


ASIA

THE FIGHT for PEACE



SIDNEY L. GULICK



Cornell University Library

Ithaca, New York

**CHARLES WILLIAM WASON
COLLECTION
CHINA AND THE CHINESE**

THE GIFT OF
CHARLES WILLIAM WASON
CLASS OF 1876
1918

Cornell University Library
JX 1953.G97

The fight for peace:an aggressive campai



3 1924 023 568 789

ech



Cornell University Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

The Fight for Peace

The Fight for Peace

*AN AGGRESSIVE CAMPAIGN
FOR AMERICAN CHURCHES*

By

SIDNEY L. GULICK, D.D.

*Associate Secretary of the Commission on Peace and
Arbitration; Representative of the Commission
on Relations with Japan; of the Federal
Council of the Churches of Christ
in America*



NEW YORK

CHICAGO

TORONTO

Fleming H. Revell Company

LONDON

AND

EDINBURGH

Copyright, 1915, by
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

Wason
IX 1953
G 77

“The Fight for Peace,” by Rev. Sidney L. Gulick, is published for the Commission on Peace and Arbitration, under the authority of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

CHARLES S. MACFARLAND,
General Secretary.

W 2234

New York: 158 Fifth Avenue
Chicago: 125 North Wabash Ave.
Toronto: 25 Richmond Street, W.
London: 21 Paternoster Square
Edinburgh: 100 Princes Street

FIRST VISION

Again the devil taketh him unto an exceeding high mountain and showeth him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them; and he said unto him, 'All these things will I give thee, *if thou wilt fall down and worship me.*'

VISION OF WORLD EMPIRE

Result

Selfishness Ambition Aggression
Pride Arrogance Disdain Scorn Self-Conceit
Animosity Enmity Hatred Rage Lust
Unfriendliness
Insincerity Deceit Trickery Treachery Suspicious
Spies Lies
Brutalities Murders Wars Destructions
Pillage Carnage Rape
Atrocities Agonies
Cripples Widows Orphans Refugees
Poverty Famine Disease
Victories Oppressions Injustice Luxury Degeneracy
Defeats Humiliation Despair Shame
Suicides
Resentments Revenge
Plottings Rebellions
Recurring ad Infinitum

HELL ON EARTH

SECOND VISION

And I saw a new heaven and a new earth.

Behold a King shall reign in righteousness; and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and might, of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord. With righteousness shall he judge the poor. Righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins and faithfulness the girdle of his reins. The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea.

Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness and all these things shall be added unto you.

VISION OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD

Result

Justice Righteousness
Good-will Sympathy Helpfulness
Brotherliness Unselfishness
Sincerity Frankness Trustworthiness
Trust Confidence
Teachableness Dependableness
Appreciation Approval Friendship Love
Honesty Truthfulness Integrity
Civilization Communication
Travel Trade Commerce
Prosperity Abundance Comfort Wealth Health
Coöperation Organization Credit
Science Understanding Mastery
Education Literature
Sculpture Painting Music
Philosophy Religion Insight
Uplift Happiness Peace Harmony Joy Hope
Progress ad Infinitum

HEAVEN ON EARTH

Foreword

CHRISTENDOM at war! Is it possible to reconcile with Christian ideals "rivers of blood and mountains of bones," to use a Japanese expression? These, however, are a small part of the tragedy. Consider the passionate hatreds of nations and their mutual denunciations, revengeful atrocities, wanton destructions, and outrageous falsehoods. How awful the poverty, the sorrow and the suffering of widows and children and cripples unnumbered in every land! These survive for years and decades after the carnage is over.

What, one naturally asks, have Christians of Europe been doing, or what have they failed to do, to bring upon themselves this scourge? Are the real causes of Europe's tragedy those usually assigned, or are there other and deeper reasons? What is the responsibility of churches in this matter? And what now is their duty?

What, moreover, shall we think of programs of economists and juridical pacifists? And what about the counter proposals of military pacifists? To what extent are any of these programs really practicable? Is not the Golden Rule the only effective peace program? Such are the questions that are to engage our attention.

The central contention of this volume is that Christianity is not bankrupt, as many allege. In its fullness Christianity has not yet been tried. In international relations it cannot be pronounced a failure, for it has never been adequately tested. Selfish greed begets its kind. So also does love evoke love. And this is true in international as well as in individual group and class relations. Whenever the Golden Rule has been

seriously tried it has been found thoroughly effective in securing good-will.

The discussions of this volume fall into three parts. The first section is a descriptive and analytic study of the significant features of the modern world and the Church as bearing upon world-militarism and world-peace. Part Two deals with the fundamental factors of world-peace, namely, the Christian vision and the Christian motive, the needed organization of the Church and the effective education of the youth of the nation. Part Three suggests a constructive program for evoking the good-will of other nations toward the United States and their confidence in us.

The details of this program have been presented with considerable minuteness. They are, however, to be regarded as illustrations of the main thesis rather than as items to be rigidly carried out. They are suggestions of possible methods of action rather than an inflexible program.

The first impression that many will doubtless receive on reading this third section will be that its call for vast benevolent enterprises is chimerical and utterly impracticable, for it assumes the existence in the churches of a transformed human nature that is not there. Even Christians are not ready to undertake such altruistic activities, much less the nation as a whole.

Yes, critics who believe in the god of things as they are are quite right. The program is chimerical. But so is the Golden Rule, and so are all the beatitudes and the commands of Jesus. Christ's whole life was chimerical and visionary, based on an impracticable insistence on the superior power of goodness, truth and love. And did not the cross prove the folly of goodness and the impotence of love? The program here suggested is in truth as impracticable and chimerical as the idealism that inspired the life of Jesus—and *no more*. It believes that God is love and that love will rule. It will rule, however, only as followers of Jesus catch His spirit, share His faith, and are ready to suffer with Him in the redemption of the world, transforming it from what it is into what it ought to be.

This program believes in the God of things as they ought to be and will be. It allies itself with the better future, not with the vanishing past.

Moreover, who knows how much transformed human nature there is in the Church to-day, and even in the world? Is not the tragedy in Europe teaching us all profound lessons, transforming our thoughts, changing our innermost feelings? The regeneration of human nature sometimes requires long periods of time and again it takes place with miraculous suddenness. How far and how deeply the inner nature of a man or of a nation is changed by even a brief experience can be known only by subsequent years of life. Conduct reveals.

What is now needed is a channel for expression and an organism for enacting into fact the fresh insight and inspiration of this great and terrible experience. Then we can see whether or not the vision of Golden Rule Diplomacy is chimerical and impracticable. When enough Americans have faith in the vision to put it into practice it will no longer be impracticable and chimerical. If it is impracticable it is not because such a program will fail to secure the promised results, but only because we have not the requisite spirit and faith.

This, however, is beyond dispute—Golden Rule Internationalism is the only practicable method for establishing world-peace. Whoever is in earnest for world-peace can gain his end only as he exalts and makes universal the rule of the Golden Rule.

S. L. G.

New York.

A Prayer for Peace

O Lord, since first the blood of Abel cried to thee from the ground that drank it, this earth of thine has been defiled with the blood of man shed by his brother's hand, and the centuries sob with the ceaseless horror of war. Ever the pride of kings and the covetousness of the strong have driven peaceful nations to slaughter. Ever the songs of the past and the pomp of armies have been used to inflame the passions of the people. Our spirit cries out to thee in revolt against it, and we know that our righteous anger is answered by thy holy wrath.

Break thou the spell of the enchantments that make the nations drunk with the lust of battle and draw them on as willing tools of death. Grant us a quiet and steadfast mind when our own nation clamors for vengeance or aggression. Strengthen our sense of justice and our regard for the equal worth of other peoples and races. Grant to the rulers of nations faith in the possibility of peace through justice and grant to the common people a new and stern enthusiasm for the cause of peace. Bless our soldiers and sailors for their swift obedience and their willingness to answer to the call of duty, but inspire them none the less with a hatred of war, and may they never for love of private glory or advancement provoke its coming. May our young men still rejoice to die for their country with the valor of their fathers, but teach our age nobler methods of matching our strength and more effective ways of giving our life for the flag.

O thou strong Father of all nations, draw all thy great family together with an increasing sense of our common blood and destiny, that peace may come on earth at last, and thy sun may shed its light rejoicing on a holy brotherhood of peoples.

WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH.

Contents

PART ONE

THE MODERN WORLD AND THE CHURCH AS BEARING UPON WORLD-MILITARISM AND WORLD-PEACE

- | | | |
|------|---|----|
| I. | A NEW ERA IN HUMAN HISTORY | 15 |
| II. | REAL CAUSES OF EUROPE'S TRAGEDY | 22 |
| III. | THE PEACE MOVEMENT | 30 |
| IV. | THE IDEALS AND THE PRACTICE OF THE CHURCHES
IN REGARD TO INTERNATIONAL PEACE | 44 |

PART TWO

VISION—ORGANIZATION—EDUCATION

- | | | |
|------|---|----|
| V. | VISION OF CHRIST'S CHARACTER AND HIS GOSPEL . | 57 |
| VI. | AN ADEQUATE ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCHES . | 61 |
| VII. | PEACE EDUCATION AMONG THE YOUNG | 75 |

PART THREE

A CONSTRUCTIVE PEACE PROGRAM

- | | | |
|-------|--|----|
| VIII. | FRIENDLY TREATMENT BY A NATION LARGE AND
STRONG OF A PEOPLE SMALL AND DEFENSELESS
POSSESSING VAST NATURAL RESOURCES: THE
UNITED STATES AND MEXICO | 81 |
| IX. | FRIENDLY TREATMENT BY A POWERFUL WESTERN
NATION OF A PEACEFUL EASTERN PEOPLE: THE
UNITED STATES AND CHINA | 87 |

X.	FRIENDLY TREATMENT BY A POWERFUL WESTERN NATION OF A POWERFUL EASTERN PEOPLE: THE UNITED STATES AND JAPAN	111
XI.	PRINCIPLES OF RACE ASSIMILATION AS BEARING UPON ASIATIC IMMIGRATION	129
XII.	A NEW POLICY FOR THE ADMISSION, TREATMENT, ASSIMILATION, AND NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS	133
XIII.	THE CHURCHES AND THE SENSATIONAL PRESS	152
XIV.	THE CHURCHES AND THE NATIONAL POLICY OF INTERNATIONAL GOOD-WILL	163
XV.	THE CHURCHES, INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, AND FOREIGN MISSIONS	168
XVI.	THE CHURCHES AND DISARMAMENT	174
XVII.	INTERNATIONAL CHURCH COÖPERATION FOR WORLD-PEACE	185
XVIII.	THE NEW CRUSADE	189

PART ONE

The Modern World and the Church as Bearing Upon World-Militarism and World-Peace

American Christians are widely asking what they must do to help establish world-peace. To formulate an effective peace program Christians must face the actual facts of the modern world. These four chapters in Part I seek to present those outstanding features of our life that throw light on the fact of world-militarism and the problem of world-peace.

