed in your wild and woolly West in the middle of the nineteenth century. The West was an empty land save for the Indian tribes. Gradually gold-seekers, hunters, traders, prospectors and ranchers began to filter in. There was no law, no state. Every man had to fend for himself. As you can see from reading the pages of Bret Harte, the rights and property of the individual depended fundamentally upon his own strength and courage, and quickness of hand and eye. Quarrels and disputes were frequent, and were settled by bluff or the gun. Power was to the strong. The weak went to the wall. Hold-ups were common, and the "bad man" had a good time until his depredations became so serious that people got together and "did him in."

In such a society peace and freedom are impossible. A number of simple conventional standards grow up, which have some effect in regulating the life of the mining town, conventions rather like international law, dealing with the rules and etiquette of fighting rather than with the prevention of it. But whenever a serious dispute arises there is no machinery for settling it. There are no courts, no legislature to formulate laws, no policemen to enforce them, and either the weak yield to the strong or there is a fight. More than this, there is no basis on which civilized life can be built up or a happy human community arise. Property is insecure. There is no system of title. Contract has no sanction. There is nobody to make roads, undertake sanitation, or conduct education. It is a poor place for women and children. It is a good place only for those who are physically strong and brave.

This state of affairs continues until the scene suddenly changes. There is no more fighting. The "bad man" is quiet or in jail. We see prosperous and progressive communities, busily engaged in agriculture, trade and commerce, secure in their possessions, with great cities, schools and colleges--in fact millions of human beings living contentedly and peacefully together and engaged "upon their lawful occasions." Disputes are settled in courts of law; issues affecting the community are debated on the platform, in the press and in the legislature, and in the end are settled on the basis of a law acceptable to the majority; and the use of violence in private quarrels or in resistance to law is treated as a crime.

What has happened to make the difference? Simply that the inhabitants have taken the steps necessary to dethrone force and to enthrone law and constitutional government in its place. This does not mean that the old grounds of dispute are not there. Men are still greedy and selfish and violent. They still want gold, or land, or perhaps their neighbors' goods. It does not mean that the old issues between progress and reaction, private rights and public well-being are not there. It does not mean that color prejudice or racial feeling or religious differences are any less strong. But it means that these issues are settled by process of law, according to the concepts of reason and justice and liberty current in the community, enforced by the collective strength of the community, instead of by ordeal of battle between the parties, or by the weaker yielding his rights through fear to the strong. And this system of substituting the reign of law for the system of allowing every man to be a law unto himself is the only method by which private war has been stopped and the reign of force has been ended, from the beginning of human history. With the growth of civilization the judgment of the citizens has gradually been substituted for the will of an aristocracy or an autocrat as the law-making power. But everywhere, from the earliest times until today, the only way in which humanity has been able to secure either peace or freedom or the opportunity of progress has been through the substitution of the reign of community law for the reign of individual force, through the agency of the state. Nothing short of this has sufficed, neither conferences, nor methods of conciliation, nor the organization of arbitration. All these things have been tried over and over again. But nothing less than the establishment of the reign of law, binding on every individual, and

enforceable by every individual, has ever availed to end war and make civilized progress possible.

The international world today is in the same position as were the western communities seventy years ago. It is without law; every state has to rely for its rights upon its own power; force is supreme. In point of fact, it is in a worse condition, because whereas people in western mining camps were united by constant contact, by the common bond of human association, and by a fairly vigorous public opinion, the international world has no bond of unity at all. Every state is separated from every other state by geography, and usually by language, race and culture, to say nothing of religion and history. In consequence it is animated in its attitude to other communities by ignorance, fear, jealousy, suspicion. It is usually puffed up with pride, selfishness, or ambition about itself. The highest condition to which any state has ever reached is indifference to its neighbor states. Nations often show some love for humanity, and especially for suffering humanity in other lands, but of love by one state for another state there is not, in history, that I can see, a single sign.

In these conditions how is it possible to solve the international disputes involving race, the color line, religion, markets, the control of raw materials, and so on, which continually arise, without war? There are no laws to which to appeal, no representative body to discuss, still less enact, a solution, and no police to forbid violence. Where diplomats fail to agree war is the only redress left.

Some people think that democracy will, in itself, be a preventive of war. Democracy removes some of the older causes of war, dynastic ambition, for instance, and the scheming of military cliques. But it adds a new cause, ignorance. Diplomats can travel and learn about the opinions and rights of other peoples. Democracies cannot. The real difficulty at Paris was not that the statesmen would not agree upon the right course, but that the public opinions of their countries were irreconcilable and out of control. Every democracy is convinced of the justice and reasonableness of its own cause. It easily becomes convinced of the insincerity and designing rapacity of the state with which it differs. There is no real means of explanation. Public opinion gets out of the control of those who know, and the war cloud appears. As a matter of fact, the most effective preventive of war today is not reason or good-will, but fear--the fear of the weak of the consequences of war with the strong, or the fear of the strong of the inevitable cost to itself of war with an equal or even an inferior in strength.

The reason why war has been practically continuous upon the earth's surface from the beginning of time, is that, internationally speaking, we are living like animals in a jungle, with no other means of settling the issues which necessarily arise between us, than the use of tooth and claw. I will give you two or three practical illustrations to show what I mean. Take Europe today. One great cause of war, the existence of the great military autocracies headed by the Hohenzollerns, the Hapsburgs, and the Romanoffs, and the suppression of the freedom of nationalities, which those empires involved--this great cause has been removed. The nationalities of Europe--outside Russia --are absolutely free. They are also all self-governing. But in the process of giving self-determination to the nationalities, Europe has been Balkanized. Let us assume, for a moment, that the difficulties which now confront us over boundaries, reparations, armaments, etc., are successfully overcome, and that national relations become normal once more. Are we any nearer lasting peace? How are some twenty-five states of different sizes, divided by race, language and civilization, occupying one territory which, excluding Russia, is much smaller than the United States, with no means whatever of adjusting the thousand and one questions which must arise between them every hour and every day--how are they going to keep the peace? How are you even going to make them disarm? You may be able to hold back an era of competitive

armaments for a few years, but sooner or later one of these states, feeling itself unjustly treated, or impelled by pride or greed, will begin to expand its armaments. The others will inevitably follow suit in self-defense; and then, sooner or later, the competition will end in an explosion as it did in 1914. Can you imagine the forty-eight states of the United States remaining in a very friendly and peaceful condition if they had no Congress, no federal courts, no interstate commerce commissions, no constitution, no laws of any kind, to adjust their relations, and each had a tariff of its own? Yet that is the condition of Europe. And it is also the condition of the world. Is it not obvious that so long as it exists, armaments and wars will exist also?

Take another case. Last year there was some friction between the United States and Japan. Nobody knew quite what it was about. People talked about immigration, and Shantung, and Siberia, and Yap, but it was difficult to point to any very exact matter at issue. Yet the war cloud had begun to form over the Pacific. Opinion in the United States was talking about war. Hard things were said about the Japanese. Observers said that eventually war seemed to be almost inevitable, just as they said that war seemed to be inevitable in Europe for the ten years before 1914. On the Japanese side, too, there had begun to arise the feeling that a struggle was bound to come and that they had better prepare.

The Washington Conference was summoned. Issues were frankly and honestly discussed. It was found that much of the suspicion was unfounded, and an arrangement was reached, which, if it did not solve the underlying problems, got rid of the immediate difficulties, and swept the war-cloud from the sky. But there was nothing between the United States and grave risk of war save successful conference. Suppose the personal equation at the conference had been less statesmanlike. Suppose even that the conference had been delayed and that the bad feeling had been allowed to pile up with all the propaganda of hate and suspicion at full blast. Suppose there had been an accident, an inflammatory speech, an incident like the sinking of the Maine. Do you think that it would have been impossible for a war to break out? And if it had broken out, would not the overwhelming majority of the citizens of both countries have said, "Well, I don't much like this war. But we are in it. The only thing is to see it through"? That would have meant fighting for four or five years. Yet all this happened within three years of the end of the greatest war and the greatest peace movement in history. Am I so very far from the truth when I say that today I can see no security against another world war?

