

THE MASSACHUSETTS PEACE SOCIETY



A PRACTICAL  
INTERNATIONAL  
PROGRAM

BY

JAY WILLIAM HUDSON

PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI  
DIRECTOR EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, MASSACHUSETTS PEACE SOCIETY

---

THE MASSACHUSETTS PEACE SOCIETY  
31 BEACON STREET, BOSTON, MASS.



THE MASSACHUSETTS PEACE SOCIETY



A PRACTICAL  
INTERNATIONAL  
PROGRAM

BY

JAY WILLIAM HUDSON

PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI  
DIRECTOR EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, MASSACHUSETTS PEACE SOCIETY

---

THE MASSACHUSETTS PEACE SOCIETY  
31 BEACON STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

POOLE PRINTING COMPANY  
251 CAUSEWAY STREET  
BOSTON, MASS.

# A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

## I

**T**HE European war has awakened the world to a new consciousness. It is becoming increasingly apparent that the enlightened peoples of all countries are almost unanimous in their condemnation of the continuance of the war system as a means of settling international disputes. But the mere condemnation of the war system is not enough. It must be directed forcibly to the attainment of certain specific ends: otherwise, public opinion will simply spend itself in an effervescence of futile generalities which will accomplish little of practical import.

One of the most interesting things in connection with this public opinion against war is the way in which it has gradually formulated itself concerning definite things to be accomplished. If only public opinion could have come to itself sooner! For instance, it is now perfectly clear that the wisest thing that the neutral nations of the world could have done at the very beginning of the European conflict was to get together and form a unit of powerful influence on the side of peace and for the protection of neutral rights and interests. Not long ago Earl Grey, presiding at a London meeting, called for the purpose of advocating an agreement among the nations for the enforcement of international law, said that the present conflict probably would never have taken place had the program of American pacifists been adopted, namely, that the nations signatory to the Hague

## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

Conference undertake collective responsibility for such enforcement. Several times recently in the United States Congress resolutions have been introduced looking toward a calling together of the neutral nations in the interests of world order. This suggests a mode of procedure which may yet be adopted during the progress of the present war, and which certainly ought to be adopted during the progress of any future war, if unfortunately there should be such. There were forty-four nations of the world signatory to the Second Hague Conference. Ten of these nations are now (April 1, 1915) busy in the worst conflict that the world has known. This leaves thirty-four nations not at war, whose interests, nevertheless, are being seriously prejudiced every day that the war lasts. When the rights of any neutral nation are violated, when the safety of her people and the security of her business interests are threatened, it becomes at once imperative to protest against the infringement of such rights and interests. But it is always dangerous for a single nation to make such a protest by itself. Misunderstandings in diplomatic exchanges, long pent up prejudices and emotions are apt to be aroused which may plunge such a protesting nation into the very war against whose procedure its protest is directed. But if the neutral nations protest together, the protest has great weight and becomes a very important factor in maintaining the order of the world.

## II

While the European war lasts, therefore, the first item in the program of the new internationalism is the calling together of a conference of the thirty-four neutral nations signatory to the Second Hague Conference. The United States, as the leading neutral power, might well

## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

assume the responsibility of calling such a conference. People scarcely realize yet what such a conference would mean and what far-reaching things it could accomplish. First of all, it could act as a unit in insuring the rights of the neutral peoples as long as the European war shall last. For this purpose and for other purposes to be named this conference might well continue in session or within call until the close of the war; for crises of a serious nature are likely to occur at any time, requiring immediate and concerted action. But this is not all. Such a conference of neutral nations would be the best agency for mediation whenever a time for the offer of mediatory services seems favorable. The offer of mediation by any one power might be resented, and in any event, might be ineffective: whereas the offer of mediation by all the neutral nations of the earth would appear as a disinterested appeal for world order and would be much more likely to be accepted. Above all, such a conference of neutral nations would in itself be a splendid example of international co-operation of the very sort for which the new internationalism is working. Furthermore, when the terms of peace shall be negotiated at the close of the war, the neutral nations acting together can have much more influence in seeing to it that the terms of peace shall not be such as to create a situation which might lead to future war or prejudice the interests of the neutral nations themselves.

### III

Let us look at this last matter a little more closely. The deliberations of the warring nations at the close of the war, when they conclude their negotiations for the peace of Europe, will be one of the most important and far-reaching events of all history. It will be an

## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

event that will not only profoundly affect the future fortunes of Europe, but will be of vital importance to the whole civilized world. Some international thinkers have even gone so far as to insist that since the neutral nations are so inextricably involved in the future of Europe, the neutral nations should have a direct and active part in the negotiations of the warring nations which frame the terms of peace. Only recently the International Peace Bureau at Berne, of which H. La Fontaine is president, issued a circular to the peace societies in all lands, in which appeared the following pronouncement:

“First and foremost, we must insist on neutral powers taking part in the peace negotiations, if only because their interests are at stake and because the agreements intended to insure a lasting peace must, if they are to be efficacious, take the whole world into account.”