We must see first of all that mankind as a whole has entered upon a new era of human history. In the briefest terms we sketch its salient characteristics.

We need also to grasp the real causes of Europe's tragedy, distinguishing them from superficial conditions and accidental events.

The Peace Movement, moreover, needs to be appraised.

And finally we must seriously consider what part the churches have taken or failed to take in promoting world-peace.

I

A NEW ERA IN HUMAN HISTORY

THOUGH we ourselves enjoy the advantages of modern civilization and marvel at its countless wonders, we little appreciate its full meaning. We fail to see the multiform consequences of our discoveries and inventions. Our social and national life and our international relations have been tremendously modified. The new conditions are so new, the changes are so vast, and we ourselves are so immersed in them that their larger results escape attention. Let us analyze them briefly.

1. Mastery of Nature's Titanic Forces.—We have become giants. Our deeds are becoming gigantic. The air and the sea have both been invaded, if not yet conquered. Infinite energy has been pressed into service. It has been directed, not only to perform man's work, but also to carry his thoughts through trackless space. Transportation and communication by land and sea have made more progress in the past century than in all preceding human history. The mysteries of matter have been unlocked; vast forces stored up in the chemical constitution of matter have come under man's control; unheard of substances are being made of undreamed utility. All these inventions, acquisitions and powers can be used by individuals and nations in the promotion, not only of human welfare, but also of selfishness and destruction. And in proportion to the good they are capable of producing are the possibilities of evil through their prostitution. The titanic and destructive character of the European conflict is due to the prostitution of modern inventions and discoveries.

2. The Collapse of Space.—Man's mastery of nature

has practically abolished terrestrial space. Not only have rivers, oceans and mountains vanished as barriers to human intercourse, but space itself has been crumpled up. Oceans no longer separate; they connect. Trade and travel encompass the globe. We accomplish in a few days, or even hours, what our forefathers often needed weeks or months to do. And as for communication, the marvels of telegraphy and of wireless have made the entire inhabited globe more accessible to-day than a single province was to Napoleon.

Now these two features of our new era have introduced into modern life, and therefore into warfare, factors of enormous significance. Nations and races long isolated are now face to face. Not only do the nations of Europe confront each other with amazing proximity, but Asia and Africa are at Europe's front door, and the white man is invading every land. Modern civilization makes possible, on the one hand, incalculable destruction; and on the other, the assembling, organizing, arming, feeding, and handling of enormous armies. Never in history has it been possible for even the greatest military genius to do what every nation in Europe is now doing. The character of warfare itself, moreover, has undergone significant changes. It has lost practically all of those features that made the older warfare more or less ennobling.

3. Increasing Wealth.—All ancient civilizations lived on the ragged edge of famine. They produced barely enough for the actual needs of the people. Practically the entire population of each land was engaged in raising and distributing food. Modern science and machinery, however, enable a small minority to raise, manufacture and distribute food, clothing, tools for vast nations. Famine is banished from civilized lands. The toil of the majority accordingly is now turned to the further development of the instruments and the wealth of civilization. These have been accumulating at a fabulous rate. Among the baleful results of this accumulation is the development of the spirit and power of materialism with its ominous consequences.

4. **Growth of Population.**—Ancient civilizations, no less than savage lands, were ever subject to decimating disease. Epidemics and warfare swept off the people, kept down the population. Modern civilization, by its discovery of specific remedies for many diseases, by its surgery, hygiene and care of children, and by its extended areas of good government and freedom from devastating internecine war has removed the ancient check on growing population. Christendom accordingly has grown during the past century at a new rate and far out of proportion to other lands.

Increasing wealth and population have also a potent bearing on warfare. Never before has it been possible to remove from productive industry such a proportion of men in the prime of life and still provide food and clothing, houses and armaments for army and people. It is civilization, therefore, that makes possible colossal standing armies.

Modern civilization, moreover, has developed the instruments of war to such a degree of intricacy that only prolonged specialized training can give proficiency. Standing armies, therefore, have become not only possible, but necessary, in order that men may acquire the needed skill.

The wealth of civilization still further makes possible the manufacture of enormously expensive weapons for both army and navy, and provides the ammunition, not only for actual warfare, but also for preliminary practice.

5. **Developed National and Racial Self-Consciousness.**—The close connection between machinery and education, resulting in general intelligence, is well recognized. But this makes possible a unification of national and race self-consciousness never before attainable. In a land equipped with telegraphic service and newspapers, where every adult reads the daily paper, the entire nation thinks the same thoughts at the same time, and develops a unity of thought and emotion, and thus a power for national action, unparalleled in ancient times. It is easier for America, with its four million square miles and a hundred million people, to know the latest

news and to act as a unit than it was for Attica with its fifteen hundred square miles and a population of one hundred thousand or less.

This principle of national unity and national self-consciousness, moreover, applies to every race and people affected by modern civilization. Greece, Turkey, Servia, Bulgaria, Japan, India, and China are all rapidly sweeping into the circle of the nations adopting the tools of modern civilization, and are experiencing the consequent changes, subjective as well as objective.

Never before in history were there so many strongly self-conscious, ambitious, national, and racial units. And never was any ancient or mediæval people so completely unified, organized and centralized as are all modern nations.

6. Recovery of Submerged Peoples.—The factors that have made the great nations greater and stronger with every passing decade have also been promoting fresh life among peoples overwhelmed in the turmoils of past race conflicts. Rising intelligence, wealth, unity, ambition are characteristics of every race group, especially in Christendom. Long submerged and relatively silent peoples are taking on new life and demanding new rights and privileges. Old supremacies are accordingly disputed. Those in power, however, resent all efforts of subject races to secure autonomy. No more significant feature characterizes modern politics than the rise of democracy in many lands.

7. The Latest Factor—Asia.—The awakening of Asia is the most important event characterizing the new era of human history. First Japan entered the current of modern civilization, and now China follows her lead. Christendom can no longer ignore Asia, even as Asia has found that she cannot ignore Christendom. What happens in other lands and continents is of vital significance to Europeans. Their long asserted and unquestioned world supremacy is soon to be contested. Will they seek to maintain it by military might or by righteous dealing? The problem of world-peace, accord-

ingly, is not one that depends alone on the relations of the nations of Christendom to one another; it includes as well all the nations of every land. The Asiatic factor in world-peace has long been ignored, but can be ignored no longer.

8. World-Unification and World-Empire.—In consequence of the factors already noticed, the interlinking of the life of the world has been advancing with giant strides. Each nation is being bound to all by innumerable cords of common interest and growing resemblance. Universal education in the sciences, history and philosophy is producing an international mind. Commerce is binding the whole world together with chains of gold. Postal communication, cables and wireless, with the daily press, carry the world's news to every hamlet of every land that has introduced these devices of modern man. Denominational, religious, race, and civilizational differences are breaking down. Common comforts and luxuries, common ideals and efforts are arising. The "International Mind" is cosmopolitan; it is not confined to America and Europe. Food and manufactured products are transported more easily ten thousand miles now than they were one hundred miles a hundred years ago. The result is not only a common luxury of life for even the poor to-day which Croesus could not purchase nor Alexander the Great command, but also a vast amount of common experience, producing common reactions and common ambitions and motives. The differences of nations and races and civilizations are giving way with almost cataclysmal speed. A common international life and a world-unity have been rapidly developing.

But in contrast to this fact of the marvelous and increasing world solidarity is the opposite fact of the effort of nations and races to maintain complete independence. Each political unit seeks to be sufficient unto itself. Hence, strong growing nations proclaim their need of colonies as sources of food supply, as fields for commercial exploitation and expansion, and as outlets for excessive population. Without colonies a country feels itself so dependent on others that its own independence is

impaired and autonomy threatened. National ambitions long for world-empires.

9. An Overwhelming Anachronism— Militarism.— In the modern world-situation, however, nothing probably is more amazing than the extraordinary development of militarism, which finds expression in the military and naval equipments of the leading powers of Christendom. For years rivalry in armaments has been a conspicuous feature in the life of each nation. The latest achievements of scientific discovery and invention have been immediately pressed into the service of militarism. The peace footing for 1913 of the armies of the six nations involved in the Triple Alliance (Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy) and the Triple Entente (Russia, France and England) was 5,000,000 soldiers, while their war footing was 13,000,000. The cost of these war preparations is stated as \$40,000,000,000 in the last twenty-five years. The total expenditures for a single year (1912 or 1913) of thirty-one nations for their armies and navies is reported as having been \$2,324,067,000. The total wealth of the warring countries is placed as \$270,000,000,000 in 1913.¹ Such withdrawals of men and money from productive industry are possible only because of modern civilization. Yet the method of settling international and interracial difficulties by battle is that of the most primitive barbarism. Vast military preparations signify the survival, in the midst of modern civilization, of ominous features of savagery and indicate how incomplete is our boasted civilization. For civilization is the triumph of reason over force. Militarism makes

¹ A computation of the cost of the wars of the nineteenth century gives the following results:—Total number of men slain in battle or who died from wounds or disease 14,000,000.

Cost in cash	\$40,000,000,000.
Value of property destroyed	40,000,000,000.
Interest paid on war debts	30,000,000,000.
Economic loss of men killed	100,000,000,000.
Debts of the nations (1900)	35,000,000,000.
Total	<u>\$245,000,000,000.</u>

force triumph regardless of reason. Militarism in Christendom is the survival of heathenism. It is the expression neither of Christianity nor of civilization, although through abuse it uses both in attaining its ends. Militarism is the great anachronism in the civilization of Christendom.

10. The Approaching Victory of Reason and Religion.—The tragedy of Europe marks the ending of the old order and the beginning of the new. The complete opposition of civilization and religion to militarism is becoming clear. Militarism has indeed drawn rich nourishment and strength from civilization and patriotism and religion. But these mighty movements begin at last to see how venomous is the militaristic viper they have nourished in their bosom. Its true character is now being revealed. True civilization, true patriotism and true religion demand the annihilation of militarism. How this is to be accomplished is the pressing question.

Yet in our just condemnation of militarism, let us not overlook the place it has held in the evolution of man. Many of his noble characteristics have been developed through warfare. Under the protection afforded in part by militarism, tribal, national, and at last international life has slowly and imperceptibly arisen. A world-mind, a world-civilization and a world-conscience have been silently forming. Through the tragedy of Europe these world-interests, responsibilities, duties, and demands are coming to self-consciousness. They seek expression and by expression more complete existence.

This means, however, the ending of the militaristic ideal and order of society; it involves the complete establishment of goodness, truth, reason in all man's social relations, local and universal.

The tragedy of Europe will not have been in vain, the sacrifice of life and treasure will not have been too great, if thereby the New Era is born in which love and reason rule among the nations.