Let me take one other case. What was it that precipitated the Great War? The effective operative cause of the explosion of 1914 was the surrender of Germany to Prussianism, and the failure of its people to take the control of military and foreign policy out of the hands of the Kaiser, his court, his officers, and his diplomats, into their own hands. But what was it that finally swept all Europe into war? It was the military time-table. No sooner did Austria-Hungary begin to mobilize in support of her ultimatum to Serbia than the Russian General Staff felt bound to do the same, in order not to be caught at a disadvantage if the struggle spread. And no sooner did Russia begin to mobilize than Germany felt that she must do so also, for the plans of the German General Staff in the event of a European war were based upon the capacity of the German army to mobilize a few days faster than the French army, and to crush it before the Russians could take the field. Hence the frantic telegrams of the Kaiser to the Czar, imploring and commanding him to countermand the mobilization, once he realized, when it was too late, where the policy of the ultimatum was hurrying with breakneck speed.

Whether the Kaiser or any other responsible man ever deliberately pressed the button to start a general European war, I don't know. Personally, I doubt it. It was the terrible military time-table, the inevitable outcome of Prussian militarism and the division of

Europe into a number of rival and separate national states, which made it almost impossible to stop the war once the first fatal step of mobilization had been taken. The Czar could not countermand mobilization unless Austria-Hungary countermanded it. And neither Berlin nor Vienna would countermand, after the fatal ultimatum to Serbia, because to do so would have meant an abject humiliation for the Central Powers far worse than that of Agadir. And so while telegrams flashed and Sir Edward Grey's proposal for conference was on the wires the fateful minutes passed. One after another the nations mobilized. The situation drifted steadily out of control, until finally the German General Staff insisted on marching through Belgium as the straightest road to victory and the only alternative to eventual defeat, and Europe stumbled headlong into a war, for which Germany was best prepared, but which probably no individual deliberately ignited.

That is the sort of situation which must always occur so long as peoples are organized as absolutely independent states. Having no other security for their rights but their own strength, with all states inevitably changing in relative wealth or man power or strength all the time, there will always be a restless uneasiness among some of them that they are falling behind or unsafe. Some ambitious power will begin to increase its armament, or to make alliances. Its neighbors will follow suit in self-defense. Competition will set in. Each will begin to consider what it will do in the event of war. The war offices and admiralties will begin to make plans. Everybody will find that time, taking the offensive, is what matters, to success. The military time-table which precipitated the war in 1914 will reappear. Finally some crisis will arise more difficult than usual. An incident may occur, one nation may mobilize, and before anybody is aware of it, under the pressure of these terrible military timetables, the nations will be at one another's throats in an agony of doubt and fear.

These three illustrations will, I think, bring home to you the truth of the proposition I am concerned to establish today.

It is the division of humanity into separate states, each owing loyalty only to itself, each recognizing no law higher than its own will, each looking at every problem from its own point of view, and with no machinery whatever for adjusting their conflicting interests save diplomacy and war, which is the fundamental cause of war. It is because of this division that national, and religious, and linguistic, and color differences, practically always have to be solved by recourse to war. You have in the United States, as every country has, both individuals and communities, which are divided by opinion, by race, language, civilization, and color. But they don't resort to war, because there are other and constitutional means of settling their disputes, and war is both forbidden and prevented. As between nations, however, there are no such means, and consequently states do resort to war, because there is in the last resort no other way of settling matters in dispute. So long as this condition of affairs continues it will, I believe, be as impossible to stop international war as it was to stop the Westerners from drawing their guns, before the territories had been organized on the basis of the reign of law. And I venture to predict that, before many months are past, if we go on as we are, we shall see the old competition in armaments, and the old diplomatic combinations, which ended in Armageddon in 1914, beginning again.

In some respects, what I have said here tonight may seem a commonplace. Of course, it may be said, it is true that wars are the result of the people of the world being organized into separate national states. Everybody knows that. But that is not quite what this lecture has set forth. What I have tried to say has been this: That so long as mankind, and specially civilized mankind, remains organized into separate states, wars, and by that I mean world wars, will continue to decimate mankind and to set back civilization, as they have done ever since the fall of the Roman Empire. I believe that every sane man and woman who

considers the matter must become convinced that this statement is true, and that you cannot prevent war, you cannot escape war, so long as states insist on being a law unto themselves, and so long as humanity acquiesces in being divided into fragments with no means of adjusting their relations save diplomacy and war.

In a later lecture I shall go on to draw some deductions from that general proposition. Today, in conclusion, I only want to draw your attention to what that statement really means. Between the outbreak of the Great War on July 31, 1914, and the signature of the armistice on November 11, 1918, there were, according to official calculations, more than ten million men killed, mostly in the flower of youth, and more than thirty million wounded. The loss of life since, and especially of child life, through famine, disease and the disorganization of production and supply, nobody has computed, or probably ever will be able to compute. The physical anguish and mental agony entailed by these losses, not so much to those who have died, but among those who have lived and watched others die, helpless to comfort or to save, cannot even be hinted at in words. This Institute is here assembled largely for the purpose of seeing how order can be retrieved out of the chaos left by those four terrible years of war.

Are we really going to allow the tragedy to happen again? It will happen again unless we take steps to prevent it. Yet if we are to prevent it, we shall have to deal not with vague, easy sentiments, but with something which seems to be a very law of our being, the existence of our countries as absolutely independent sovereign states. If what I have said is true, nothing short of this will avail to end war, for it is the fundamental cause of war.

LECTURE II

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL REASON FOR WAR

Humanity today is divided into between fifty and sixty independent sovereign states. These states and the human beings they contain must have relations with one another. It is utterly impossible, even if it were desirable, to keep them in separate water-tight compartments. Human beings are continually moving from one state to another. There is a constant and growing interchange of commodities and raw materials. There is the steady permeation of that highest of all social explosives, new ideas, by personal contact, the newspapers and books. Relations exist between these states, whether they want it or not, and it is obvious that with the growth of modern transportation and invention, these relations are going to become more constant and more numerous, affecting every aspect of human life. The question before this century is this: Are the innumerable issues which must continuously arise between these states, issues which concern national rights, commercial progress, the color line, and all the vast complex of human progress and reform--are these issues to be settled by the barbarous and unbusiness-like methods of diplomacy and war, or by some other and better means?

Humanity has worked out a comparatively successful machinery for regulating disputes between individuals, and between communities of individuals, within the state--a constitutional machinery which adjusts them according to reason and justice and fellowship and not by brute force. But so far we have done practically nothing to establish an analogous means of adjusting disputes or the issues of progress and reform between the communities of men organized as states. Force, in its extreme form of war, is still the authorized final arbiter, and reason and justice have no recognized position. Are we going to continue to acquiesce in this state of affairs, and with it, as its inevitable consequence, in constant minor wars and periodic world wars? Or are we going to try to do for the world as a whole what is everywhere done on the sections of the earth's surface, and substitute some more rational and effective system of dealing with disputed issues?

Let us examine what really happened in those new communities of the West, when what Lord Bryce calls the state of nature was replaced by the reign of law. Technically, of course, the federal government of the United States stepped in and organized the area as a territory. It took the whole body of law embodied in the constitution of the United States, in its statutes, in the common law--the vast heritage of centuries of experience and progress--and made it applicable to the area. At the same time it set up a legislative authority to make new laws, a system of courts to interpret them and a police force to enforce them. And in due time, when its inhabitants became numerous enough and organized enough to frame a constitution for themselves, the territory was converted into a state and admitted to the Union. That is the mechanical process, a process clearly inapplicable to the situation of the world as a whole. But what is the underlying change in moral attitude which makes possible a change from the reign of force to the reign of law? Is it not this, that the inhabitants of what is a lawless area, whether from motives of idealism and love of progress, or from motives of fear and self-preservation, agree to surrender their individual discretion in certain important respects, and to become members of a social community, governed by laws regulating their conduct towards one another, which are enforced by the community on those who would disobey them? In other words, they

recognize that they owe a duty to all the other members of the community and not only to themselves, and therefore combine to frame and enforce laws which secure peace, freedom and opportunity on equal terms for all.