It is just possible that, however desirable it may be, this direct participation of the neutral nations in the peace negotiations will not prove feasible. Europe is under the war system and, unfortunately, will probably insist upon concluding its technical terms of peace without outside interference. The countries engaged have been fighting a long, hard, bloody war: a war which every warring nation regards as a war of desperate defense: a war in which each nation has spent not merely vast resources of an economic sort, but thousands upon thousands of the lives of its best young men. After a desperate war of such magnitude, it is but natural that the peace negotiations will be conducted in somewhat the same temper as the war itself was waged. Any advantage gained by any particular nation will have been dearly bought and will not be easily relinquished. Of course, this is the great danger of the situation: the



## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

danger which the participation of neutral nations in the negotiations is designed to meet.

But I wonder if there is not a surer and more feasible way of influencing the terms of peace at the close of the war in favor of a stable international order. Remember this: at the close of the present war public opinion in Europe will have more influence upon government than ever before. This great catastrophe has affected the average man and woman in Europe as no other catastrophe within the memory of man. Before the war, public opinion in Europe had gradually been educated to more and more of an international viewpoint. National and race differences had been lessened through the myriad means of intercommunication between races and nations and through friendly co-operation in all the great vital interests of civilization. The war came upon public opinion as more or less of a surprise and a shock, and it is not at all inconceivable that when this war shall close, public opinion shall have been educated through its bitter and tragic experience to make itself heard and felt as never before in the history of Europe. Autocracies and bureaucracies there still will be; but they will tend to be more merely nominal in their absolute powers than in the past. European rulers and counselors had already learned before this war that the conviction of the masses must be reckoned with. After this war they will have to reckon with it still more seriously; for nothing teaches individuals or nations like the school of experience, and the European war has taught the average man lessons which will not be forgotten for generations to come. Democracy may indeed be slow in coming, but public opinion, nevertheless, will have a vast deal to do in preventing terms of peace of a sort which would be likely to menace the future security of the common

## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

man in Europe. Now, public opinion is the great hope and reliance of the peoples of the neutral nations of the earth. For the public opinion of the world is interrelated, and the convictions of the masses of the people outside of Europe, if made definitely and distinctly known to European peoples, will have a vast part in molding the European mind. Above all, the public opinion of America, the country in which more than in any other the masses of the people read and think and express their thoughts freely,—this American public opinion, I say, will have more influence upon European public opinion, as well as the public opinion of the world, than that of any other nation. Now, who makes this American public opinion? You and I. What shall we have to say with regard to the terms of peace at the close of this war? Well, we shall say at least the following things and insist upon them with all the force of our collective conviction. First, the terms of peace to be concluded in Europe must be of such a sort that they will not only avoid creating new reasons for future retaliations and revenges, in short, for future wars, but they must remove, so far as is possible in the nature of such negotiations, the causes of strife which have existed for so long and which have been the occasions of the upbuilding of that vast militaristic system under whose burden the European peoples groan. Second, the world should insist that the terms of peace shall not be such as to involve the crushing of any nation engaged in this conflict. It is well indeed that militarism shall be crushed forever; but it would be nothing but a calamity if any European nation should be humiliated to such an extent that the world would lose her cultural integrity, her distinct contributions to civilization, her self-respecting co-operation in the constructive work of the world.

## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

Germany must not be crushed; England must not be crushed, nor Belgium, nor France, nor Russia, nor Austria-Hungary, nor any other country, no matter how much we may be of the opinion that one or the other is to blame for the international anarchy now prevailing. Third, it is almost unanimously agreed among international thinkers of the present time that the terms of peace should not involve the transfer of any territory from one nation to another against the will of the majority of the inhabitants of that territory. These three things, at least, public opinion can help to accomplish, and they must be brought before the mind of the world incessantly and persistently until they have become part of the intimate convictions of civilized mankind everywhere.

### IV

So much for the *immediate* world program of the new internationalism. But note that all these immediate measures look forward to one great goal: the permanent peace of the world. These immediate measures are not enough to accomplish this permanent peace: they are merely deeds by the way,—important deeds, but not sufficient. What, then, is the next great thing that the world must do to bring about the new world order which it demands?

It is quite clear that this new world order must be planned for in an intelligent and efficient way and that the very first step to be taken after the war is over is the calling together of a world conference comprising all the nations of the earth, including those now in conflict. The calling of such a conference at The Hague was contemplated long before the present war began; and now the reasons for calling such a conference are

## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

multiplied a thousand-fold. It is not absolutely essential that this conference be held at The Hague; but two world conferences have already been held there, and these two conferences have already accomplished so much toward world co-operation that it would seem to be highly advisable that the next meeting of the nations shall take the form of a Third Hague Conference. People at large scarcely realize the wonderful progress toward international understanding achieved at the first two Hague Conferences. The First Conference, which met in 1899, was in the nature of an experiment, which a number of doubting statesmen predicted would fail. Yet at this conference twenty-six of the world's fifty-nine independent powers were represented, these powers standing for three-quarters of the world's population and resources. In some respects this conference symbolized the greatest international event in the history of the race. The Second Conference, held in 1907, lifted the possibility of international co-operation beyond the stage of mere experiment and justified the hope that a world federation for the conserving of international interests and the welfare of humanity at large was no longer a merely impractical dream. At this Second Conference were represented forty-four of the world's powers and practically all its population and resources. Of course, the actual achievements of such conferences must be slow, but they are none the less sure and worth while. As the Hon. Elihu Root says:

“The immediate results of such a conference must always be limited to a small part of the field which the more sanguine have hoped to see covered; but each successive conference will make the positions reached in the preceding conference its point of departure, and will bring to the consideration of further advances towards

## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

international agreement opinions affected by the acceptance and application of the previous agreements. Each conference will inevitably make further progress and, by successive steps, results may be accomplished which have formerly appeared impossible. . . . The most valuable result of the Conference of 1899 was that it made the work of the Conference of 1907 possible. The achievements of the two conferences justify the belief that the world has entered upon an orderly process through which, step by step, in successive conferences, each taking the work of its predecessor as its point of departure, there may be continual progress toward making the practice of civilized nations conform to their peaceful professions."

Let the next great assembly of the powers be held at The Hague. Through the munificence and far-seeing vision of a noted American, a great building, the Peace Palace, has already been erected for this very purpose, and its portals are ready to open in welcome to the deliberations of all nations and all races. Some humorists, with more regard for humor than the deeper significance of historic events, have amused themselves and a certain section of the public by picturing the Palace at The Hague as being "To Let," thus suggesting that the whole conception of such an edifice has been proved a failure. Well, let it go at that: the Peace Palace at The Hague is "To Let"; and after the present war the nations of the world ought to be glad enough of this fact to draw up an everlasting lease of it, so that it may be henceforth used for the peaceful and constructive discussions of those international problems which heretofore nations have attempted to settle by force, but which henceforth they shall settle by reason. No one had more to do with persuading Mr. Carnegie to build The Hague Palace than did Andrew Dickson White, formerly president of

## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

Cornell, later ambassador to Germany. Of this palace, while in prospect, Dr. White rightly said:

"Such an edifice would convey to the mind of the average thinking man throughout the world tangible evidence that such a tribunal already existed, and would so influence public opinion that, whenever there should afterward arise threatening questions, the governments and peoples would naturally say to parties inclined toward a warlike solution: 'Why not try first The Hague International Court? A large body of judges of the highest standing in the various nations is already provided, and from these you can make your choice. There is also an International Court House standing wide open for you. . . .'

I insisted that, while there was an admirable purpose to be served by the Peace Palace as a home for international conferences and courts, its most immediate practical and tangible use was as an 'outward and visible sign' to the whole world that full provision had been made for the international tribunal, and that such a tribunal could be called together at any moment."

The next great question is, what shall be the specific business of this great world conference? Its chief business will be to secure to the world the following four achievements:

(1) The gradual but sure creation of an adequate international law as a rational basis of international order.

(2) An international tribunal for the settlement of all international disputes.

(3) Universal disarmament.

(4) An international police to sanction and maintain the world order so long as any force anywhere attempts its defiance.

Let us take up these several projects one by one.

## V

First, an adequate international law. Just as in individual states the common welfare of persons, their social interests and rights, are expressed through law and guaranteed by law, so must the common welfare of nations, their international interests and rights, be expressed through law and guaranteed by law. For, what is law? It is the outward expression, the visible sign and symbol of the social consciousness and the social conscience. Without it, society might have some sort of order, but it would not be sufficiently articulate, sufficiently self-conscious, to be secure, efficient and progressive. Nations can no more be left to themselves to act alone with regard to international measures affecting other nations than individuals can be allowed to do just what they please, regardless of the fortunes of their fellows. The mere wish that civilization might express to settle international differences hereafter through rational measures rather than by force is not sufficient, no matter how ardent that wish may be. This wish, this desire, in order to prevail, must become objectified, codified, and as familiar to the consciousness of civilized men as the fundamental propositions of the constitution of a nation are familiar to its good citizens and are deemed by them inviolable, no matter what may be the temptations of self-interest and the passing wants of the moment. No longer can we trust ourselves as single nations, either as democracies or monarchies, to decide for ourselves great questions of international policy. I say neither democracies nor monarchies can be so trusted. Not monarchies: for the monarch is a human being, as fallible as are all human beings, with a natural tendency to sacrifice world welfare to national patriotism

## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

and aggrandizement; and these temptations are magnified in proportion to the power which he holds and to the weakness of the personality which he happens to possess. Not democracies: for while, in Lincoln's phrase, you cannot fool all of the people all of the time, it is not so difficult to persuade an excited majority in times of stress that national patriotism means self-interest to the extent of asserting the so-called rights of the individual nation over against the manifest welfare of the world at large and over against the real and permanent welfare of the nation involved. Thus it is that, for the sake not only of international interests but of that true national welfare which depends upon the conservation of international interests, international law of an adequate sort must be created and must gain the respect and allegiance of all the nations that create it. This does not mean that any nation is robbed of its freedom, for does it not help make the law by which it is bound, and is it not thus a member of what might well be termed an International Democracy?