II

REAL CAUSES OF EUROPE'S TRAGEDY

EUROPE'S tragedy is the product of an enormously complex situation. Only those behind the scenes in Berlin, Vienna, St. Petersburg, Paris, London, and the lesser capitals of Europe have the knowledge needed for a complete statement of the motives and manœuvres that have plunged Christendom into strife. Nevertheless, even without such detailed knowledge, it is not impossible, nor even difficult, to understand the main features of the situation. In truth, knowledge of too much detail may obscure the vision. In the following discussion details are purposely avoided that we may the more clearly fix attention on really controlling factors.

Europe's tragedy is due, not to conditions but to active causes. To discover a practical method for abolishing war, we must understand these active causes no less than the general conditions of the modern world.

How far the European war was demanded by the peoples, and how far it is a war of dynasties and bureaucracies may be impossible to distinguish. An honest and informed plebiscite of all Europe would probably have placed each nation in clear opposition to war. However that may be, it is significant that the official representative of each government now at war repeatedly declared that he desired peace and was working for it to his utmost. Each accuses others of having been the real aggressors. But though they professed to desire and seek for peace, they helplessly drifted—nay, rushed into war. How was this possible? Were they hypocrites and liars, one and all? That is highly improbable. The simple fact is that by the end

of July, 1914, so many forces were at work that war was practically inevitable.

Those who kept in touch with the actions, and especially with the feelings of the nations in recent years, have been certain that a tremendous European war was bound to come sooner or later.

What, then, should we regard as the real causes of Europe's war? Who is responsible? On what nation or nations is the blame to be laid? Germany accuses England, Russia and France, individually and collectively. These countries, on the contrary, lay all the blame on Germany and Austria-Hungary. The effort, however, to lay all responsibility on a single nation or group is useless and fruitless. Much less is any individual the sole culprit. Many think to fix the responsibility by citing the evidence of the White Books of England, Germany and France, and the Orange Book of Russia. What these books show, however, is only the final manoeuvring of the various diplomats for material advantage and moral prestige. Moreover, it is by no means certain that these books disclose all the pertinent facts. Indeed, there seem to be reasons for holding that important communications have been withheld, whose publication might require considerable modification of present approvals or condemnations.

The real causes of the war and the responsibility for the same are not to be decided by observing only the actions of diplomats and war lords the last week or month before the attacks on Belgrade and Liège. When scores of men smoke cigarettes in a powder factory, the explosives of which they are all manufacturing, no one can charge exclusive blame on the individual who drops the fatal match. *All are responsible.* And that I take it has been the situation in Europe, and even throughout the world.

The *real cause of Europe's tragedy* has been the ambitions of races, dynasties, nations, and military, capitalistic and bureaucratic cliques. Each has been ruled by plans for selfish advantage; each has sought prosperity regardless of the

prosperity of other nations. Each has regarded the rest with jealousy and suspicion more or less pronounced. Unscrupulous men in each have guided the activity of their own nation to its supposed gain, even by methods often unfair to others. For four hundred years, moreover, each country of Europe has regarded as legitimate objects of prey the native peoples and lands of America, Africa and Asia who have been unable to defend themselves by military might. America, North and South, was first overrun and overwhelmed. Africa has recently been partitioned among the powers ; and the day has been eagerly awaited when China and all Asia would meet the same fate.

Now the militaristic theory as to the relations of peoples and races has been handed down, it is true, from primitive times, and it has been completely and complacently accepted and developed by every nation in the world, however civilized and religious. Overwhelming majorities of the individuals of every nation not only acquiesce in the theory and practice of militarism, but positively approve it.

This approval, moreover, is not an unconscious acquiescence in traditional ideas and ideals on the part of the lower and uncultured masses in opposition to the more cultured and religious. It is a policy consciously and actively advocated by the most intellectual classes of all the nations of Europe. It is doubtful if the militaristic philosophy of international relations urged by militarists would have captured an entire nation had it not been accepted and advocated by her intellectual, her moral and her religious leaders.

One party regards with horror the asserted predatory designs of the other party. But how many men of any nation regard except with approval their own vast possessions in Africa and Asia, where the rights of native populations have scant consideration ?

Since available fields for further colonial expansion have become exhausted, the ambitions of powerful European peoples have inevitably clashed ; hence the development of antagonisms,

suspicious, distrust, animosity. As each, moreover, has watched the growing military might of neighbors it has felt compelled to arm more and more for its own safety. War scares have been utilized and even deliberately fomented by ambitious individuals, aristocratic cliques and capitalistic classes. Nations have been deliberately educated to believe the worst about neighbors. In each land the watchword has been "patriotism." Even governments are known to have controlled the press, moulded national opinion and aroused "patriotic" enthusiasm by falsehoods.

The final result of decades of military preparation, not only in guns and ammunitions, but in fears, hatreds, jealousies, beliefs and strategies is what we see to-day revealed in the passionate denunciations and outrageous falsehoods hurled back and forth over the various boundaries of the combatants.

Are English indeed what many Germans vehemently assert? Assuredly not, though Germans are perfectly confident they utter the truth. And are Germans in fact what many British insist? By no means. Neither are Russians nor Japanese, nor French, nor Austrians, Poles, Jews, and all the rest what their respective opponents allege.

The real cause of this tornado of international passions, carnage and destruction is not to be found in the misdeeds of any few individuals, nor may the responsibility for the whole terrible situation be laid upon any one nation. "We have all sinned." Every nation is involved. We are all consenting partners in maintaining the relic of barbarism that has survived in spite of religion and civilization—the appeal to might instead of to right and reason. Every nation believes in might as the only final means of safety. Any nation that carries her preparations farther than others may not realize perhaps that she has thereby made all her neighbors afraid, or at least suspicious of her. They have not been able to compete with her applied science and technical skill. Confidence in her own militaristic principles and military preparations, loudly, widely and publicly proclaimed, may then become a part-cause of

war. They have certainly caused fear, distrust, animosity, and increased armaments on the part of her neighbors. Corresponding armaments in other and rival countries have had their reactions, evoking fear, suspicion, animosity and still increasing armaments. The process has been cumulative, each increase in one nation necessitating corresponding increases among the others.

Ambitions, aggressions, injustice, fears, suspicions, distrust, animosities, and actual war preparations, with confidence in the same—these are the explosives that have been collecting in dangerous masses for decades. To assign responsibility for the final act that ignited the fuse is useless and vain. But useless it is not, to understand the inner nature of the real causes of Christendom's calamitous disease. For, if we isolate the germ, we are prepared to discover its toxin.

A bad philosophy of international politics is accompanied by an equally bad method of diplomacy. Along with explosive war material, physical and psychical, and in order, doubtless, to its safe-keeping till the psychological moment, we find the antiquated diplomacy of the middle ages.

From time immemorial the nations of Europe have sought to aid themselves by secret pledges, alliances and ententes, whose exact obligations were known only to rulers. This Machiavellian method was probably inevitable in ancient times when wide dissemination of knowledge was impossible or when an empire or a kingdom was regarded as the personal possession of its ruler, who alone was responsible and who alone decided questions of peace or war. The people were not and could not be responsible. They were accordingly used as pawns by the rulers in their game of dynastic ambitions. The people had nothing to say as to war or peace. But such diplomacy is belated. It is not in harmony with this modern age. Peoples now ought to know the full text of every treaty and international pledge. For the people of each land can and should be responsible. Publicity is needed for honest diplomacy no less than for honest business or politics.

Secret alliances to-day, moreover, are not really secret, although the exact terms of the pledges may not be published. They serve rather to promote distrust, suspicion and ill-will and these are active causes for war.

The language, moreover, of diplomacy, with its indirections and misleading technicalities, indulging at times in specious duplicity, and with studied conformity to supposed principles of etiquette—covering the mailed fist with a velvet glove—are relics of an age that in other matters is gone. These characteristics of ancient diplomacy have persisted till the present, promoting suspicion and a sense of insecurity.

But probably as important as any other cause for the breaking out of the war just when it did was relative readiness for war. It was only necessary to press the button. A single act was able to set in motion the whole vast enginery that each government had been decades in perfecting. Millions of men had been drilling for years. Ammunition had been stored in every fortress. Cannons, guns, swords, powder, and uniforms of every description had been manufactured and piled up in huge quantities. Plans of strategy had been all worked out. Every man knew just what he was to do, where to go, what train to take, from whom to take orders. All Europe was ready. It was as easy to start a war of the nations as to turn on an electric light. The switches were easy to move. And that exactly was the reason why the tragedy of Europe has come at this time.

If the nations had thought that they were not wholly prepared and had needed a few weeks or months for the final preparation; or had they thought that the prospect of victory would be better a year or two later, there would have been time for peace forces to get to work. A *modus vivendi* might have been found. But peace could hardly have been lasting. There was too much gunpowder, physical and psychic, lying all around Europe. It had to go off sooner or later. It was merely a question as to when the leading nations felt ready and saw the chance for a favorable beginning. As it was, those in each

land who seriously desired to maintain peace had no time in which to speak. In a word, the nations were far better prepared to act aggressively than to think peacefully. Panic and passions demanded war so loudly that they drowned the voices calling for peace.

Readiness for war then was a positive cause. And of course millions of soldiers, and especially the officers in every army, were straining at the leash. The dogs of war long to do that for which they exist and for which they have been trained. In this sense also readiness for war is a real cause.

Moreover there is no doubt that a system of absolutely un-human international ethics has been developed, expounded, accepted and defended by leading professors of philosophy and ethics; those ethics are accepted not only by individuals, but by all the nations of Christendom; they furnish the background and fundamental postulates of international politics and policies. Unchristian passions of individuals and peoples have been let loose; unchristian words have been uttered; unchristian deeds have been done. Many are guilty from whom better things were to have been expected. President Hadley is absolutely right:

“To any one who looks at the present European crisis dispassionately, the striking thing—I may well say the pathetic thing—is the failure of the different nations to understand anything about one another’s point of view. Each is so fervently convinced that it is right that it credits its enemies with being hopelessly and wilfully wrong—either deceived by their rulers or animated by the lust of conquest. It believes all good of itself and all evil of its neighbors. It can no more see the truth in international affairs than an individual man can see the truth of a private controversy in the midst of blind rage of passion. . . .

“The effective way to stop war is to stop these misunderstandings and discourtesies in their inception. . . .

“But all machinery fails, and all machinery must fail. The question of peace or war rests not with the diplomats but with the people. To bring about peace on earth men must develop the Christian virtues of fairness and courtesy. They must try to see

things as others see them ; to speak and act with a view to the feelings of others as well as themselves. This appreciation of others' point of view is the essential element both in fairness and in courtesy. . . .

“ Any Government which, while professing to seek peace, gives an example of arrogance to its neighbors ; any newspaper which, proclaiming the evils of war and the desirableness of stopping it, repeats mean insinuations against its opponents and shapes its editorials to suit its own prepossessions, without regard to the facts ; any individual who, condemning militarism among nations, nevertheless nurses his own prejudices and harbors unjust suspicions against his fellow-men, is to-day belying its prayers by its actions. . . .