Nowhere has the idea which lies at the bottom of the process whereby war is abolished and peace established within a community, been more clearly set forth than in the constitution voluntarily framed by the Pilgrim Fathers in 1620 for the conduct of their new settlement at Plymouth. Immediately after crossing the ocean in the Mayflower and before landing they embodied this idea in the following solemn covenant: We "do by these presents solemnly and mutually in the presence of God, and one of another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politic, for the better ordering and preservation and furtherance of the ends aforesaid" (namely, to plant a colony), "and by virtue hereof to enact, constitute, and frame such just and equal laws, ordinances, acts, constitutions, and offices, from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general good of the Colony, unto which we promise all due submission and obedience."

This document, sometimes called the first written constitution, sets forth exactly the fundamental idea which underlies all civilized society, the idea which raises the society of men above animal herds, which makes freedom possible, and which brings peace in its train, when properly applied.

I want to note in passing that the "first written constitution" contains no machinery. It simply sets forth the underlying idea which the Pilgrim Fathers recognized as the necessary basis for their life, namely, that they were members of a community, and that this community could only thrive through obedience to laws framed "for the general good." From this basis, however, has been gradually built up the machinery of a modern democratic state, whereby without fighting or war, not only can every conceivable conflict of interest between individuals be settled according to ideas of justice and reason embodied in law, but every question of policy affecting the progress or well-being of the community as a whole, can be determined, after debate and discussion, by constitutional means, by the votes of the citizens, from the standpoint of what they consider to be the "general good" of the commonwealth. The effectiveness of this idea embodied in the solemn covenant of the Pilgrim Fathers, when carried into practical execution, can be seen not merely in the history of the original settlers at Plymouth, but of the millions who now inhabit the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the Republic of the United States, which have grown out of this and other similar original foundations. Now let us turn and look at the situation in the world at large. You find that on every atom of the earth's surface inhabited by man, disputes between individuals are settled and war between individuals is prevented on this basis. The only differences are that the machinery for making and enforcing the laws and determining what is the general good is not as yet always controlled by the people at large, but by hereditary autocrats, oligarchies, or other minorities. Why is it that, in contrast to this state of affairs within the state, between states war still stalks brazen and omnipotent throughout the earth?

The reason, as we saw in my last lecture, is that humanity is divided into more than fifty different communities organized as states, with no common machinery for adjusting their disputes. If that, however, were all that is missing, the remedy would be obvious and easy. We should have only to make a federal constitution for the world, and international war would vanish for ever from the earth. But the obvious impossibility of this makes us realize that there is something else than machinery missing. Is it not that the basis as set forth in the Pilgrim constitution is not there? That basis was that each individual recognized that he was part of a community, and owed a duty to all his neighbors. In the international world not only is there no sense of the duty of one state to another, but there is no sense of

the nations forming a single brotherhood, and of the necessity of framing "just and equal laws, ordinances, acts, constitutions," etc., for the purpose of protecting and promoting the welfare of the community of men. It is the absence of any effective desire for the "general good" of the whole family of nations which makes us acquiesce in war as being "natural and inevitable," and prevents us from finding a practical means for adjusting disputes by legal and constitutional methods. Until it makes its appearance we shall never, in my judgment, be able to prevent war on the earth.

As a matter of fact, if you talk to any ordinary man or woman of good-will about humanity, he will express interest in it and a desire that it should be happy. I doubt if there is anybody who does not cherish the hope and belief that humanity as a whole will progress, as an abstract proposition, or who would not view with distaste or horror the idea that any section of it should be condemned to stagnation or still more to extermination. But that sentiment only extends to the sociological or humanitarian field. When you turn to politics, it disappears. Politically, every state thinks primarily of itself and of nobody else. Its citizens acknowledge their liability to be taxed for the sake of one another, and their duty to die, if called upon, in defense of one another. They not only admit no such duty as regards humanity as a whole, but they think it right and natural that they should go to war with their neighbors, if the state of which they are members constitutionally decides that they should do so, whether they think the cause is just or unjust.

It is this worship of the national self which causes the inhabitants of every state to be content with limiting their loyalty to their own fellow-citizens, and which prevents the growth of an effective sentiment that the "general good" of humanity must have precedence over the self-interest of any fraction of humanity.

I do not want to be misunderstood as belittling true patriotism or national feeling. The love for one another expressed in the loyalty which citizens of the same country feel for one another, and the manner in which they are willing to subordinate their individual interests to the general good, whether in framing legislation, or in sacrifice for defense, are entirely good. True patriotism is a higher manifestation than racialism or tribalism. It is a good and noble thing. I hope I am a good patriot myself. I trust you are good patriots, too. My only quarrel is that this patriotic feeling stops short at the national frontiers, so that the loyalty and benevolence that citizens feel for such of their fellow human beings as live within a certain line on the map, turns to jealousy, suspicion, or fear of other peoples who live on the other side of that geographical line.

Just consider how absurd that really is. Most people are concerned in some way or other to make things better. The natural friends and allies of the best citizens and the most progressive and sensible people in every community are people of the same type in other lands. The friends of civilization and progress ought to stand together in every land. Yet the effect of our present self-centered statehood cuts right across this line. We in England feel an obligation towards a primitive, backward, possibly criminal, newcomer who has only recently emerged, perhaps, from barbarism, which we do not feel to citizens of the highest type from France or the United States. And you do exactly the same. According to the accepted standards you would admit the obligation to shoot Shakespeare or Wilberforce, the great British abolitionist of slavery, if you met them on the field of battle in war, and we should admit the duty to shoot Emerson or William Lloyd Garrison in similar circumstances, if our countries unfortunately quarrelled, even though everybody knew that the quarrel was caused by the control of the political life of our respective countries by a far inferior and less enlightened type of citizen.

The more you examine it the more, I believe, you will find that it is this narrow national selfishness which is the psychological root of war, just as the division of mankind into separate sovereign states is the mechanical cause of war. It is this self-centered, exclusive patriotism that fills us with suspicion and fear and even hatred of our neighbors. It makes us want all advantages to come to our own state, and view with jealousy every advantage which comes to another state. It estranges us so much from our brothers as to make us think it natural that we should be organized into separate national states, arrogant and self-assertive, armed to the teeth against one another, and bitterly resentful of any suggestion that they ought not to be a law unto themselves. It prevents the growth of that love of humanity as a whole and desire for its well-being, which is the necessary preliminary to the ending of war. Just as the Pilgrim Fathers or the settlers in the West found that the only way in which they could get peace was to settle disputed issues from the standpoint of the "general good" of the whole community and not by a trial of strength or the surrender of the weak to the strong, so the peoples of the world will find that they also will be able to get peace only by rising to the level of settling their disputes from the standpoint of the "general good" of the whole community of men instead of each trying to get its own way. The growth of a world patriotism, not destroying national patriotism, but extending it to include all humanity exactly as national patriotism extends family loyalty to include all fellow citizens, is the necessary preliminary to the creation of any machinery for the ending of war.

In my last lecture I propose to consider how, if the civilized nations develop a sufficient sense that they are members of a single community of nations, war can be abolished between states, as it has been abolished between individuals. Today, I want to show how, even without any formal international organization, the acceptance of the standard of the "general good" of humanity, as opposed to the self-interest of the sovereign states, begins at once to prevent war, and to make progress possible.

I want first of all to examine the question of whether the World War of 1914 was really inevitable, or whether it could not have been prevented.

I don't propose to go into an elaborate discussion of the immense documentary testimony as to the origin of the war. I simply want to consider the question in very general terms. I explained in my last lecture, how, under the pressure of the Kaiser and the military party, the competition in European armaments set it. It was obvious to every thinking observer that war was brewing. Every year the tension increased, every year the armies and navies grew greater, every year the gulf of fear and misunderstanding grew wider. Every year the military time-table was tightened up. There was no shortage of responsible men who uttered warnings. Yet nothing was really done to prevent the cataclysm, except a frantic effort when it was too late.