Well, the Hague Conferences have already made beginnings which look toward the creation of such an international law, so necessary for international order. As Prof. William I. Hull says in his splendid book, "The Two Hague Conferences," "The twenty conventions and declarations adopted by the two conferences form a code of international law which is, in the aggregate, of much volume and great importance."

One cannot leave this topic without saying that heretofore the extremely important matter of the creation of an adequate body of international law has been slighted more than it should be by many of those who have been seeking the accomplishment of a new world order. The achievement of this law will, of course, be a gradual



## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

matter; indeed, it will be a matter of perpetual growth and improvement: but the supreme thing to attain just now is the unswerving and persistent purpose of all the nations to create such a law and to be loyal to it in terms of an international patriotism which shall never allow itself to be misled or betrayed by the narrower interests, often powerful and well-nigh irresistible, of the particular nations.

### VI

But the creation of such an international law as has been described involves the creation of a world court, or courts, where cases of dispute between the nations shall be brought for settlement and where international law shall be adequately administered by expert and impartial judges. That such a court is not at all impracticable is proved by the fact that during the last one hundred and twenty-two years over six hundred international disputes have been settled by courts of arbitration. Some will reply to this that the cases settled by such courts have been trivial. But this is by no means true. Many of the cases peaceably settled by such courts have been cases that were once regarded as disputes involving "national honor" and "vital interests," which statesmen once thought to be impossible of settlement by any international tribunal. The fact is that thinking people have come to see that the "vital interests" of a nation cannot be separated from the vital interests of the world, and that there is no higher "national honor" than the assuming of that supremely honorable courtesy toward other nations which demands and concedes fair play and reasonable deliberation on all questions involving the larger human welfare. Furthermore, the Permanent Court of Arbitration al-

## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

ready inaugurated by the Hague Conference marks the auspicious beginning of a world court to which all the nations shall have free recourse in the settlement of their difficulties. It might be added that a world court administering an established international law is a much more practicable institution than the traditional court of arbitration. For a court of arbitration very often considers the merits of the case before it in terms of that rather unknown quantity involved in the exercise of common sense and untechnical equity. The result is that cases submitted to mere arbitration, without the backing of an adequate international law, have frequently resulted in decisions which meant nothing more nor less than a mere compromise, unsatisfactory to both parties and yet accepted in the name of peace rather than in the name of justice. The world court of the future will administer an international law created and acknowledged by all nations. Thus its decrees will be much more acceptable, and as a result, it will be much easier for nations to submit their differences to such a court, since they will be assured that the decision will not be a matter of mere compromise, but of justice.

The Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague has already proved its serviceableness in the cause of international understanding by settling thirteen cases between October 14, 1902, and May 6, 1913. We as Americans are proud to remember that the very first case considered by this court was one submitted by our own country and the United Mexican States. Since this dispute was settled, the United States has applied to this court twice: once in the North Atlantic Fisheries dispute with Great Britain, which was settled in 1910, and once again in the dispute over the claims of the "Orinoco" Company with Venezuela, settled amicably

## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

in the same year. Another case in which the United States was involved was concerning the right of preference claimed by blockading powers; a case made notable by the fact that all the countries in dispute, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Venezuela, Belgium, Spain, France, Mexico, Netherlands, Sweden, and Norway, committed themselves to the jurisdiction of The Hague Permanent Court. This set a precedent which augurs well for the future pacific settlement of international disputes. As James Brown Scott has said:

“Our own experience has shown us that differences of nationality are not insuperable difficulties; that the existence of states possessing local self-governments offers no serious impediment to the judicial settlement of controversies which would produce war between equal and sovereign nations; that a Supreme Court is necessary for the interpretation of an instrument to which the 46 states composing the American Union are parties, and we believe that an International Court, created by the 46 nations of the world recognizing and applying international law, is as necessary for the interpretation of international conventions and the settlement of judicial questions as a Supreme Court is to the 46 states composing the American Union. We believe, further, that this court can be created by the nations; that it will be created by the nations if and when they recognize the importance of its existence and the services it may render to international justice.”

## VII

But an adequate international law and an international court,— even these are not enough to secure world order at the present stage of the development of international relations. In our own local governments the existence of law and the decisions of courts are not enough to keep the peace. If John Smith wishes, he can openly defy

## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

both the law and the decision of the court. What do we then do with John Smith if he persists in thus disregarding these institutions for the securing of social order? There is only one thing left to do: we resort to force; we have him arrested, whether he likes it or not,— we have him confined if necessary. In other words, the law and the courts rely upon the force of a police to execute and make operative their decrees. Without that force, neither the law nor the court would be of any real value. So it is with an international law and an international court. There must be some way of compelling defiant nations to observe the world order. Now, just what this means of compulsion shall be is a question of no little debate. Many have thought that all that the international law and the international court will need is the sanction of the public opinion of each nation added to the sanction of that ever growing and powerful unit, international public opinion. No doubt public opinion is a most important factor in securing obedience to law. No doubt any law would be utterly useless unless public opinion were behind it demanding its enforcement. But while public opinion is thus absolutely necessary for the enforcement of law, it is certainly far from sufficient. There are people in this world who care nothing about public opinion, or who care so little for it that they are willing to defy it for the sake of gaining personal ends. These people must be dealt with by some more drastic power than mere public sentiment. If this is true with regard to individuals, it is still truer with regard to nations. Just as in the case of an individual, a nation may care very little for international public opinion if it happens to go counter to its own cherished aims and ambitions; and this defiance of public opinion on the part of a nation is sometimes reared to the glory of a

## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

supposedly just cause through the conception that an exalted patriotism demands it and that the nation's traditions and hopes, its integrity and honor call for self-assertion, even involving the defiance of the welfare of the world. Thus, even more than among individuals, the nations who league themselves together in terms of law and order must have some power absolutely conclusive to compel defiant members of their group to stand by the larger international loyalties whenever they are tempted to defy them. What shall this means of compulsion be? Some have suggested an efficient policy of "non-intercourse." Very probably this would be a sufficient compulsion. Many have thought that just as a unit of individuals has its police as the strong right arm of the law, so the unit of nations must have some sort of international police, an international army and navy if you please, to be the strong right arm of the world order. It seems quite probable that, as long as there are nations backward enough in their appreciation of their international obligations to defy international law and to rely upon force in the settlement of their disputes with the rest of the world, such an international police will be necessary. It is sometimes objected that the existence of such an international force would be the recognition of the very sort of thing that we are trying utterly to eliminate from international affairs,—namely, force as a means of settling international disputes; but there is as much difference between such an international army and navy, expressing international law and order, and a national army and navy, defying international law and order, as there is between the police of a local government, enforcing the decrees of local law, and the individual who runs amuck with a gun with no sanction save his own selfish impulse and desire. There is a place for

## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

force in the world, not as the coercer of the international conscience, but as the expression of the international conscience. Force as the expression of international reason is the deification of force; force as the coercer of international reason is the prostitution of force. The next stage in the world's history will be marked by the splendid transition to a civilization in which force becomes subservient to reason and law, rather than being the creator of opinion and law as in the past.

The efficiency of an international police depends, of course, upon the agreement of all the nations to do away with their individual armies and navies, except so far as they may need them for the purposes of internal order, as, for instance, the putting down of strikes, riots and local rebellions. *No nation can disarm alone: that would be impracticable and perhaps suicidal in the present stage of the world's history. No: the great powers must disarm together.* The absurd competition in armaments must end. Already the burden of taxation for the support of these armaments on the part of the masses of the people of all countries is becoming unbearable. Besides, this competition in armaments in the last resort results in an endless circle, utterly futile in the attainment of its real design. If one nation adds a unit of armament and another nation, because of this, adds two units, and then the first nation adds a third unit, which is the gainer by the process? Neither gains; but that is not the worst of it,—both lose to the extent of the enormous expense to which they have gone and to the extent of subtracting millions, perhaps billions of dollars from the legitimate constructive work of national upbuilding. How this disarmament is to be brought about is a detail which statesmen must solve at the earliest possible moment. It is quite possible

## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

that after this war European nations will have sufficiently learned the tragedy resulting from this needless competition in armaments to the extent of being more willing than ever to listen to some rational proposal which will look toward the entire reformation of the militaristic system now in vogue.

That there are many objections that might be raised to the efficiency of an international police is to be frankly recognized: but there are no objections that are insuperable. For instance, one objection is that such an international army and navy as is proposed will be made up of the fighting men of various individual countries and that these fighting men will, in case of stress, feel more patriotism to their particular countries than they will to the larger world interest. In other words, it is urged that it would be very difficult to get an international army with the proper *esprit de corps* and based upon an adequate world patriotism. If we were relying merely upon such an international army, this would, no doubt, be an unanswerable objection: but we are relying upon such an army plus a new international mind, a new international public opinion,—the very public opinion which will bring such an army into being; the public opinion which will have to be convinced before such an army even exists that the interests of individual nations cannot any longer be severed from world interests and that when national patriotism conflicts with world patriotism, national patriotism must revise itself for its own honor, for its own interests. With material disarmament must go that greater thing, moral disarmament. In fact, when the world order is once secured by its expression in a world law, a world court and a world police, such a police will have as little to do with the average nation as the police of a city has to do

## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

with the average individual. Just as the average man has no desire to defy the law and rarely, if ever, has any encounters with the force which backs it, so it will be very rare indeed for any nation, once the international mind expresses itself, to defy international law and call upon itself the overwhelming compulsion of an international police. Indeed, when the world has committed itself to such a system of law and order, even the world court will not have so many disputes brought to it as some people anticipate. The great majority of disputes will be settled by friendly means of a more intimate character: such as diplomacy and special commissions appointed to look into the facts in dispute and deliberate upon them in terms of fair play and common sense. There is rarely any question of a court of law and a resort to police on the part of friends. For one hundred years the United States has been at peace with Canada, despite the fact of a continuous boundary line of 3,840 miles, unprotected by armies or forts, except Fort Friendship, Fort Reason, Fort Co-operation, and Fort Justice,—the strongest forts in the world. Perhaps the most signal instance besides this of what international understanding may finally bring about is to be found symbolized in the monument erected upon a peak of the Andes by Chile and Argentina over ten years ago. Fifteen years ago these two countries were in imminent danger of going to war over a dispute with regard to the ownership of about eighty thousand square miles of territory. Through the efforts of broad-minded citizens of both countries the question was at last submitted to the arbitration of the King of England, who appointed an expert commission to examine the facts and to submit their decision. When the decision was rendered, both countries gladly accepted it and were so pleased



## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

with the outcome of this settlement of a difficult international question that they

“in June, 1903, concluded a treaty by the terms of which they pledged themselves for a period of five years to submit all controversies arising between them to arbitration, the first general arbitration treaty ever concluded. In a further treaty they agreed to reduce their armies to the proportions of police forces, to stop the building of the great battleships then under construction, and to diminish the naval armaments which they already possessed.

The provisions of these treaties which have now been in force nearly two years, were carried out as fast as practicable. The land forces have been reduced, the heavy ordnance taken off the war vessels, and several of the vessels of the marine turned over to the commercial fleets. Work on the four great warships was immediately arrested, and some of them have been sold. One or two of them, unfortunately, went into the Japanese fleet off Port Arthur, in spite of the fact that both governments had, in the treaty, pledged themselves not to sell any ships to nations engaged in war. The vessels were bought under disguise by a firm in New York, and then turned over to Japan; after which neither of the governments would sell any vessels to either Russia or Japan.

The results of this disarmament — for it is a real disarmament — have been most remarkable. With the money saved by the lessening of military and naval expenses, internal and coast improvements have been made. Good roads have been constructed. Chile has turned an arsenal into a school for manual training. She is building a much needed breakwater in the harbor of Valparaiso, and has commenced systematically the improvement of her commercial facilities along the coast. One or two of Argentina's previous war vessels have gone into her commercial fleet and are now plying back and forth across the Atlantic in honorable and lucrative business. The great trans-Andean railway through the heart of the mountains, which will bring Buenos Ayres and Santiago within eighteen hours of each other and

## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

bind them together in the most intimate relations of trade and travel, will be completed this year.

But more significant than any of these material results has been the change in the attitude of the Argentines and Chileans toward each other. All the old bitterness and distrust have passed away, and the most cordial good feeling and confidence have taken their place.

The suggestion of Bishop Benavente as to the erection of a statue of Christ at Puente del Inca was quickly carried into execution. As early as 1901, on the initiative of Senora de Costa, president of the Christian Mothers' Association of Buenos Ayres, one of the largest women's organizations in the world, the women of Buenos Ayres, who had already manifested the deepest interest in the new movement, undertook the task of securing funds and having a statue created. The work was entrusted to the young Argentine sculptor, Mateo Alonso. When his design was completed and accepted, the statue was cast at the arsenal of Buenos Ayres from old cannon taken from the ancient fortress outside of the city. . . .

The base of the statue is in granite. On this is a granite sphere, weighing some fourteen tons, on which the outlines of the world are sketched, resting upon a granite column twenty-two feet high. The figure of Christ above, in bronze, is twenty-six feet in height. The cross supported in his left hand is five feet higher. The right hand is stretched out in blessing. On the granite base are two bronze tablets, one of them given by the Workingmen's Union of Buenos Ayres, the other by the Working Women. One of them gives the record of the creation and erection of the statue; on the other are inscribed the words:

'Sooner shall these mountains crumble into dust than Argentines and Chileans break the peace to which they have pledged themselves at the feet of Christ the Redeemer.'

## VIII

These are the great fundamental things which civilization must accomplish before the international order is

## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

established and war is forever abandoned in favor of reason as a method of settling the world's problems. All these will be made possible by the average man and woman, by whom that large public opinion is molded through which the international mind comes into existence. We have depicted the ideal, and the ideal must be thoroughly understood and kept in mind always in all efforts which are being made for the attainment of the ultimate peace of the world. But there are more immediate things which the average man and woman must keep in mind; humbler, more every day duties which must not be neglected. The trouble with most people is that they content themselves with the larger dream, trusting that it will be attained somehow, somewhere, without realizing that they, themselves, are individually responsible for the attainment of the dream. What can the average man and woman do here and now to hasten the realization of the world order for which enlightened minds have struggled so long?