“ This is not a time for thanking God that we are not as other men are. This is a time for each of us to exercise close self-examination. How do we stand these tests ? Are we trying individually to be fair in the controversies that actually come before our attention ? Do we read the newspapers that tell us the plain truth, or do we choose the ones that tell us what we wish to believe ? ”

The real causes of Europe's tragedy are the ambitions, passions, selfishness, suspicions, distrust, and hatred that have come down from ancient times and have been fomented by hereditary aristocracies, military bureaucracies, capitalistic cliques, scheming politicians, crafty statesmen, and a sensation-loving, money-making press.

III

THE PEACE MOVEMENT

AMONG the important factors of the international life of the past few decades has been the Peace Movement. For a hundred years it has gradually been gathering force. Its advocates, long considered chimerical dreamers, have of late been regarded as far-seeing statesmen.

In his "Modern Pacific Settlements" Dr. E. D. Darby gives a list of six arbitrations in the eighteenth century and four hundred and seventy-one in the nineteenth. Since 1900 there have been about one hundred and fifty.

The signing of special arbitration treaties between countries is a custom that has arisen only in the most recent times. Between 1899 and 1912 (inclusive) arbitration treaties to the number of one hundred and fifty-eight have been signed between pairs of countries. Of the forty-nine sovereign states in the world forty have such treaties with one or more countries. During the past year America has been especially active in these matters. Secretary Bryan has negotiated twenty-six arbitration treaties of a new form, by which a year for investigation by a joint commission is mutually pledged before either side shall declare war.

That event, however, which has focused the attention of the world and aroused high hopes for the success of the Peace Movement has been the holding of two official international peace conferences at the Hague (1899 and 1907) and the proposal by the second conference for the establishment of a permanent Court of Arbitral Justice. Ardent peace advocates have been preparing for the third Hague Conference in 1915, now, however, indefinitely postponed.

In the promotion of this world-peace movement some five

hundred peace associations, including branches, have been organized in European countries, most of them since the Paris Peace Congress of 1889. The Inter-Parliamentary Peace Union which came into existence that year binds together legislators of many lands. In the United States we have the "American Peace Society," the "World Peace Foundation," the "Carnegie Peace Foundation," the "Church Peace Union," and the "Commission on Peace and Arbitration of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America." Connected with these general bodies are groups of associated local societies and committees.

The Peace Movement has in recent years become so well known to the public in general that much has been hoped from it. To many it began to look as though "pacifism" might really win.

The tragedy of Europe is nevertheless being enacted. The nations of Christendom have plunged into war and are ascribing each to the other words of duplicity and deeds of treachery and atrocious barbarism. The folly and futility of the Peace Movement is accordingly being widely proclaimed. Many are saying that "the first step toward the establishment of peace is to blow up the Peace Palace with dynamite." "The Hague Conference is just at present like a red rag to a bull." This was the time, they urge, for the Peace Movement to show its value, yet it has availed nothing.

Colonel Roosevelt asserts that "No arbitration treaties or peace treaties of the kind recently negotiated at Washington, and no tepid good-will of neutral powers would help us in even the smallest degree." He asserts in the strongest terms that the only practical peace program is preparedness for war. "The present all-inclusive arbitration treaties, peace conferences and the like, upon which our well-meaning pacifists have pinned so much hope, have proved utterly worthless under serious strain." Only treaties backed by force and preparedness to use that force have value.

On the face of things, indeed, decades of peace efforts seem

to have been useless. Treaties, promises, agreements, conventions, have all been swept away as chaff before a storm. Long-standing pledges of neutrality have been described by the highest authorities and signatory powers as mere "scraps of paper"—"paper bulwarks." Frightful carnage of the flower of the nations has appalled the world. Incalculable financial and economic losses are being suffered. In consequence of these facts many have lost heart. They see nothing before the human race but endless warfare, more and more destructive and awful.

Others, however, are saying that this will be—this must be—the last war. Yet how can that be unless some effective way is found of relating the nations and of curbing their passions and selfish ambitions? Nothing is more certain than recurring wars, so long as the present emotional attitudes and international political philosophy are maintained in every land.

What then can be said at this time for peace programs? Must peace advocates admit that their peace plans have been foolish and their efforts futile? Must they now abide in silence and wait till wars have ceased through the exhaustion of the weak and the enforcement of peace by domination of the strong? Are militarists after all the only really practical men? Are peace advocates and peace arguments all foolish and Utopian?

On the contrary, do not terrible carnage and appalling destruction of wealth but emphasize the need of exactly that which the pacifists have proposed? Is not now coming true what they have been foretelling? Inconceivable economic and human losses are being incurred, and all so foolishly. The nations, however, have not heeded the arguments of pacifists nor followed their counsels. Only with reluctance have the governments participated even slightly in the development of judicial machinery for the rational settlement of international difficulties. Europe's tragedy, instead of disproving peace arguments, but emphasizes their value. Had Austria and Germany been willing to submit to the Hague the case against

Servia, some honorable method would doubtless have been found for solving the immediate difficulty at issue. But some at least of the nations seem to have had ulterior designs and were therefore unwilling to use the means provided by the Peace Movement. For this failure, the Peace Movement cannot be made responsible. The failure does, however, bring to light a factor in the Peace Movement of the gravest significance.

Peace advocates, nevertheless, are by no means discouraged. The European calamity, many are saying, has advanced their cause at least by a century. The nations begin to realize what war really means in this new era. It involves the entire structure of civilization and the very foundations of society; it disarranges every detail of life to a degree never possible before; the whole world is caught up as in a cyclone and is hurled hither and thither. Men now see things of which hitherto they had only read, and they are now beginning to say that somehow effective world-peace must be established. They are ready as never before to listen to proposals for inter-relating nations and races by methods calculated to remove or at least diminish the danger of war.

Advocates of peace, moreover, are justified in pointing to the many difficulties that have already been solved by the use of such peace facilities as have been established. Hundreds of cases (over 600) have been submitted to arbitration in a little more than a century. Long standing issues have been settled, which might easily have ended in war—such as the Newfoundland Fisheries contention and the problem of the Alaskan boundary. In all these cases, how easily the passions of the peoples might have been inflamed and collisions developed! Thanks, however, to peace methods, providing for the full hearing of each side by men whose impartial judgment could be trusted, a solution was reached at once rational and satisfying to the honor of both sides.

But the most conspicuous instance of right relations and mutual confidence maintained between two peoples through a happy peace program and carried out for a full century is wit-

nessed to by the four thousand mile unfortified boundary between Canada and the United States. No fort frowns nor soldier threatens.

With such arguments and experiences to fall back upon, peace advocates are by no means discouraged. Rather they are more insistent than ever that peace proposals are not needless nor ineffectual. But of course they can be effectual only when actually used.

Students, however, of the Peace Movement should understand its fundamental postulates and the real nature of its proposals. The movement builds on two assumptions; first that people really want justice and do not want to fight; and second, that conflicts arise through lack of machinery for adjusting difficulties and providing for justice.

The attention, accordingly, of the movement has been mainly directed to devising suitable machinery. Pacifists contend that whatever may be the desires of dynasties or armies or bureaucratic cliques, the people themselves really do not want to fight. They become embroiled, however, by events that touch national pride and that can be used by crafty militarists and shrewd unscrupulous statesmen to arouse national passions. Lacking tribunals and methods of honorable settlement to which the people can appeal, pride and passion finally make war inevitable. Pacifists believe that as soon as adequate international judicial machinery shall have been established and confidence in the essential justice of its decisions shall have developed, international friction will be continuously relieved, national feelings appeased, and danger of wars averted. The movement, therefore, seeks to construct machinery whereby difficulties may be adjusted by methods satisfying the honor and essential interests of the nations concerned.

Peace advocates, however, have not failed to see that the promotion of international good-will is also of the highest importance. Count d'Estournelles de Constant, for instance, the illustrious founder of the International Conciliation Association, has stated his views in the following pregnant form :

“ Before war, arbitration ; before arbitration, conciliation ; before conciliation, concord. Such are the steps of ideal progress that men of good-will of all civilized lands are pursuing to-day.”

In harmony with this principle, the International Conciliation Association has made many noble efforts, and by no means fruitless, to bring together Frenchmen and Englishmen, Frenchmen and Germans, and Englishmen and Germans. The Inter-Parliamentary Union has likewise wrought valiantly to produce acquaintance and thereby good-will among the political leaders of the nations. In the United States many special societies have been organized for the furtherance of these ends, such as the Pan-American Union, the Japan Society, the China Society, the American Scandinavian Society.

This entire Peace Movement, however, is bitterly attacked in every land. Here in America the opposition finds expression in the United States Navy League. Its watchword is “ An adequate navy.” It insists that it too stands for peace, but for peace established on righteousness and enforced by might. Wars spring from the struggles of democracy with autocracy, from race prejudices, from unfair competitive struggles for lands, spheres of influence and harbors. Human nature is what it is and wars will never cease till human nature is changed. It is folly therefore to disarm or even to be insufficiently armed. Nations are selfish and pagan. Might is the only thing nations respect. We Americans, it is true, are enlightened and pacific ; we have no predatory designs. But other nations are not so. We must therefore be ready to resist force with force. Progress comes by fighting injustice and resisting evil with at least a display of overwhelming force. Treaties, conventions, paper promises are valuable, provided armed forces are available to make them effective. New organizations are now being formed upon these faithless assumptions.

For convenience we shall term this group military pacifists, and the usual advocates of peace juridical pacifists.

What attitude, now, should Christian pacifists take to these

opposing positions? Both schools unquestionably desire righteousness and peace. Both are sincere in their arguments and desires. Do not both also proclaim aspects of truth and right that need recognition?

The substantial accuracy of the militarists' statement of the world-situation can hardly be denied. The peace program does not and cannot appeal to peoples and governments that have selfish ambitions, that plan to expand their territories, to rob their neighbors and destroy their prosperity by force. Such nations will not accept the status quo as permanent. The nation that fails to arm in some adequate proportion to the arms of aggressive neighbors is doomed to impotent helplessness. National safety in such cases depends on national power. Treaties with such nations have only so much weight as there is military power to enforce them. A peace policy, therefore, military pacifists insist, which leaves a people helpless is the height of folly, and is absolutely impracticable, as the world is constituted to-day. Nations, they insist, are selfish, and world-peace based exclusively on reason and right is out of the question because no nation really accepts reason and right in international relations. What, moreover, is right and reasonable to one people is far from right and reasonable to a rival. So much depends too on the mood of the moment. World-peace, therefore, unsupported by military might, is, they assert, an iridescent dream; it may span the heavens like a rainbow, but it is absolutely without substance or practical value.