Why was that? Was it not because all the great nations of the world were wholly preoccupied with themselves? They did not want to think about the problem, and so long as the danger seemed to affect somebody else rather than themselves, they did not care. Suppose they had been thinking about world progress, would they not have taken steps long before it was too late? Suppose we were to be whisked back now to a time some years before the war, with the knowledge and understanding we possess now, do you think the war would have taken place? Would not the statesmen and the journalists, the publicists, and thousands of plain citizens, have gone to the German people and said, "What are you afraid of? There is no encirclement of Germany going on. Nobody covets what you have got. Your trade and your prosperity are increasing by leaps and bounds. The reason why you are isolated and alliances are springing up against you is that your government, your foreign policy, your army and navy are not under your control, but under the control of an

autocrat and a military clique. We don't think that you are seeking world dominion, but we think your rulers have something of the kind in mind. Directly you have taken charge of your national policy for yourselves and ousted the militarists, you will find that our suspicions and our preparations will disappear. But so long as you leave the militarists constitutionally in charge, we are going to prove to you that you cannot succeed, because, however fast you multiply your armaments, we shall multiply them faster."

Do you think there would have been a war if France and England and the United States had said that even as late as 1908, when the defeat of Russia by Japan had removed from Germany the Eastern menace, and before the race of armaments had become too intense? Don't you think that there would have been a German revolution and not a world war? I do. Yet the situation was just as clear to those who had eyes to see, as it is to everybody now. The nations did not see it simply because they were not interested in the rest of the world, because they had no sense of the "general good" of mankind, and were thinking only of themselves. Dante, in the *Inferno*, reserves almost the worst punishment for those "who were neither for God nor against him, but only for themselves." The hell through which the world has passed is the inevitable consequence of our thinking only of ourselves. Is it to take another world war to force us to think also of one another?

I will take another case--the Peace Conference. It is the fashion to decry the work of the Paris Peace Conference. I agree entirely with Mr. Cravath, I think it was, who said in a Round Table the other day that when you consider the state of passion and feeling in Europe at the end of a five years' war, when millions of men had been killed and millions of acres had been ravaged, the wonder was not that the peace was so bad, but that there was a peace at all. As a matter of fact, I believe that if you exclude reparations--which dealt with money, the love of which St. Paul wisely said is the root of all evil--history will rate the political decisions of the Paris Conference, imperfect as they were, as an immense advance on the work of any previous international conference.

What was it that enabled the Peace Conference to do its work at all, to steer its way to any sane conclusions amid the passions and intrigues of forty nations none of them understanding one another? Simply this: That in the Council of Four, you had some men at any rate who, despite many defects, were trying to make a peace from the standpoint both of what was just in itself and of what was for the "general good" of the world. They may have made many mistakes and many lapses. I think they did. But they made a real attempt to curb and discipline national passion and ambition within the limits of what was best for the world as a whole. I venture, indeed, to predict that when the time comes for the whole of the minutes of the meetings of the Council of Four to be published for the whole world to read, public opinion will recognize the sincerity of the attempt, and appreciate more clearly the stupendous difficulties with which the Council had to contend. On the other hand, cannot we all now see that in so far as the Paris Conference was not a success it was precisely because the world point of view did not prevail sufficiently over the selfishly national point of view?

Since 1919 what has happened? Is it not that the world point of view has practically entirely disappeared, and that every nation is scrambling for itself? I am afraid I am now going to say something which some people may not like. But it would be no service to you if I did not tell you the truth, as I see it. The final destruction of the attempt to regulate the terrible difficulties which presented themselves after the war from a world standpoint, and not simply as a conflict of national interests, came from the United States. The most serious blow that the United States dealt to Europe was not so much the rejection of the Covenant of the League of Nations, as the withdrawal of its presence and counsel from the consideration of post-war problems. And it did so, not because it could not get its advice

accepted, but for internal reasons of its own. Before the disappearance of the United States the world standpoint was more or less accepted, and in the United States it had an enlightened and far-sighted advocate. But no sooner did it set the pace by leaving the conference table than the unity was broken, and nations openly said that they also had to think first of themselves, and the situation rapidly degenerated to the condition in which you see it now.

In saying this I do not want to suggest for one moment that our troubles in Europe are to be attributed to the United States. They are primarily of Europe's own creation. Nor do I say it in any censorious spirit, for no nation can pretend that it has not been guilty of political crimes in the last few years. Our own record, for instance, in the matter of reparations, is surely black enough. I think I understand, too, the immense difficulties which present themselves to the United States. It is, I confess, an extraordinarily difficult problem which confronts you, namely, that of how you are to play your part as a world power in helping to guide world policy, while avoiding entanglement with the purely internal problems of Europe. But it is none the less a fact, and it is a fact that nobody can dispute, that whereas after the armistice an attempt was made to deal with world problems from a world standpoint, the withdrawal of the United States destroyed all real possibility of remedying the mistakes of the Peace Conference and of solving post-war problems, because the most powerful nation in the world, the nation most disinterested and constitutionally the most advanced, was no longer there, to inspire, to restrain and to guide.

Take the matter a stage further. What is the fundamental difficulty which prevents a settlement of the problems of the time? Is it not that every nation is now looking at them from the standpoint of its own interests and not from that of the common good? In consequence every nation is beautifully clear about what its neighbors should do, but wonderfully dense about what it should do itself. It is inevitable that confusion and chaos should continue, so long as we each think first of ourselves. Yet directly we begin to consider things from the point of view of what will help the whole family of nations, and not primarily from the standpoint of how it affects ourselves, does it not become obvious almost at once what ought to be done, at any rate in broad outline? I am not going to discuss these things in detail, for the proper place to do that is in the Round Tables. I simply ask the question. If you take the reparation question, the debts question, the scandal of the Near East, still more commercial questions, any one of the problems which agitate us now, and look at it for five minutes from the standpoint of what is going to help the world forward most rapidly to prosperity and peace, is not the answer pretty clear? Is not what we need now a return to that world point of view which for the first time in history flickered into feeble life in the Conference of Paris?

Let us take a final case. Let us look for a moment at the future of Europe. What is it that is fundamentally the matter with Europe? Is it not that its people have no sense of their own essential unity, no sense that they can only prosper in friendship and co-operation? Even leaving out of account the momentary difficulties of the time, how can Europe ever have peace, ever be freed from war, so long as each of its twenty-five states looks at every problem from the standpoint of its own self-centered interests alone? It is manifestly impossible. The forty-eight states of America could not have peace if each were entirely independent and each looked at America's problems from its own point of view, and with no thought of the well-being of the United States as a whole. As a matter of fact, they would not think of the problems of America at all. They would be engaged in an endless quarrel with one another about boundaries, railway rates, customs barriers, commercial advantages, and the relative strength of armaments exactly as the nations of Europe are today. The United States is prosperous and at peace because George Washington and

Abraham Lincoln saw that the particular interest of every state was best served by subordinating it to the "general good" of the whole, and they insisted, at the cost of immense sacrifice, that they must be and remain a unity. In consequence, the United States, with an area not unlike that of Europe without Russia, with resources not dissimilar, with 100,000,000 people of exactly the same races, nationalities, and religions as Europe, is prosperous, united, and at peace, while Europe, though it has been freed from the military despotisms and is now democratic, is faced with a long era of discord, suffering and possibly war. Is it not obvious to every person in this room that the only final solution of the European problem, the only means whereby peace and concord can ever be reached among the European peoples, is that they should recognize that the "general good" of all its peoples must prevail over the selfish interests of any of its parts, and take the steps necessary to insure that every dispute shall be settled and every problem solved from this wider point of view?

It is exactly the same with the world. The problem there is less urgent. There is in the nature of things far more risk of disputes and war between nations geographically contiguous than between those separated by the sea. But in essence what is true of Europe is no less true of the world as a whole. Harmony and lasting peace will not even come into sight until the civilized powers, at any rate, begin to recognize that their peoples are members one of another, and therefore to adjust political questions, commercial questions, shipping questions, oil and raw material questions, not as a competition between them for advantage or power, but from the standpoint of what will best promote the peace and prosperity of humanity as a whole.

The truth is that the Golden Rule is not a counsel of abstract perfection, or an injunction to lead a hard and mortified existence here for the sake of reward after death. It is not only sound morality, it is good business as well. And it is no less good a guide in international affairs than it is in commercial or private life.