First of all, we can read the great literature which has appeared during the last few years with regard to the problems of international relations and become thoroughly conversant with it, so that it becomes part and parcel of our everyday consciousness. In terms of this reading, we can think constructively and contribute our own individual thought, however meager, however unimportant, to the great mass of thought through whose utterance public opinion is molded and the world's progress is directed. Second, we can converse with all with whom we come in contact on this great topic and thus spread our influence by imperceptible degrees to an extent which we can never individually calculate. At first sight, talk seems cheap; and yet, if we but realize it, the great reforms of history have been accomplished

## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

more by the conversation of enlightened minds than by any other agency. In ancient Athens, who was it that exerted the greatest influence upon the Athenian State? Socrates. And yet Socrates never wrote a word, so far as we know. He made his profound influence upon history through conversation: through the incessant utterance of his ideas to individuals in small groups in the home and in the market-place,— anywhere where he could get anyone to hear him. Thus it is that in America the great formative influence in molding the progress of the American people is the discussion of American citizens one with another with regard to the great issues of the day.

Then there are our clubs. There is hardly one of us who does not belong to one or more clubs or lodges. At this stage in the history of the world such associations of people should not forget their responsibility in promulgating, so far as they can through their collective influence, the greater ideals of international welfare which are everywhere current. For instance, no literary club should plan its year's program without including prominent consideration of the great world problems which have been suggested by the present European war. Speakers on such topics are available; or if these cannot be secured, there are the great classics on international relations, on which some member of the club may write a paper or lead a discussion, and concerning which the whole club may contribute their thought. Then there are our churches, which have sometimes been all too backward in considering the practical considerations which have to do with the ushering in of that kingdom of peace which was the vision of the Nazarene and for which He lived and died. Nor must we rely merely upon organizations already in existence. New organiza-

## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

tions for the promotion of international understanding and co-operation should be effected. For instance, reading circles, whose one purpose should be to become better acquainted with the international vision, should be organized in every city and town of the United States. Furthermore, no human being who earnestly cares at all about the realization of a world at peace should hesitate a moment in allying himself with at least one of the great peace organizations which at the present time are doing so much to spread the gospel of international co-operation among the peoples of the world. For instance, the American Peace Society has a branch in nearly every state of the Union. Every citizen of the United States, in so far as he is sincere in his desire for the promotion of world peace, should belong to his own state branch of the American Peace Society, for it is only by such universal co-operation that we can expect the ideal of international unity to be speedily realized.

Again the average person can do very much to remove misunderstandings with regard to what the peace movement really means. Those who do not understand it are very prone to suppose that the peace movement is a matter of sentiment merely. The mass of the public should be speedily taught that back of the peace movement are some of the most practical minds in the world, including those of eminent statesmen, efficient business men, and practical scientists. *The peace movement should not be confused with non-resistance.* Very few peace advocates have ever been so unwise as to insist that any nation should practice such an impossible doctrine. Sometimes the impression has gone abroad that all the peace movement means is disarmament of this nation or that. The average man

## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

or woman who believes in international co-operation ought to help to remove this impression and make people understand that *no great peace advocate is urging that the United States, for instance, shall disarm before the other nations disarm.* Certainly internationalists agree that there should be *universal* disarmament; but they also agree that *no nation can disarm first,—that all nations must disarm together.* We are idealists; but we must impress the world with the practicability of our ideals, and especially with the practicability of the immediate means which we advocate for the attainment of them.

Perhaps the greatest thing that can be done in bringing about an era of international reason is the education of the young in the public schools. The young boy and girl should be taught how much the culture, the civilization of every nation owes to the culture, the civilization of every other nation of the world, so that he shall not feel that the peoples of other nations are really aliens, but shall realize that to his own country's upbuilding have been contributed thoughts and deeds from those whom he is accustomed to call "foreigners." American history is rich in opportunities for this sort of teaching. We sometimes speak of America as being the melting pot of the various races of the earth; but it is also the melting pot of all the various cultures of all times and of all peoples. Once a people appreciates what it owes to another people in great ideas, it will be very reluctant to start on a killing expedition against those to whom it owes such genuine obligations.

One of the most encouraging aspects of the American public schools is the fact that their pupils are made up of the children of all races and of all nations. Slav, Teuton, Anglo-Saxon, Latin study side by side and

## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

learn to ignore racial and national differences in the daily experience of the possession of a common humanity. After all, children are alike the world over. They like the same games. They laugh at the same things. They have the same ambitions, the same sorrows, the same tragedies and the same comedies in their everyday lives. Sharing these as they do in the schoolroom and on the playground, they tend to understand each other better. This understanding is precisely of the sort which the nations of the world need, and which our heterogeneous pupils working together with a common end well exemplify.

There is an insistent movement on foot for the teaching of citizenship in the schools. Those who are interested in this movement are not satisfied with teaching a pupil merely the rights and obligations of citizenship in our own country, but desire to impress upon the growing mind the duties and obligations of citizenship in the World State. Thus it is, a new sort of patriotism is capable of being developed in the minds of the young; a patriotism to humanity at large, regardless of national boundary; a patriotism which will by no means lessen the patriotism which one owes to his own country, but which will be a part of that patriotism, and which will thus transform the flag into a symbol of not merely national glory, but of international honor.