The arguments, however, of military pacifists disclose amazing ignorance of the positions, contentions and proposals of juridical pacifists. They regard all pacifists as indifferent to justice, as demanding peace-at-any-price, as Tolstoian, demanding disarmament and complete non-resistance. Having set up their man of straw they proceed to knock him down and dismember him, which is of course an easy thing to do, seeing they have put him together for that purpose.

The juridical pacifist, however, takes no such optimistic view of human nature and of the establishment of world-peace

as is alleged. He is by no means a peace-at-any-price man. He has no less regard for righteousness and justice than the militarist. Pacifists are not ignorant of the pagan selfishness of states and nations, nor do they misunderstand the problem before them. They see clearly that the world can take only one step at a time, and they seek to help it take the next important step toward peace, which is mutual acquaintance of nations and peoples and the establishment of suitable judicial machinery for the attainment of justice and thereby the settlement of difficulties between nations that desire to settle difficulties in that way.

That world-peace will never be established merely by arbitration treaties and Hague tribunals, juridical pacifists see no less clearly than militarists. Vast changes must first take place in the moral sentiment of peoples, in their national ambitions, and in their sense of right toward alien peoples and races and their treatment of them. None will acknowledge more readily than juridical pacifists the insufficiency of mere judicial machinery.

And on the other hand, must we not agree with pacifists who insist that world-peace can never be established by sheer might? Military pacifists who think that mighty armaments will insure peace are in reality as unpractical as ultra peace-at-any-price pacifists. Militarism in rival countries inevitably evokes fear, jealousy, suspicion, and all the vast range of animosities and hatreds. However just each country intends to be, it will resort to spies and subterfuges to discover the military preparations of neighbors. Each will gradually become convinced of treacherous plans on the part of others which will lead to fresh stratagems and finally to conflict. Conflict may indeed decide for a period which nation is the stronger, but it can settle no question of right and produce no feelings of mutual good-will. The exclusive program of military pacifists, therefore, sincere though it unquestionably is, will nevertheless saddle increasing militarism on the nations, East and West, Far East and Far West. Vast alliances will

be formed and reformed. Every independent political unit will seek safety by war preparations and armaments and fortifications, by intrigues, spies and lies; by every discoverable device. World-militarism will thus grow from more to more, till the weight can no longer be borne. Then will come a world-tragedy, and world-exhaustion, with realignment and new political combinations. Centuries may intervene between successive world-tragedies. But so long as militaristic philosophy and pagan practice as to international and interracial relations prevail, world-tragedies will occur in the future as they have occurred in the past, ever larger and more frightful. Nations, races, civilizations will rise and flourish, only to decay and be overthrown by younger and more virile peoples and civilizations.

Is it not evident then that neither school of pacificism provides a complete method for establishing world-peace? Neither deals with the fundamental causes of war; namely, selfish ambitions and passions. Each school, however, has its measure of truth. These the practical pacifist should see and accept.

In his famous series of articles on "What America should Learn from the War" Colonel Roosevelt exalts the "Peace of Righteousness." "We must insist on righteousness first and foremost. We must strive for peace always, but we must never hesitate to put righteousness above peace." He imagines that those who advocate peace are indifferent to righteousness and he fails to see that *the very gist of their proposals concerns the methods of securing justice and honor for both sides.*

No American juridical peace advocate stands more prominently before the American public than Mr. Elihu Root. A few quotations from his address of February 26, 1909, on the Causes of War will show his insistence on injustice between nations as the cause of war and justice as the only foundation for world-peace.

"Peace can never be except as it is founded upon justice. . . . If we would have peace, it is not enough to cry 'Peace, Peace!'" It is essential that we should promote and

insist upon the willingness of our country to do justice to all countries of the earth. "By far the greatest cause of war is that suspicion of injustice, threatened and intended, which comes from exasperated feeling. . . . Questions which can be disposed of without the slightest difficulty between countries really friendly are insoluble between countries really unfriendly."

The main difference then between juridical and military pacifists is one of emphasis and spirit. Both alike believe in justice and righteousness. Both agree that no real or lasting peace is possible without these. They differ as to the emphasis placed upon the means of securing it. The former emphasize the use of reason expressed through international promises, tribunals and laws. The latter emphasize the need of our might to enforce our right. Both, however, put forward practically the same proposition when it comes to the concrete question as to how the nations are to be organically interrelated for world-peace. Both would establish an "International League of Peace." This is now the method widely favored by all classes of thinkers.

It is, however, no new thought. It was suggested, to go no further back, by Alfred Tennyson who taught us to look forward to the glorious time when war drums shall throb no longer and all battle flags be furled,

"In the Parliament of man,
The Federation of the World."

Books have been written on how this may be achieved. In his volume on the "Federation of the World" (1907) Mr. Trueblood enlarges on the "United States of the World." In "The United States and Peace" (1914) Ex-President William H. Taft "elucidates the history and conception of a court of judicial arbitration."

This vision of world-peace through federations of nations finds frequent recent expression. Mr. Andrew Carnegie expounds it in his first written statement relative to the European tragedy (*The New York Independent*, October 14, 1914).

Viscount James Bryce speaks of it in his article on Pan-Germanism. He hesitates not to say that

“No scheme for preventing future wars will have any chance of success unless it rests upon the assurance that the States which enter it will loyally and steadfastly abide by it and that each will join in coercing by their overwhelming united strength any State which may disregard the obligations it has undertaken.”

Colonel Roosevelt had quite independently put forward the same proposition, and, after quoting the above sentence, adds, “This is almost exactly what I have said.”

In the *Independent* for September 28, 1914, Mr. Hamilton Holt urges a “League of Peace.” It will rest upon five principles :

“First, The nations of the League shall mutually agree to respect the territory and sovereignty of each other.

“Second, All questions that cannot be settled by diplomacy shall be arbitrated.

“Third, The nations of the League shall provide a periodical assembly to make all rules to become law unless vetoed by a nation within a stated period.

“Fourth, The nations shall disarm to the point where the combined forces of the League shall be a certain per cent. higher than those of the most heavily armed nation or alliance outside the League. Detailed rules for this pro rata disarmament shall be formulated by the Assembly.

“Fifth, Any member of the League shall have the right to withdraw on due notice, or may be expelled by the unanimous vote of the others.”

Here then we have ardent “pacifists” and ardent “militarists” making substantially the same proposals. Do not these proposals, however, really seek to combine the fundamental contentions of both? Do not both provide, on the one hand, for compacts and rules of procedure for securing justice, and, on the other, for military might with which to enforce judgment?

Ought it not then to be possible to bring these two schools of pacifists together and find a program upon which both can work harmoniously?

Examination, however, of these and of all kindred proposals reveals the fact that relatively little consideration is given to the problem as to how the mighty selfish passions and ambitions and prejudices of nations and races are to be met. It seems to be assumed that so long as these passions express themselves through the recognized channels allowed by the laws they need not be considered; when they exceed the methods so allowed, the only way to meet them is by force. The question is not raised as to whether there is any method for allaying them.

Is not this, however, the most fundamental and important question of all? Is it conceivable that the peoples of Europe can possibly establish a Peace League among themselves when this war is over, unless in some way frightful wounds are healed and hideous hatreds are eradicated and the reconciled peoples learn to trust and appreciate each other?

And is it conceivable that a Peace League can include Europeans, Americans, North and South, Asiatics and Africans, Mohammedans, Christians and Hindus, so long as these diverse peoples and religions hold toward one another the opinions and feelings they now hold?

In what way, however, are mutual kindly feelings and trust in each other on the part of nations and races to be evoked? These are preliminary steps of the utmost importance to a lasting world-peace. Is it not self-evident then that whatever the practicable method for establishing world-peace may be, it must concern itself with more than either machinery or force? Must it not also take into account the ambitions, passions and prejudices of nations?

Such being the case, however, is not world-peace a hopeless vision? Is it possible to change the feelings and prejudices, the ambitions and passions of entire nations? Are not national feelings exactly those features of human nature that are beyond the rule of reason and therefore beyond control?

Many indeed so argue. But the facts are against them. Japan's emotional attitude to the white man, and especially to America, underwent an amazing change in the eighth decade of

the last century. China's friendly attitude to us to-day is one of the miracles of history. An emotional transformation of a people is in fact far easier than is usually believed. Such transformations may take place with amazing speed.

Here we come upon the special contribution to the peace cause that religion, especially the Christian religion, has to make, and that religion alone can make. If Christianity can teach the nations to take seriously its fundamental teaching that God is the loving Father of all men, and that they are all equally His children, and therefore brothers, the problems of world-peace can be solved. When men love one another most difficulties between them disappear. And any difficulties intrinsic in the situation can be solved. By continued experiment, social and judicial machinery can finally be found that will meet the needs, provided only that all the parties concerned desire to have justice done and good-will prevail. Now the universal cultivation of this spirit is the special function of the Church. And exactly this is the essential spiritual foundation upon which the Peace Movement must build. The movement can advance only as this spirit is developed throughout the nations. "The Peace Movement must build its political structure on the moral character in individual and state, created by such moral agencies as Church and school."

In view of all these facts and considerations, let not peace advocates lose hope. Let them rather take wide views and enlarge their plans. Let them realize that great progress toward world-peace has been made in recent decades. The conscience of the world and even of most nations no longer sanctions frankly aggressive wars. In the present European conflict the people of each nation had to be convinced that its own part was honorable, that it was called to battle in self-defense or for defense of the weak. Only so could they be led into the conflict. War lords no longer rule without regard to the convictions and consciences of the people. Each nation, moreover, seeks the moral approval of the world.

The Peace Movement, however, needs to be deepened and

strengthened. So-called pacifists and militarists recognize and admit the truth held by the other. Judicial machinery for settlement of international differences and elimination of friction is beyond question of the highest value. Peace Leagues are surely needed. Let these movements go forward as rapidly and widely as possible.

But let us remember that not every people is willing as yet to maintain the status quo. Especially do peoples that feel unjustly treated, and those that have been conquered in decades or centuries past, insist on recovery of rights. There come times also in the history of peoples when they are hypnotized and misled by ambitious individuals and cliques. They become entirely indifferent to the control of "reason." These conditions compel those that love peace, nevertheless, to maintain armaments.

What the world now needs, if world-peace is to be secured, is a pacifist policy that cordially approves on the one hand all efforts to construct practical machinery for relating nations, peoples and races, in ways that will remove frictions and diminish passions; that approves with equal cordiality on the other hand the maintenance of armaments for defensive purposes; and that provides in the third place a *constructive program for producing positive international and interracial good-will*, changing the inner selfish spirit of peoples, dispelling their suspicions and fears, banishing race prejudice and class arrogance, evoking mutual confidence, and persuading ruling classes to share that rule.

In brief, we must combine the principles of juridical, of military, and of Christian pacifism. Since the principles and proposals of the two former schools have been clearly expounded in recent literature, no further attention will be paid to them in this volume. The application, however, of Christian principles to international relations as a practical method for establishing world-peace has received as yet surprisingly little attention. This is the special theme of our present study.