I remember that Mr. Lloyd George, long ago when he was president of the Board of Trade, found that British shipping was suffering because the load line of safety imposed by the British government was higher than that imposed by commercial rivals and was acting detrimentally to British shipping. People urged him to reduce the British load line to the level of his competitors. He refused. He was determined not to reduce the margin of safety, the safety he thought necessary for British sailors, nor was he prepared to ask Parliament to subsidize the companies. He therefore called a conference of the maritime powers and secured a general agreement to a uniform international safety load line. You see his action was good humanity, good patriotism, and good business as well. And I believe it is always so. The more you do unto others as you would that they should do unto you, the easier it is to agree, and the better the results in the long run for everybody.

Is it not obvious that in international affairs it is impossible for nations to secure what they want for themselves alone? Every nation wants freedom and peace, and profitable commercial exchange. No nation can make sure of any of these by itself. Liberty it can only obtain if it is stronger than all comers. Peace it can never be sure of, for somebody else may start a fight. Profitable trade is only possible where other nations can trade profitably also. The nations will find, sooner or later, that the very things that each is seeking for itself, by itself, these three blessings--peace, freedom and prosperity--they can obtain only by combining to secure them for one another.

These illustrations from current affairs will, I hope, serve to strengthen the fundamental proposition which is the subject of this lecture. The ending of world wars by the establishment of machinery whereby international disputes and the problems of human

progress can be settled by some less barbarous and more just and effective means than war, depends upon the growth among the civilized nations of the sense that they are themselves members of a larger human community and that the well-being of that larger community must be the standard by which all international questions must be tried and settled. Until that sentiment is general among the most civilized powers, I do not believe that anything really effective can be done to stop war, and that war will continue on the earth in the future as in the past, the great scourge of man. The great obstacle in the way of the growth of this sentiment is the modern religion of national selfishness. This is, in some ways, the most important point. It is always easy to cheer fine sentiments about humanity and peace. The real difficulties appear when we are faced by the fact that in order to realize those ideals we have to sacrifice many precious prejudices and habits of mind which stand in the way.

We are inclined sometimes to think that we have progressed far beyond the standards of the idolaters of old. We read with horror of the human sacrifices to Baal and Ashtaroth, to Dagon and Moloch. But are we really so very far ahead? If it is true that war can be abolished, and peace and order and freedom can be established on earth by relinquishing our national selfcenteredness sufficiently to allow the "general good" of humanity to prevail over our several national wills, we must be worshipping something very ugly and very terrible, that it should lead us, generation after generation, to fresh holocausts on the altar of war. Did the gods of old ever exact a toll of human sacrifice like that which was paid between 1914 and 1918? Are the idols which we worship now going to exact this toll again? Their names are not Moloch, or Baal, Dagon or Ashtaroth today. Nor are they Germany, or Italy, or England, or America, for these names stand for great and noble things. Their names are a little different. They are "Deutschland über alles," the "Sacro egoismo Italiano," "Rule Britannia," "America first." It is the idols of national selfishness which set the stage for the last war, and which will set it for another unless we awake to overturn them in time. It is these hideous forms that make kindly men and generous women suspect and hate and finally fight one another; which prevent them from leaping over the barriers of race and language and religion and stretching out the hand of brotherhood and friendship to all mankind; which hinder us from hastening towards that far-off commonwealth of man where war is for ever ended and freedom is for ever secure.

LECTURE III

THE ONLY ROAD TO INTERNATIONAL PEACE

In my previous lectures I have endeavored to prove two propositions, which I believe to be fundamental if we are ever to abolish war from the earth. The first was that the most potent and constant cause of war, the cause which infinitely outweighs all others, is the division of humanity into absolutely independent sovereign states. I tried to show that in contradistinction to the situation within the state, there was, in the international sphere, no legal or constitutional machinery for adjusting, according to reason and justice, the disputes which arise from other and more immediate causes, such as national ambition, commercial rivalry, color prejudice, the advance of civilization, etc., and that in consequence resort was necessarily made from time to time to war, as the only final court of appeal. The second proposition was that we should never be able to create any effective machinery for adjusting international issues by legal or constitutional means, and so abolish war, until the civilized nations had overcome their narrow self-centered nationalism sufficiently to recognize that they belong to the larger community of all nations, and that international issues ought to be settled from the standpoint of the welfare of the whole, and not as a conflict between the self-interest of the parts.

Nations today are far from being ready to admit this conclusion. But assuming that they were, what practical steps would be necessary to make an effective end of international war? That is the question I propose to discuss today.

It must be obvious to all that the only method is the substitution of the reign of law over all nations, for the present reign of force. Nothing short of that will suffice. Obedience to law or principle is the condition of peace, freedom and happiness, in every sphere of life. No musician can make progress until he obeys the law of harmony. No individual is either really at peace or free until he submits himself to the wisdom of the Ten Commandments. No community is at peace or free in which the citizens do not submit themselves to the restraints of their country's constitution and laws. The Pilgrim Fathers saw that very clearly. And nations, similarly, will be neither at peace nor free until they unite to bring themselves under the reign of just law.

Mere benevolence will never keep the peace among the nations, any more than it will keep the peace among individuals--in their present state of moral growth--without the restraint of obedience to law, and without the machinery whereby disputes can be settled impartially according to law, and fighting is prohibited and prevented. If law is indispensable in the civilized community of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, what reason have we for thinking that it is not even more necessary among the estranged and suspicious communities of men? If nations cannot trust one another enough to unite to frame a means of settling disputes according to justice, what possible ground is there for thinking that they will always manage to settle them by voluntary agreement? As William Penn said, "Government is the means of justice, as justice is the means of peace."

We have not got to wait till man has realised perfection before we create the machinery of the reign of the law. When he is perfect he won't need it. It is precisely because he is still imperfect, quarrelsome, selfish, greedy, intolerant, that it is needed at all. You don't

suppose that all the citizens of the United States or Great Britain are perfect. There are fairly good specimens of both human perfection and human depravity in both countries. Yet we all know that we could not get on at all without the machinery of law. We know also that it is the less good citizens who need it most and who have to resort to it most often. Political mechanism is not a symptom of perfection. It is the means whereby a community insists that quarrels between imperfect individuals, or disputed questions of public policy, be settled by legal and constitutional means, and not by the method of fighting, which is both bad for the parties concerned, and upsets and damages the rest of the community as well. It is just the same with nations. They are certainly imperfect, and it is because they are still imperfect that they need some constitutional means of solving their disputes if they are to avoid war.

Hence, I can reach no other conclusion, whether from a study of the past, from experience of the present, or from the consideration of theory itself, than that war between states will continue until we apply to the world as a whole the same fundamental ideas as are universally applied within the state. War will only be abolished from the earth when the peoples of the world, or at any rate the civilized peoples, combine under some organic constitution whereby international questions are settled by an appeal to law designed to promote international justice, law which is obeyed and enforced by all mankind, until it can be modified by constitutional means. That is the basis of peace and civilized government everywhere in democratic communities today. In my judgment it is the only means whereby peace and civilized government can take the place in world affairs of the unintelligent, barbarous, and destructive method of war. That, to my mind, is the inexorable teaching of underlying principle. I do not believe that it is possible to escape it.

Before going on to consider the practical application of this conclusion, let us consider for a moment the alternatives which are usually put forward. Take first of all disarmament. The agitation for disarmament, in so far as it represents the rebellion of public opinion against a new race of competitive armaments, is entirely to the good. I would not lift a finger to discourage the campaign. On the contrary I would help it in every way, unless it were represented as a final solution in itself. It is a step in the right direction. But it does not solve the problem. No nation can or will abandon its armaments altogether until it has both an alternative method of protection and a system in which it has confidence whereby disputes with its neighbors can be justly and honorably decided. Universal peace will never come from universal disarmament. You would not have got very far with giving peace and real freedom to the western communities of the United States if you had simply taken away the guns of individuals and done nothing more. Until the institutions of a state were established, there was no other way of settling disputed questions than fighting, and if individuals who felt themselves unjustly treated or aggrieved, had not been able to use guns they would have used clubs or their fists, or any weapon to their hands, to defend what they believed to be their rights. It is exactly the same with nations. They cannot and they will not disarm without an alternative system of protection and of settling disputes. You would not do so yourselves. And if there is no alternative system, nations will, sooner or later, be landed in war. If they are not united enough to form a common machinery for the conduct of their common affairs, it is a pure delusion to think that they will be able to escape disagreements or to avoid settling those disagreements by fighting.