All that has been said easily makes it apparent that the attainment of international peace depends more upon a right attitude of mind than upon anything else. Friendship, whether personal or international, is much more a matter of right attitudes than of logic expressed in all sorts of social safeguards and machinery. Stress has been laid so far upon what might be called "the international mind" as part of the attitude men need to acquire, but one might also emphasize as equally indis-

## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

pensable "the prospective mind": the mind that not merely looks about and includes all existent beings in its interests, but looks forward and views the human race in terms of a never ending progress, which is capable of infinite possibilities. Civilization is not static: it is intensely dynamic. Human nature is not static: it is capable of boundless change and improvement. It is needful for us to realize this last fact, because there are so many people who keep telling us that it is human nature to go to war; that it always has been human nature; and that it always will be human nature. If there is any argument that is feeblest, it is this. There is nothing in this world that can be said to belong to a permanent human nature, except the quality of not being permanent at all. There is nothing so changeable as human nature; and that is the glory of it. It is that which makes man divine in his ideals and possibilities. As a matter of fact, men have not always warred; in truth, war has been the exception, and great minds, as well as the minds of the common people, have always looked forward to a time when some reasonable method would be devised which would make war forever impossible. In the journal, *La Revue*, of February 15, 1909, a writer by the name of B. Beau wrote a very good satire on the traditional defense of war as being a necessity of an unchanging human nature. He entitled his article "A Defense of Cannibalism." It is supposed to be a speech of a medicine man addressed to his tribe in answer to anti-cannibalistic propaganda that a Christian missionary was making among them. The argument has been reprinted as a document of the American Association for International Conciliation. There is no space here to reproduce the argument in detail. The following short extract, however, will at once remind one of the sorts



of things that some people say in defending the war system. Says the medicine man:

"A stranger has come among us to teach us a new religion. There are among the doctrines which he preaches a great many things which are indifferent to us, but there are also some very dangerous for the tribe. He declares, for example, that cannibalism ought to disappear from the earth and that it is necessary to renounce our custom of eating human flesh.

There have been in all ages individuals to whose stomach this aliment was repugnant. But this is a rare physiological idiosyncrasy. Even those who suffered from it regarded it as an infirmity. This is the first time that an attempt has been made to make a dogma of this pathological distaste.

The propaganda of this stranger might prove fatal. At the last public feast where ten prisoners were immolated, three of our warriors have refused to touch the flesh. That is why I have resolved to demonstrate to you that this doctrine is absurd and that those who permit themselves to be seduced by it will be traitors to their tribe.

In all ages, as far back as the memory of the oldest men can reach, enemies killed in battle have been eaten and prisoners have been fattened into proper condition for killing. When a custom is so ancient it is not dependent upon the will of men. It is not an accident of their history, but a law of their nature, instituted by the gods themselves. Hearts too tender may deplore it, but against natural fatalities it is vain and puerile to wish to fight. . . .

Repudiate then, Oyampis, these new ideas. Anti-cannibalism is a doctrine essentially chimerical. Men have always eaten one another; they will continue to do so in the future as they have in the past. And the best way to avoid being eaten ourselves is to enfeeble neighboring tribes as often as possible by liberal bloodletting."

\* \* \* \*

"When the medicine man had finished, the warriors

## A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

shouted their approval. The missionary, on account of this reaction in favor of the ideas he had combatted, feared that he might be made to contribute to a feast of reconciliation, so he took flight. It was to his prudence doubtless that we owe the advantage of having read the argument of the cannibal.

Besides, could he have made a decisive reply?

Nevertheless, the Caribs themselves no longer eat one another."

The application of this parody upon the usual argument for war is obvious. There is no human ideal which vitally involves the welfare and improvement of the human race that cannot be achieved if we will it. As Browning puts it:

"All we have willed or hoped or dreamed of good shall  
exist. . . .

The high that proved too high, the heroic for earth too  
hard,

The passion that left the ground to lose itself in the  
sky,

Are music sent up to God by the lover and the bard;

Enough that he heard it once: we shall hear it by and  
by."

## IX

This, then, is the program of the new internationalism, in its broad outlines. These are the things that men and women must keep in mind constantly as ideals to attain and things to do. But the ideals must become living ideals, and the deeds must become earnest and effective deeds, or our dreams are naught. From what has been said it is easily apparent that this is no isolated movement, but that it involves the co-operation of all those manifold forces which belong to the sure progress of mankind toward the achievement of the hopes and struggles of the ages.



PAMPHLET SERIES  
ON  
THE NEW INTERNATIONALISM

BY JAY WILLIAM HUDSON

PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI  
DIRECTOR EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, MASSACHUSETTS PEACE SOCIETY

*Published by the Massachusetts Peace Society*

- 
1. WHAT IS THE NEW INTERNATIONALISM?
  2. THE ARITHMETIC OF WAR
  3. AGENCIES FOR PROMOTING WORLD ORDER
  4. A PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM
  5. AMERICA'S INTERNATIONAL IDEALS
- 

These pamphlets have been prepared especially for those who wish a comprehensive statement in simple language of what the International Peace Movement of to-day means. They are particularly adapted for Reading Circles.

*Single copies, five cents. Price in quantities on application*

THE MASSACHUSETTS PEACE SOCIETY  
31 BEACON STREET, BOSTON