IV

THE IDEALS AND THE PRACTICE OF THE CHURCHES IN REGARD TO INTERNA- TIONAL PEACE

THE ideal of Christianity is universal peace. Christian Scriptures are read each Sabbath Day in every church in Christendom. Christians profess that Jesus is their Lord and Master. The church organization exists to propagate the Christian faith and to provide for the observance by Christians of all that is essential in the Christian religion.

In spite of these facts, millions of professed Christians are fighting. They are Christians not only in their own belief, but also in that of the country for which they fight. The churches of each nation have sent the armies to the front with their benedictions. Each nation, moreover, is praying for victory to the God in whom it professes to believe, and whose commands it professes to obey. Not only have the churches of the nations at war taken no active steps to stop war preparations; they have not as churches taken any particular interest in the Peace Movement.

How may we explain this paradox, this contrast of professions and practice, of ideals and deeds? Six characteristics of Christianity unite, it seems to me, to produce and thus to account for this paradox.

1. **The Inadequate Interpretation of Salvation.**—For centuries the Church has regarded salvation as chiefly a matter of individual escape from hell and assurance of heaven. Roman Catholic and Protestant, as well as Greek orthodoxy, all agreed on this point, differ though they might as to the effective means of salvation. All agreed that religion consists

in the religious experiences of the individual and in his personal relation to God. It is seldom that Christians asserted that the relations of men in groups, and especially the relations of races and nations, are likewise included in the teachings of Jesus as to salvation and its results, and His fundamental law of love to man, that men should love one another.

Our modern problems of labor and capital are in part due to this same individualistic interpretation of salvation and duty.

2. The Disproportionate Emphasis on the Intellectual and Ecclesiastical Aspects of Christianity.—Throughout the centuries, moreover, Christian teachers have been predominantly interested in doctrine, in correct logical systems of Christian philosophy, and in ecclesiastical organization. The results at times have been weakening to vital Christianity. The tests to determine whether or not individuals should be regarded as Christians have been saddening, formal rather than vital. Membership in a specific organization, performance of certain rituals, baptism, confessions, participation in the Eucharist, formal acknowledgment of certain creeds, ability or willingness to avow certain beliefs, and the like, frequently have been made the tests as to whether or not a man was to be regarded as a Christian. How out of harmony this seems with the words of Jesus! “Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father.”

3. Imperfect Conceptions of the Kingdom of God.—The outstanding constructive feature in the teaching of Jesus is that of the Kingdom of God. By this striking phrase He meant the organic relation of all men to each other and to God in righteousness, good-will and love. But what has the Church done with it? Has she not completely failed to understand what Jesus meant? In place of His ideal of the Kingdom has not the Church set up its very opposite—rule by authority and even by force? And even now churches, which denounce control of the state by the Church and resent the control of the Church by the state, nevertheless think that they promote their

own spiritual welfare by ecclesiastical authority and intricate machinery. Modern church politics may be one aspect of a perverted conception of the teaching of Jesus as to the Kingdom of God.

The real Kingdom of God is established neither by force nor by fraud, nor by ecclesiastical machinery. It comes only by knowing, loving and living the will of God in its fullness; and this involves, first of all, right feelings. And these feelings must include, not only one's own clique, sect, class or race, but every class and every race. "If ye love them that love you, . . . do not even the Gentiles the same?"

The Kingdom of God, however, does not imply an unorganized society. As a Kingdom it involves rather ever growing organization. Yet the organization of society must be of such a nature and ruled by such principles that the highest interests of the individual are provided for. And every nation and race must be included. If love is the ruling principle, then right methods can easily be found for relating the individuals and classes and races of even the most complex society. Justice and opportunity can be provided for all of every class and race. Exactly this is included in the Kingdom of God.

4. Incomplete Realization of the Brotherhood of Man.—Next to the revelation of God as a loving heavenly Father, the most important insight of the Apostolic Church was that of the brotherhood of all men in Christ. This new teaching was not easily won nor easily held. It was not an abstract theoretical teaching. It came as a direct revelation from heaven. It ran counter to centuries of Jewish teachings and feelings. The records of the Apostolic age—the so-called Acts of the Apostles—devote chapters to a narrative of the wonderful ways whereby the narrow Jewish Apostolic Church was led to break over the conventional exclusiveness of the ages, and to accept men of every race as brothers, recipients equally with themselves of God's grace and love and obedient like themselves to His Spirit. They went to the full limit of social

intercourse; they actually ate with Samaritans whom they had hated and with Gentiles whom they had despised, having learned to love and respect them.

Paul was profoundly impressed with the importance of the new revelation, first given to Peter, and first widely proclaimed and practiced by himself. He speaks of it as the mystery which for ages had been hid in God. It came as a tremendous flood of light on the problem of the races; in God's plans for mankind every race has its place; all are co-heirs in the Kingdom, fellow-members of the body, and fellow-partakers of the promise. The Jews without the Gentiles would be incomplete. In God's great purposes each race not only has its place, but its part to take, its work to do; none can be complete without the rest.

The Apostolic Church well-nigh made shipwreck on the rock of racial antipathy. Proud Jews resented the disgrace of being put on the same level with Gentiles and refused to accept "dogs" in social relations. But those who became Christians learned that God is no respecter of persons nor of races; that the true children of Abraham are they who share his spirit; that the physiological ancestry of a man's family counts for nothing in making him acceptable with God.

Only that portion of the early Church which learned the lesson of race equality was used of God for the establishment of the Church universal. A Christianity insisting on race pre-eminence was in so far no longer Christian.

The modern Christian Church is met by the same issues that confronted the Apostolic Church. "What think ye of heathen races" is the question now confronting us. Will Christians treat them as equals or as inferiors? Does not the modern Church as a whole contend that God has elected the white race to rule the world? That the white man is superior and all other races are inherently inferior? Does the modern Church insist on giving men of alien races among us the square deal? Do we see to it that justice is done to Japanese and Chinese and Hindus residing in this land of liberty and hope and that

our treaty obligations are kept? If we fail in these respects are we practicing the principles of universal brotherhood? Can we properly claim to be Christian?

Because of the new contact of the races, a new testing has come to the churches on this ancient problem. If modern Christians take the old Jewish attitude of race superiority and privilege, have they not abrogated the unique character of Christianity and fallen back in their religion to the status of a tribal faith? And with this attitude is world-peace possible? Does any one suppose that other races will always meekly accept the inferior status we assign them? Can a Christianity that proclaims white race superiority establish world-peace? Is it not clear that such a relation can be maintained only by militarism?

Modern Christianity is in truth being tested afresh. It has lost the apostolic conviction and practice of race equality and is in danger thereby of losing its soul. The theoretical limitations prevent universal acceptance and develop provincialism.

5. Failure to Practice Love of Enemies.—Jesus taught nothing more original than the duty of His disciples to love their enemies, to pray for them and to do them good. And this remarkable teaching He Himself practiced. The early disciples of Jesus caught His spirit and followed His example to a degree truly amazing. Christian conduct confounded heathen critics who criticized the Christians for their unreasonable love for aliens.

This, more than all else, however, was the power that conquered. It won men's hearts. It convinced them of the sincerity of apostolic teaching and of the abiding presence and power of Christ, even though He had vanished from human sight. For to love one's friends, splendid though it be, is human. Do not even the Gentiles the same? But to love one's enemies—those who hate and seek to harm—that is divine. Only divine power living in human hearts can restrain the natural desires for revenge, and in their place make love supreme. Only love like that of Jesus can enable the disciple

to enter into the world-redeeming work of Jesus and make effective His atoning life and death.

But where in modern Christendom do we find in practice this love of enemies? Where is it systematically taught? What churches insist upon it as an essential condition of membership? Not only do Christians not love their enemies, they do not always love one another! For centuries different branches of the Church have regarded each other as foes. Where active persecutions have not been indulged in, have they not too often hated each other with perfect hatred? How recent is the time that Protestant denominations have condemned each the other, and regarded each other as rivals and foes, as perverters of truth and deceivers of the people!

We may rejoice that between many Protestant bodies this animosity has largely passed away. But even to-day, where is the love of Christ that *loves enemies*? You point to foreign missions. Yes, that is a bright spot in modern Christianity. But how large a part of the Church universal is interested in foreign missions? How many Christians take any share whatever in supporting them? How many really love those "heathen" across the seas, or do anything for them that even appears like self-sacrifice, like the suffering unselfish love that Christ demands of disciples? In 1913 Great Britain expended over three pounds (fifteen dollars) per individual for alcoholic drink, whereas its total gifts for foreign missions were barely three shillings (seventy-five cents) per individual. The United States spends fifty millions for chewing gum and seventeen millions for missions.

Except for an influential minority, must we not acknowledge that modern Christians lack the practice of the most important and the most characteristic feature of the original Christianity?

In brief, is modern Christianity as a whole effectively Christian? Does it not misunderstand Christ's most important teachings and fail to practice His most urgent commands? Modern Christianity, no less than mediæval, takes the Christian name but lacks the Christian power. It is largely satis-

fied with organizations, rituals, doctrines, and mystic experiences. It does many harmless and some good things, and it teaches some truth. But does it not merit the verdict of the Master it professes to follow, "These things ought ye to have done and not to have left the other undone" ? Do we not fall under the condemnation pronounced on those who merely say "Lord, Lord" but do not in fact obey His commands ?

6. Denominationalism.—Since the Reformation, a notable feature of Christianity has been its organic divisions and subdivisions. Sects and denominations have arisen and flourished. Each no doubt has had its special justification. The divisions, nevertheless, have promoted misunderstandings, antipathies, jealousies, and rivalries. Sects have too often combated each other. But apart from questions as to their justification or the good and the evil they have done, this surely will be admitted by all. Each denomination, exactly because it is a denomination, fails to feel responsibility for the right conduct of the nation in international affairs.

If treaties are transgressed, as are at present our treaties with China and Japan, how many churches know it ? Even if they know it, how many protest or take any action to secure national observance of treaty pledges ? It must be admitted that as a whole the churches do not concern themselves with the moral responsibilities of international life. This means that our international activities are left in the hands of men who may or may not be Christians ; but even if Christians they do not have the support of the churches in carrying out Christian international policies. The selfish aggressive interests of our country are, therefore, relatively free to manipulate our international policies, unhindered by Christian forces.

At some crisis our churches may come for a brief period to national self-consciousness, have a spasm or two of international thought, and make a few demands of the politicians ; but they soon relapse into indifference, engrossed in local and ecclesiastical interests.

Our national and local governments are too largely manip-

ulated by scheming, selfish, aggressive interests. No single denomination feels adequately or can so feel the responsibility for making politics Christian. The churches, because of their divisions, fail to coöperate. Because they are denominations they do not see the problem as a whole or recognize their individual responsibilities.