Disarmament, therefore, is no solution. What about the international court? This also is a step in the right direction, for it accustoms men to think of justice as the true arbiter of international problems. But international courts by themselves cannot suffice. Courts of law interpret law, adapt law to the changing facts of human life, develop law; they do not enact it. That is the function of the legislative body. If the courts began to enact laws they would immediately become the center of violent controversy, just as legislatures are today.

Their impartiality would be assailed, their authority would wane, and their decisions would be disregarded. The function of the judiciary is quite distinct from that of the legislature. The latter is representative of the community, discusses its problems, and gradually embodies in a law the best solution it can, which is binding on all the citizens and enforced by the courts. The courts themselves have no responsibility for the wisdom or unwisdom of the law. They are solely concerned with its practical application. No body of a judicial or unrepresentative character could possibly solve the vast problems relative to the color line, to the development of self-government among backward peoples, to the control of world markets and supplies of raw materials, which are increasingly going to convulse mankind. These are political matters, not judicial, and they must be settled by political means.

What about the system of international conference, either temporary, like the Washington Conference, or permanent, like the League of Nations? I am not, of course, going to discuss the merits or demerits of the present League, for that is a matter of party politics in the United States. Nor is it material to my point to do so. I entirely endorse the underlying idea of a League or Association, call it what you will, of all the nations of the earth, to deliberate about world problems. Some such regular institution is essential to international understanding and without it no progress whatever towards world peace can be made. But no such body can, in itself, end war. At the very highest it can only do what your Confederation did between 1781 and 1789. It will ultimately fail to solve the international problem for exactly the same reason as the Confederation failed to solve the American problem. The Confederation failed because, its members being delegates, it tended to approach every issue as a matter of adjusting the conflicting interests of separate states, and not from the standpoint of what was best for the American people as a whole. It failed still more because even when it could agree upon the wise solution it could not give effect to it, because its decisions were only effective if they were simultaneously accepted and carried out by thirteen separate legislatures, widely scattered, and each looking at the question from its own point of view. As you all know, the system broke down hopelessly, as it has broken down in Canada, Australia, South Africa, Germany, everywhere where it has been tried, and a federal system had to be erected in its place. It will be exactly the same with a League or Association of all nations. It is a step in the right direction. But a League or Association of absolutely independent sovereign nations will ultimately fail, partly because its members will be delegates and forced to discuss world problems as a matter of bargaining between their separate states, and partly because even when it can reach unanimity, its conclusions, however good, will never be accepted or carried out simultaneously by more than fifty separate states, scattered all over the world, and wholly immersed in their own point of view.

I think every dispassionate thinker will agree that none of these expedients, admirable as they are, as steps in international co-operation, can ever, by themselves, end war. I would go further. Unless people see clearly what is the ultimate goal and recognize that these methods are just steps towards that goal, they may become that dangerous thing, the paper screen. They send the world to sleep; they make it think that it is dealing with the real causes of war, whereas it is not, so that eventually it finds itself suddenly awakened, as in 1914, to the horrible reality by the shriek of the bullet and the roar of the guns.

I don't want to be misunderstood as being against international co-operation. I am for it, to the limit, in every helpful form. It is the only present practical method of reaching agreement and diminishing the risk of war. All I am concerned with today is to point to what I believe to be the fundamental truth, that the only method of finally ending war, and therefore of establishing freedom for all nations on the earth, is to apply to the world as a whole the same fundamental ideas which have alone given peace and liberty and opportunity in its separate parts.

I venture to believe that the great majority of those who have considered the arguments and facts set forth in these lectures will agree in theory with this conclusion. The real difficulty is to see how to convert that theoretical proposition into a practical and effective reality.

Before I go further, however, I want to make it clear that I am not talking practical politics. I am for the moment a political theorist. The ending of war along the lines I have been discussing is not a matter of practical politics today. Nor will it be for many years. We are still in the thinking stage. The question will have to be thought out far more deeply than I have done, and in many countries, before the idea can enter the field of practical realities. I discuss this somewhat abstract subject here because the Institute of Politics in Williamstown is an organization which exists not for partisan or propaganda purposes, but for the scientific study of international affairs. And it is only by hard thinking in such institutes that we shall ever reach conclusions which are practical and not merely theoretic. I should like to say in passing that I think the Institute is the most interesting experiment of its kind in the world, for it is the only institution that I know of which brings real students together, free from party bias, with access to governmental knowledge, but free from governmental control, with direct contact with representatives of foreign opinion, for the purpose of collective, creative thinking about the international problem.

If you think I am going to give you a nice, clear-cut, neatly docketed proposal for preventing war, all tied up with string, and embodied in a draft treaty or convention, I'm afraid you will be disappointed. The people who begin that way, in my experience, end nowhere. I am simply going to throw out for consideration a few leading ideas, which, in my opinion, go to the root of the problem, and which may help those who want to do some pioneer thinking about this great question, to think towards an ultimately practical proposal. My ideas are all tentative, and they will not become definite and conclusive until they have been discussed and criticized by others. I hope, therefore, that you will take what I am now going to say, not as the advocacy of a plan, but as a contribution to thought upon a great problem. For it is only by thinking, and thinking together, that we shall ever solve it.

You will remember that in referring to the "first written constitution" of the Pilgrim Fathers, I noted the fact that it contained no machinery for giving effect to the fundamental covenant of the original settlers that they would enact and obey laws designed to promote the "general good" of the community. The precise machinery for giving effect to this idea was a later and a gradual development. I think we must approach the world problem in the same way. The first indispensable step is to get general assent to the fundamental covenant that the world is a single community of many nations, that the promotion of the "general good" of humanity ought to be the standard of our national conduct, and that if we can find the way to do so, we ought, to quote the Pilgrim Fathers again, "to enact such just and equal laws, ordinances, acts, constitutions and offices, from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general good" of mankind, and that to these we ought to "promise all due submission and obedience."

I don't think that anybody in this hall who thinks about the matter will dissent from the view that we ought, if it is practically possible, to make the welfare and progress of the world as a whole the object of our international policy and action. Let us assume, therefore, a general desire on the part of civilized peoples to drop their self-centeredness and rise to the level of being willing to combine to promote the welfare of humanity, and incidentally, of course, of their own countries as part of it. Is it possible to reproduce on a world scale the three institutions whereby the reign of law has been established, and warfare

abolished, within each state? Is it possible to create a world legislature representative of the people, to enact the laws for the general good of the world, world courts to interpret them, and a world police force, backed by some kind of military or militia force, to enforce them?

Before trying to answer that question, let us face up, honestly and squarely, to the difficulties. We shall make no progress to the goal of world law and world peace unless we do so.

The first obstacle which we meet is the enormous difference in race, language and culture among civilized nations. The basis of every civilized and democratic community with the normal institutions of a state, as above, is a substantial similarity among the citizens. They usually all speak the same language, or are willing to do so. They are usually at about the same level of civilization, or anxious to reach it. They are all either of one nationality, or are assimilable to that nationality, and anxious to be assimilated to it. Where there is no probability of assimilation, immigrants are excluded.

There is no such similarity even in the civilized world. The great national entities of the world—France, Italy, Britain, the United States, Germany, Russia, Japan—all differ profoundly. You could not get them to merge their national identities in a single cosmopolitan state. They ought not to do so, even if they could. That form of internationalism looks backward and not forward. There is no possibility, and in my judgment ought to be no possibility, of creating a world state on the model of any national state which now exists. The nations are the pillars of the world's temple of peace. Nothing less strong will support the roof which is still to be built.

The second obstacle is no less formidable, and that is the different levels of civilization. The great majority of humanity is still not yet self-governing in any real sense of the word. If you look at it, Asia, as a whole, is not, though it is marching fast in that direction. The overwhelming majority of the four hundred millions of China and the three hundred and fifteen millions of India, though self-governing institutions are making their appearance in both, as yet take no conscious interest in the problems of government. The politically minded and the electorate capable of casting an intelligent vote are still only a tiny fraction of the whole population. When you turn to Africa or Polynesia you see that most of their inhabitants, so far from being able to govern themselves when subjected to contact with the terrible stresses and temptations of the modern world, still require the protecting and guiding hand of a highly civilized power.