Not until this situation is remedied and the various denominations find some way of establishing a corporate life of the Church as a whole, can we expect the Church to play an effective part in producing either pure politics at home, or in establishing righteous and Christian international relations. But world-peace apart from these is impossible. For so long as politics and policies, national and international, are left to men whose primary interests are selfish, the establishment of the Kingdom of God in the world as a whole or even in our own land is impracticable. Only as Christians in organized coöperation assert their principles and their power, which is so easily possible in democratic America, shall we begin to establish world-peace.

But the criticism of the Church briefly presented in the preceding paragraphs gives only one aspect of the question. A static view of a great movement fails to show the real truth in regard to it exactly because it omits the element of movement, of progress. Christianity has been growing throughout the centuries, and particularly in recent decades. We know more about Jesus to-day and have more of His spirit than any generation of Christians since the second century. The defects pointed out, moreover, are now widely recognized. We begin to see that men's thinking even about Christianity is profoundly affected by the rest of their thinking.

In an age when all political, social and ethical thought was individualistic, it was inevitable that Christian thought and practice also should be individualistic. The very nature of man's psychic life rendered it unavoidable that intellectual emphasis and ecclesiastical organization should loom large at

certain stages of his development. Now, however, we are passing out of these stages and are beginning to see their limitations and defects. While it is well to recognize them and to point out their relation to certain survivals in our own times, we should not let the reaction blind our eyes to the noble thoughts and deeds of those earlier stages of Christianity.

What splendid men of God the Church has produced in every age! How strong and courageous and how conscientious! How earnestly they thought and reasoned and acted! But for them we should not be where we are to-day. In spite of their shortcomings, we can but admire those heroes of the faith.

And not in ancient times alone has the Church raised up noble men and women of faith. Never has there been so large a number of devoted and intelligent Christians as to-day. They are giving themselves with zeal to know and to do whatever is good and true and kind. The Spirit of Jesus is abroad in the world. Millions are asking for light. And what is more, they are finding it and living it.

In our modern emphasis, moreover, on the application of Christian principles to social life, let us never forget that the salvation of the individual is indeed the foundation and source of every right movement in society. Individualism expresses, therefore, profound truth which we cannot afford to lose. Social emphasis that ignores the individual is perverse and blind indeed. The hope of society lies in developed and responsible individuals. The more organized society becomes the more does its welfare depend on developed and reliable individuals.

Especially should we note that great progress has been made in recent decades. Every denomination has its pioneers; each shares in the movement; all are growing toward Christ and thus they are getting closer together. The ranks of Christians are closing up. Sectarianism is waning. The duty and opportunity of the churches in local and national life are becoming clear and millions are responding.

Foreign missionary work, though only a century old, is a mighty force. Its 25,000 missionaries and thirty millions of

dollars raised annually from Protestant countries express a new sense of human brotherhood and interracial good-will. Its reactions on the Church and on Christendom also are perhaps as important results of the movement as its direct influence on non-Christian lands.

The churches, moreover, have been widening their thought of and deepening their hold on the teachings of Jesus. They see that salvation means more than preparation for a future world. The teachings of Jesus apply to society, to its classes of every grade. Every church takes increasing interest in social service, in making society as a whole Christian. They study and seek to mould its economic, industrial, commercial, and even its political life. Demand for honesty and purity, for unselfishness and kindness in every branch of business, are becoming insistent. Many, moreover, are exemplifying these ideals in actual life.

And now at last are we not all beginning to see that the principles of Jesus must be applied to international life also? That righteousness and honesty, truthfulness and good-will apply to nations as well as to individuals? This is the new insight attained on a large scale among Christians to-day. A Christian conscience on international matters seems to be one of the products of Europe's tragedy.

If this hasty survey of Christianity is at all correct, can we wonder at the apathy of the churches in regard to world-peace? Through its sectarian divisions and interests it has failed not only to do the work we might naturally have expected of it but even to feel its responsibility for that work.

But we need not despair. It is a great thing to have preserved intact through the ages the teachings of Christ. Many individuals, both lay and clerical, are aglow with fresh fire from the altar and many have caught new visions of service and opportunity. What is now needed is that these forces shall be organized. Our international conscience should be guided to concrete duties and be provided with effective channels and instruments of expression.

For the redemption of the world from its sin and its sorrow, for the reviving life wherewith to heal the disease of the world, where shall we look, whither shall we go, save to the Christ made known by the Church? Whence shall come the restoring energy, save from those followers of Christ who to-day are living the life He alone makes possible?

How can world-peace come except through that force which changes the hearts of men and nations? Nations great and strong must learn to respect those that are weak and small. The lion must be taught to lie down with the lamb. The practical movement for world-peace must evoke such feelings and establish such relations between nations and races that they will no longer fear, hate, suspect and despise one another, nor seek to gain selfish advantage through aggression or trickery. Each will rejoice in the prosperity of the rest, and the prosperity of each will promote the prosperity of all. Only then shall we see swords turned into plowshares and battle-ships into merchant marine.

Whence, however, are these changes to come unless it be from Christ through the Church? And how is the transforming force of Christ's spirit to be made effective among the peoples save by the corporate activity of the churches? This does not of necessity mean that the churches must first effect organic union. It does mean that they shall by means of some kind of united action put forth forces that will regenerate society and nations.

PART TWO

Vision—Organization—Education

What now is to be done? What practical measures may the churches of America adopt for abolishing war and establishing world-peace? Our constructive program distinguishes between measures that are preparatory and those that are positive. In this section we study the former. Three lines of preparatory activity are essential to the inauguration and effective execution in America of an international world-peace policy.

We must have fresh visions.

We must establish an effective church organization.

We must educate the nation.

V

VISION OF CHRIST'S CHARACTER AND HIS GOSPEL

FRESH visions, peace organization of the churches and peace education of the youth are, however, but preparations for that real and constructive program of Christianity by which alone true world-peace can be established.

At present, as militarists assert and all admit, every nation is actuated by selfishness; and selfishness is, moreover, regarded as natural and inevitable. International relations, from the beginning of mankind, have been so selfish and the conduct of peoples and races has been characterized by such brutality, with suffering incalculable, that nearly every people is suspicious of every other. Jealousy, hatred, fear, and revenge control more or less consciously the attitude of each to all.

Permanent world-peace, however, can come only as these feelings are overcome and good-will is established in their place. These animosities, distrusts, indignations, have been evoked by positive deeds. They can be overcome only by positive deeds. The way to conquer evil is to do good. "Overcome evil with good" is a universal principle; it applies to nations as well as to individuals. Our Christian ideals and practices must now be definitely and consciously applied to nations, to international life. *The Golden Rule must be given universal application.*

Here, therefore, is the platform of the Christian World-Peace Program. Christians must seek to establish the Kingdom of God on a world-wide scale through methods of *international righteousness and helpfulness*. Nations become

friendly only by doing deeds of good-will for each other. Treaties of peace and arbitration are well, but they are not enough. Promises not to declare war until time has elapsed for a commission to investigate and report are thoroughly worth while. They are not, however, adequate substitutes for active good-will and mutual confidence. What the world now needs are international actions that remove now existing suspicions, distrusts, animosities, and prejudices. The following chapters are devoted to concrete suggestions as to how the Golden Rule, the Christian principle of love, may be applied to specific cases.

Clergymen, priests, teachers, and all leaders of the churches need first of all to gain a clear vision of the character and the purpose of Jesus. We must be mastered by His conception of the Kingdom of God. We must put the emphasis of religion where Jesus Himself put it, on faith and resulting moral life. We must adopt His motives and His methods for establishing His Kingdom. The Golden Rule must replace the rule of gold in the relations of nations.

If we who are the professed expounders and exponents of Christianity fail to understand or to live the most essential elements of the Christian faith, what can we expect of lay Christians? "If gold rust, what shall iron do?" If the Church is to take an important part in establishing world-peace, the movement surely must have its source among the clergy. And it can start there only as we see the defects of our emphasis and practice in relation to Christianity and the nations. A new vision of the Christ and of the largeness of His gospel must be our first insistence.

We must grasp the full meaning of the *Kingdom of God*. We must see it as coming here and now by the establishment of right and kindly relations between all classes of men and between nations and races. We must see that it excludes all forms of special privilege, in politics, in business, in international relations. The Kingdom does not consist in church-going nor in any ritual nor in any emotional experience, help-

ful though these may be for inspiration and spiritual culture. It consists in righteousness and justice, truth and good-will among men. These relations, moreover, we must insist, are not to be limited to neighbors and friends, but extend to every man of every class and nation and race. Any idea of a Kingdom less than this is not the Kingdom of God. God has no pet race or class or dynasty. All men are equally His children and He loves them all and desires that all shall have the fullest opportunity and the richest life possible.

We need to catch some glimpse of the largeness of God's plans for men by recognizing, as Paul did, the providence of God in creating so many and so diverse races. The mystery of the races became clear to Paul when he saw that no one is complete without the rest. While God has no pet race, He nevertheless has given to each race some special character, fitting it for some special service in the human family. Race prejudice would fain have all the "inferior" races of mankind eliminated, or at least kept altogether at a distance. That evidently is not God's plan. He has better things for us, a richer life for mankind than any race could possibly produce alone. We need to recognize that as each individual has his place and value in society exactly because he is an individual, different from every other, so each race and nation can make its effective contribution to the life of the whole only as it is different from every other.

Not only should the churches see this vision of the significance of the races in the Kingdom of God, but they should impart it to the world and help the world to give each race that opportunity which will enable it to make its characteristic contribution to the life of the whole.

We must gain, moreover, a vital grasp on the Christian doctrine of the Atonement. We must regard it not only as a mystery to be appreciated and a doctrine to be believed, but also as a force to control life. Self-sacrificing activity of those who have for those who have not, even though it cost, and cost heavily, is the supreme teaching and practice of Christianity.

This is the secret of its power. Only suffering love can redeem the world—not only the suffering love of God in Christ, but the resulting suffering love of the disciples of Jesus. The doctrine of the Atonement, rightly grasped and lived, throws new light on all man's problems. It becomes a mighty living force for the redemption of the world. For Christ's redemptive work is not complete till all His disciples have shared with Him in His suffering for the sin of the world, that they may share with Him its redemption.

These fresh visions and understandings must be fearlessly and clearly taught in every church and in every land. Lay Christians no less than pastors and priests must be led to see the visions and share in the labors. Only so can they share in the victories. Indeed, only so can the victories be won and world-peace be actually established.

The Christian vision, however, must find expression in man's organized life. Christian citizens must organize in order to realize their ideals for society and for all mankind.