It is obvious that world organization on a democratic basis for all humanity is still far off. The civilized nations will not allow their own future, and the future of the world, to be controlled by the votes of peoples who have not yet demonstrated their practical capacity to conduct an orderly and progressive government of their own countries. It would not help the progress of the world if they did.

Then there is a third obstacle. That is the sheer problem of numbers. The population of the world is about 1,700,000,000 people, and if one third of these are children, a world assembly on the basis of one member for every 100,000 electors would exceed 10,000 members, a wholly fantastic and unworkable number. The present machinery of democracy does not seem to be very appropriate for dealing with the world problem.

Then there is a fourth obstacle. If ever the world is to have unity and liberty and peace, it must be on the basis of the self-government of all its parts. Over and over again in history great leaders have attempted to give mankind some respite from war, and the set-backs to

progress that war entails, on an autocratic basis, and they have always failed. The only successful attempt was that of Imperial Rome, which, for several centuries, gave the civilized world the only universal peace it has ever known. But in changing from a republic to an empire, Rome destroyed the mainspring of its vitality. Its administration became more and more lifeless and inflexible. Its peoples, having no responsibility for their government or their laws, became effete. And finally it collapsed under the pressure of barbarian invasion from without, and moral decay within. Charlemagne tried to restore it in 800 A. D. The Papacy tried to establish a universal theocracy under Innocent III. Napoleon tried to set up a universal empire a century ago. Some German minds even thought of it in 1914. But great as were the blessings which universal peace offered to mankind, it preferred freedom more. Every time that a universal empire was in sight nations rebelled, and the attempt was foiled. National self-government is the only foundation upon which world unity and world peace can rest.

I think that is a fair statement of the chief practical difficulties, though there are many others. There is, in particular, that most imposing, but least substantial obstacle of all, the sheer inertia of humanity itself, and its prejudice against reform. The mere enumeration of these difficulties shows how formidable a proposition we are up against, and how inappropriate is the simple mechanism of an ordinary democratic national state to their solution.

How then can we proceed? I think we can only proceed along the same line of development which has succeeded so well in the past. I wish I had time to discuss the political system established by Moses and the Israelites as recorded in the Bible. That to my mind is the beginning of self-government, and of his idea of the commonwealth. But I will begin with the Greek city state, which invented democracy as we know it--that is to say, the system whereby the laws under which a community lived and its executive were made amenable to popular control. Greece perished because under its primitive democratic system the city state was limited to the number of citizens who could hear the voice of a single orator, and so vote on the issues at stake. Greece was therefore divided into a great number of city states which had no means of adjusting their common affairs, rather like civilization today. They were constantly at war, and the Greek political system perished from internecine strife, ending in conquest from Macedonia.

Then came Rome. Rome developed the concept of the universality of law, and out of this idea and the intense patriotism of the city of Rome grew up a system which eventually embraced the whole civilized world, and kept the peace for centuries within it. But as we have seen, Rome failed to invent a system for extending responsibility to her citizens once the reign of her laws extended far beyond her city walls. She became an empire, and, like Greece before her, perished from internal decay and external attack.

Then England invented the representative system. This advance meant far more than a mere change in mechanism. It implied a vast moral advance in the sense of brotherhood and loyalty on the part of the individual. Without that moral advance--an advance, in my judgment, only made possible by Christianity--modern parliamentary government would have been impossible. The representative system not only brought into being states which extended over an immensely larger area than the Greek city states, but saved them from internal decay because it made all citizens responsible for the laws under which they lived.

Finally America invented federalism--the division of the functions of government between local and central legislatures--a still further advance both in mechanism and moral outlook. Federalism has made it possible to extend responsible constitutional democratic government over a whole continent, as Australia following the American precedent has

been able to do. And I should like to remind you in passing how France, inspired by this example, not only established the democratic system on the western end of Europe, but under Napoleon, in his earlier and creative period, swept away the medieval system of Central Europe, and so paved the way for modern European democracy.

But even federal democracy as we have known it, despite all recent developments in transportation and telegraphic communication, is not really applicable to the world as a world. I have already pointed out some difficulties. But does federation do anything to point the way? I think, in its American form, it does.

There are three fundamental ideas underlying the American Commonwealth which seem to me of vital moment. First, the sovereignty of the Constitution, which, for practical purposes, can only be altered by the people themselves. Secondly, the definition of the powers of the federal and state governments in the Constitution, so that no government has the right to exercise any authority over any other. And third, the vesting of the duty alike of interpreting and enforcing the Constitution, not in the governments, but in the courts, both state and federal. What does this mean? It means that so long as the people of the United States as a whole give effective support to the Constitution and the courts, there can never be a collision between any of its governments. The Convention which drew up the Constitution saw that to give the power of enforcement to any government as against any other government, inevitably involved war, and it consequently provided that the Supreme Court should have jurisdiction over all controversies between states. In other words, under the American Constitution, no controversy between states, or between the Federal Government and the state government, is at present conceivable which is not a matter for judicial determination and settlement. And where the development of the Constitution by judicial decision is inadequate or unsatisfactory, the Constitution can be amended by the people themselves.

While these ideas may not be applicable in their entirety to the world problem, they seem to me to point the way. Is it impossible that we should be able to draw up a constitution for the world which would define the rights and duties and independence of all national states, which would set up some body to deal, from a world standpoint, with those matters which today lie outside the control of any nation, and which by vesting the enforcement of the constitution in the courts of every country, supplemented by an international court, would end the possibility of international war, so long as the peoples were willing to give effective support to the constitution itself?

It has been said that I am advocating a super-state. If you mean by that a body which can give orders to the United States or Great Britain, or France or Russia, I emphatically am not. That way failure and disaster lie. Within their own spheres the Congress of the United States, the Parliament of Britain, the Legislature of France, must remain omnipotent and supreme.

But is there any reason why you in this room should not be citizens, in the constitutional sense, of the city of Boston, of the state of Massachusetts, of the Republic of the United States, and of the commonwealth of all nations? If you were, would you be any less free and independent? The body which represented you in your capacity as a citizen of the world would be no more able to interfere with the United States than the United States is able to interfere with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Each would have the organs necessary to enable it to deal with its own affairs. But there would be no ground for dispute or war between the national states of the world, because the duty of dealing with the matters which lie outside national control, and which today are dealt with by diplomacy and war, would then be constitutionally controlled by some body whose business it was to

act as trustee for human welfare as a whole. I am not in favor of a super-state, but I am in favor of seeing whether the civilized nations cannot enter into a constitutional bond which will give justice, liberty and equal opportunity to all peoples. If a constitution could be created, it would end in one stroke imperialism, international rivalry, disputes about boundaries and half the issues which are now regularly settled by war.

Leaving on one side prejudice and inertia, what are the difficulties in the way of proceeding along these lines? The first and most obvious is, that it involves a curtailment of national sovereignty, or, rather, it means a definition of a line of demarcation between the powers to be exercised by the body representing people in their national capacity, and those exercised by the body which represents them in their capacity as world citizens. But I ask you to consider this: Do sovereign national states really exercise sovereignty in the world sphere now? They manifestly do not. War is not sovereignty, and that is the only power they can exercise as sovereign states. In 1781 the peoples of Massachusetts and New York thought that they were sovereign powers in America. George Washington and Alexander Hamilton explained to them that they were not. It was no exercise of sovereignty for the thirteen states to quarrel and fight about America's future. The only way in which the people of America could exercise sovereignty was, while remaining divided into thirteen states for local affairs, to become a single people for common affairs. Then, and only then, were they able to exercise sovereignty--that is, to control American affairs--for then, and only then, could they create the constitutional organs which enabled them to do so. Between 1781 and 1789 the people of America, despite their independence of Great Britain, were not free, for they could neither agree nor act about anything. After 1789 they were free and had dominion, because they had brought themselves under the reign of a single sovereign law.

It is exactly the same with the world. The peoples of the world today are neither sovereign nor free, in any real sense of the word. Their only power is to fight, and that is not freedom. They cannot control the world in which they live. The only way in which they can become free and become sovereign is to pool their sovereignty, so to speak, in that sphere which lies beyond national rights, and create an organism, responsible to themselves, through which they can control world issues by law, instead of by the savage and often meaningless means of war.

Further: Is not the universal tendency towards centralization of government, and away from the true democratic idea, is not the delay in the spread of democracy itself in the world, largely due to the fact that every nation has to base its constitution and its methods on the risk of war? The liability to war is the great centralizer, the greatest empire builder, the great enemy to democracy, in the world. We shall only be able to establish a true constitutional balance in our own countries when constitutional government within is balanced by constitutional government without.

The second difficulty which arises is this: What about nations which may not wish to join such a system, and prefer or are only fit to remain in a state of nature outside? And what about the non-self-governing peoples? How can they share in sovereignty and exercise its responsibilities? As to nations who refuse, or are too lawless, to join, is it not possible to begin to bring unity into the world on these lines gradually, by introducing the system first among as many peoples as will unite to submit themselves to the reign of law, as it was introduced first along the Eastern seaboard of America, and later gradually extended until it included and gave peace and order to the whole of the United States? The possibility is worth considering anyway. And as to the backward peoples the process is clear. The American Constitution makes provision for territories. You can deal with the Philippines. Sovereignty can be vested theoretically in the whole people of the world, but in the

intermediate stages, until civilization and self-government have made more progress, the most advanced peoples can act in world affairs, as they do today, as trustees for the whole, under proper constitutional guarantees.

Finally, there is the difficult question of mechanism. How are you going to constitute a body which can speak for humanity in the extra-national sphere? Here it seems to me that we await another advance in political mechanism of the same kind as that made, first by the Greeks, then by the British, and then by America. You have got to discover a development beyond both the representative and the federal systems, if you are to create an institution which can really be said to represent humanity, which will secure the confidence of humanity to the extent that they will entrust it with the decision of extra-national affairs, and which in some way can claim the allegiance of the individual. I do not see why that new idea should not emerge here in America, among those who created and understand best the last great constitutional invention. Anyhow, I put it up to you to discover it!

As I have pointed out before, however, far more than a mere change in mechanism is involved. It means a profound advance in moral outlook. It implies that a sufficient proportion of humanity come to see that they owe a loyalty to all men, of the same kind as they feel that they owe to their fellow nationals. The members of each nation have to relinquish the idea that they are in competition or rivalry, and feel that they can be citizens in both the nation and the world, and that there is no rivalry between them. As a matter of fact, if the leading nations of the world really recognized the brotherhood of all men, and thought about justice and human welfare and not only about themselves, would it take very long for them to unite sufficiently to put an end to all risk, at any rate of the kind of internecine wars with which we are threatened today? I do not think they would find the difficulties insuperable.

This change in spirit and outlook is the fundamental thing. As it appears, everything else will be comparatively easy--the distribution of powers, finance, boundaries, armaments--for it is always possible to find means of giving practical form to an effective general will.

That is as far as I can go today. I believe you will find that some of these ideas are fruitful and that if you study them they will lead you further than may at present appear. I would only suggest two broad subjects for further study. On the one side I think you will find the fundamental ideas involved in the problem more clearly enunciated and discussed in the writings and speeches of your own fathers than anywhere else. If you study the works and lives of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton and the other writers in "The Federalist," John Marshall and Abraham Lincoln, you will, I believe, be driven to the same fundamental conclusion as I have been, that only by means of some organic structure of the kind I have discussed, will you ever be able to abolish war from the earth.

On the other hand, I think you will find that it will repay you to study the constitutional theory, and, still more, the practice and spirit of the modern British Commonwealth. It contains within itself a quarter of the people of the earth. It unites in one loose bond, completely independent self-governing nations, and peoples of every race and color, and level of civilization. Its institutions are very rudimentary. But they serve to keep the peace, and to promote freedom among 440,000,000 of the children of men. The British Commonwealth, indeed, shows that the idea of world unity is not so far-fetched as at first appears, and involves far less interference and change in the existing national system, than people believe.

I see that somebody has suggested that I want the United States to join the British Commonwealth. That is absurd. It is not a question of either entity joining the other, but of their combining with other nations to give some kind of constitutional system to this world. As a matter of fact, in my judgment, the British Commonwealth cannot indefinitely last in its present form. If the world progresses towards unity and peace, it will be replaced by a greater thing. If the world moves back again, it will break up in that further Balkanization of mankind, and that still more frightful world war, which are inevitable if the civilized peoples do not read in time the lessons of the last ten years.

I have an idea that a good many people are saying: "Well, the total abolition of war is a beautiful dream, but it is only a dream. Some day it may be possible, but not now." To this I would make two answers. The first is that the main burden of these lectures is not to advocate this plan or that, but to point out that we are faced with two alternatives, and two only-- steady constructive progress in the direction of world unity, and another world war. We can have whichever we choose. But the choice itself is, in my judgment, inexorable. If we sit still and murmur, "Well, it's a beautiful dream, but we cannot do anything about it now," then we are in fact casting a vote for another world war.

The second answer is, that I believe that the ending of war by these means is ultimately perfectly feasible. The road may be long and difficult. It will certainly wind up hill all the way. But it is none the less the road. What is it that really stands in the way of moving, and moving steadily forward? Is it not fundamentally fear, prejudice, ignorance, inertia, and selfcenteredness? There is nothing really impossible about creating the constitutional machinery whereby civilized humanity can deal with the problems of the earth by some more intelligent and humane method than war. The problems are there. They have got to be dealt with. The only question is whether we shall go on failing to deal with them because we can only fight about them, or whether we shall create some means whereby we can deal with them according to reason and justice and from a human point of view. To face this question, and not to ignore it, is, to my mind, to have one's feet on the ground.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, St. Paul says that "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." The substance of world unity is certainly not seen yet. Is it not, therefore, faith that we need now, the vision that the Founder of Christianity said could remove mountains, not so much of rock, but of prejudice, and fear, and illwill?

I have taken as the subject of these lectures "The Prevention of War." But I do not think that the desire to avoid war is the best or the most potent motive which ought to guide us. I doubt if we shall ever abolish war simply because we want to avoid it. The only power that will gird us with the needed strength is a consuming desire to see a better, cleaner, happier world, a world not desecrated and ruined and set back in its progress by recurrent bloodshed and destruction.

If we can only lift ourselves out of the rut of our own national prepossessions and selfishness, and go up on to a mental mountain and survey humanity and its problems as a whole, does not our course seem clear? We see our fellow human creatures, men and women and children, just like ourselves, with the same virtues, the same failings, the same striving for better things, the same human hearts. We see some comparatively wise and thoughtful, fortunate and prosperous. We see others ignorant and thoughtless, in misery and squalor. In some areas of the earth we see civilization and progress. In others we see pools of phosphorescent decay just stirring with new life. Yet everywhere there is not co-operation for improvement, but jealousy and strife and war. Is it not obvious that we can none of us really progress until we combine to drain these disease-breeding pools, with

education and true knowledge, and to build human ties and constitutional bridges uniting all races and nations. Are we not in reality, all one people?

It is really a great adventure which lies before us, if we have eyes to see it. It is an adventure calling for even greater qualities than those needed for fighting a war. There is no risk of our becoming effete if we really attempt it. And it is for the civilized peoples to take the lead.

There are some lines written by Sir Owen Seaman early in the Great War, which caught very well the spirit in which nine hundred and fifty thousand of the varied races and peoples of the Commonwealth to which I belong, laid down their lives for freedom's cause. The copy which I first saw was found upon the body of an Australian soldier who had come thirteen thousand miles to fight in Flanders fields. They embody, I think, the spirit in which your sons also crossed the seas. They set forth the spirit in which alone we can make sure that the work which they died to begin, that no such tragedy should happen to humanity again, shall not be left unfinished, because of anything that we leave undone.

"You that have faith to look with fearless eyes
Beyond the tragedy of a world at strife,
And trust that out of night and death shall rise
The dawn of ampler life;

"Rejoice, whatever anguish rend your heart,
That God has given you, for a priceless dower
To live in these great times and have your part
In Freedom's crowning hour.

"That you may tell your sons who see the light
High in the heavens, their heritage to take:-
'I saw the powers of darkness put to flight;
I saw the morning break!'"