VI

AN ADEQUATE ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCHES

VISIONS and ideals as such are not adequate. They do not realize themselves. Seers of visions must make them real. They must descend from the clouds and walk the earth. In the modern world, however, realization of ideals is practicable only by deliberately organizing for the purpose. It cannot be accomplished by isolated individuals. This work, moreover, should not be left exclusively to peace societies and wealthy individuals. They have done nobly. Jurists, economists, statesmen and philanthropists have made valuable contributions to world-peace by their varied activities. In the determination of historical, economic, legal and social facts, in the suggestion of ways and means, in devising social and judicial machinery and in financing special expensive undertakings, individuals and peace societies have already rendered and may still render services of the highest importance.

But the Church has its own contribution to make, a contribution of inestimable value. Without this contribution world-peace is unattainable. Church membership includes hundreds of millions of men and women already committed to righteousness and justice. They live in many lands and belong to many races. In principle the Church is a world peace society. Pastors and preachers by their very calling should inspire and lead the lay members. This is what pastors are for. If they fail to render this service in the establishment of the world-wide Kingdom of God, they fail in a vital part of their duty. What is now needed is the coördination and focusing of our vast Christian forces on the new problem con-

fronting civilization. This the Church and the Church alone can accomplish. The churches of Christendom, however, as organized at present are not prepared to insist on world-peace. Neither are the religious forces of America. Those individuals and local churches, accordingly, that see the new vision of duty and opportunity must take the initiative; they must organize in new ways.

Some may feel that definite ecclesiastical action calling upon Congress and the nation for specific legislation in promotion of international peace should wait till complete organic church union shall have taken place, and the Church universal can face the world. Decades, however, are likely to elapse before such union takes place. But the world needs world-peace now. An aggressive, constructive and powerful peace program on Christian lines should be started immediately, for the time is opportune. Millions are earnestly calling for it. We stand at the parting of the ways. Europe's tragedy marks a new era in human history; Asia's awakening is pregnant with opportunity for the whole world. Shall world-militarism be the determining feature of the new era, or good-will among the nations? The answer will depend in no small part on the answer of America and American churches. In some way, therefore, the churches must surmount the obstacle of denominations and sects; they must build up their peace organization and swing the whole nation into line with their peace program. If the 24,000,000 Protestant Christians of the United States can be welded into a single well organized body for the effective Christianization of America's international relations and policy, a mighty step forward will have been taken in establishing world-peace; they will also demonstrate to the world the essential unity of the churches.

American Protestant Christians rightly hold that the Church and the state are distinct; that neither should invade the realm and the functions of the other. This principle, however, does not mean that the state may adopt pagan principles of conduct. Yet unless Christians demand that the state be Chris-

tian, non-Christians will inevitably conduct the state on non-Christian principles. And exactly this is the dominant character of the relations of the nations even of Christendom. It is, nevertheless, to be insisted that the state and the Church are distinct and independent. Long experience shows the wisdom of this practice. Never again should the Church utilize civil power for securing its own support or for the supposed promotion of truth or prevention of error. Never again should the state dominate the Church to promote the interests of dynastic, or party, politics.

This principle, however, must not be misunderstood nor misapplied. It should not be used to block the demand of Christian citizens for righteous international policies and relations. While the Church and state are indeed distinct, it is also true that they are intimately interrelated. Christians are citizens and as citizens they may not ignore their responsibilities as Christians. In a democratic land like ours the insistence of Christians that international policies and behavior shall be honest, just and kindly, and the proposal by Christians of measures that adopt such policies and secure such action is not a violation of the principle in question. This insistence may be voiced by established ecclesiastical bodies, or it may be voiced by Christians acting individually or collectively. But, however it is voiced, there is no invasion of the realm of the state by the Church. Has the time not come for Christians to organize their common convictions in this matter? Should Christians not give these convictions efficiency in determining the international relations of our people?

The positive peace program to be outlined in Part III assumes that the time is ripe for this advance. While our churches should leave to the Federal Administration all details as to the execution of international policies, the characteristic moral features of those policies should be determined by the Christian citizens of our land. If we are serious with our world-peace program, the fundamental spirit underlying our international life should not be left without definite considera-

tion and choice. If it is so left, it will be dominated in the future as it has been in the past by that spirit of the world that expresses itself in militarism.

If world-peace is ever to come, it must be achieved by conscious Christian action directing the policies and activities of the state. Anything less involves failure to establish the Kingdom of God in its fullness.

First of all then the churches must organize for the new work laid upon them by the enlarging vision and the deepening conscience of modern Christians.

The proposals here offered build upon the splendid organizations already existing, namely, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and the Church Peace Union. The Federal Council was established in 1908 by the official action of thirty denominations; it includes more than 138,000 local churches having over 17,000,000 members. This Federal Council has established among its many Commissions one on Peace and Arbitration. Here is the vital nucleus for the Protestant Christian churches.

The Church Peace Union came into existence in January, 1914, through the action of Mr. Andrew Carnegie in providing an endowment of two million dollars for peace work among churches. On its Board of Trustees are Protestants, Roman Catholics and Jews. Here is the natural center for the united peace action of those three great religious groups.

Let us now consider how the Protestant churches of America can be so linked up with each other and with all other religious people in this land that they can cooperate effectively to the same great end.

The completion of the peace organization of the Protestants might be brought about in various ways. The following is suggested as perhaps best adapted to avoid difficulties and secure prompt and effective results, and also most easily put into practice. It interferes with no ecclesiastical precedents and puts no new burdens on already existing committees, general assemblies, synods, and annual conferences.

The proposed organization springs from the local churches; these are to unite in Community Church Peace Leagues which in turn are to find their common center in the Peace Commission of the Federal Council. By means of the Federal Council representatives on the Church Peace Union, Protestants can unite their peace activities with those of Jews and Roman Catholics.

(a) **Local Church Peace Committees or Societies.**— Let each church which feels responsibility for Christianizing America's international relations and wishes to share in its realization establish a Peace Committee. Where the peace interest of the church makes it desirable it might well organize a regular Church Peace Society, having its officers and an executive committee.

The following suggestions are offered as methods of activity for Peace Committees in local churches:

1. Secure lists of suitable reading material for lay Christians; local libraries should be consulted. To be supplied with the best and most recent peace literature inquiry should be made of the Peace Commission of the Federal Council (105 E. 22d St., New York). Those who have not kept in touch with the movement in recent years will be surprised at the amount and quality of peace literature now available. Some of it is of thrilling interest.
2. Establish reading circles among its members that they may become intelligently informed on what has been and is now being done by the various peace agencies, as well as familiar with the various proposals, arguments and criticisms.
3. Arrange for occasional public discussions, debates and lectures in the church.
4. Carry out an every-member canvass, seeking to enlist each church member as an active member of the Church Peace League.
5. Promote peace study in the Sunday-school, in the Y. P. S. C. E., in the Men's Club and in any other regular organization of the church. In large churches where there are Peace Societies there might be branches, one for adults, one for young people between fifteen and twenty-five, and one for children, also with their respective committees. They might have occasional meetings in common.

6. Take any other action as may be called for by local, national or international needs.

7. Keep in touch with the peace activities of its own denominational district and national organizations.

The real strength of the movement will depend on the number of the churches and Christians that enter heartily upon the general peace program. All really rests on the local churches. Each church must of course fix its own rules and determine the method of financing its work.

The importance of forming a Peace Society in each local church distinct from the church is greater than might first be thought. The Christians of the country should ere long grapple with problems of legislation dealing with international matters, concerning which there may be grave differences of opinion. The Church as such, either locally or in its synods, general assemblies or other representative bodies, should take no part in these political questions. These questions, however, Christians should not shirk, for, though Christians, they are also citizens. These problems of practical international politics should be kept out of the churches. Ministers should indeed declare with no uncertain voice the call of God to all Christians to enact Christian legislation. But no minister, as a minister, should undertake to tell the people what particular bill is Christian and what is not. Nor should any ecclesiastical body as such undertake to control the voting of its members in regard to any political matter. Every church member, however, who wishes as a Christian citizen to fulfill his Christian duty in international matters that necessarily involve legislation, should unite himself with fellow Christians that think the same way and thus make possible a united Christian campaign for the practical application of the Golden Rule in international matters. The Church Peace Society as here proposed is therefore not merely a group of Christians, but a group of Christian citizens having a definite political purpose, namely the enactment of the Golden Rule into law. The mere fact of church

membership should not of itself alone involve membership in the Peace Society.

(b) **Church Peace Leagues.**—A Church Peace League should be organized in each community by the officers and peace committees of the various church peace movements. It should enroll among its active members all voting citizens who sympathize with the Peace Movement. All who sympathize with the movement but are not voters might be made associate members. Among the duties of members should be an agreement to regard his right to vote as a duty to be exercised conscientiously with a view to the establishment of the Kingdom of God throughout the earth. There should be at least one full meeting of the League annually for the election of officers and appointment of committees.

The following suggestions are offered as methods of activity for Church Peace Leagues :

1. Promote peace interest in churches that have not yet established their own peace committees or societies, persuading them if possible to share in this movement to establish world-peace on Christian principles.

2. Arrange for occasional large public meetings, securing local or national speakers, and providing for peace lecture courses.

3. Provide for inter-church debates, for prize contests and for other meetings calculated to arouse interest and promote intelligent study of the methods and proposals of the Peace Movement.

4. Establish official connection with the Federal Council Peace Commission by reporting annually its officers and committees and work, including the statistics of the year.

5. Serve as a medium of communication and connection between the Peace Commission and the local church peace movements.

6. Act as the official representatives of the local peace interests in dealing with newspapers, libraries, educators, and legislators.

What is now needed is a nation-wide organization of Christian citizens prepared to carry through the Christian program. The American Federation of Labor musters more than 2,000,000

upon its rolls (1914) having gained more than 23,000 members the past year. Every man pays his monthly fee for the support of the local and the national organizations. By this organization of voters the Federation is able to influence local and even national legislation in important matters. Should not Christians unite their forces for the establishment of Christian principles in international relations? Might not the Church Peace Leagues enroll 5,000,000 voters? The responsible leaders should of course see to it that the organization adheres to its program and takes up no issue that does not involve moral international issues. Peace Leagues should not attempt to direct *how* its members should vote; it should only insist that its members vote somehow, each according to his own conscience.

(c) **The Commission on Peace and Arbitration of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.**—As stated above, the Federal Council has already established a Peace Commission. It has been in existence since 1911 and has already done considerable work in the distribution of peace literature as well as in other directions. The Church Peace Union is a product of its activity. Since this Federal Council is the official organ of thirty Protestant bodies, and since its Peace Commission is the regularly established agency for looking after the peace interests of the entire body of churches that compose it, this Commission would seem to be the body for serving as the central clearing house, or, to change the figure, the central power house for the entire Protestant peace movement of the country.

The writer accordingly suggests that the Federal Council Peace Commission, upon the approval of the Executive Committee of the Council, provide—

1. That the Peace Commission shall include in its membership at least one representative from each of the constituent denominations.
2. That every important action of the Peace Commission shall

be reported by its secretary to the national executive officers of each denomination.

3. That every Church Peace League that applies shall be enrolled as an affiliated branch of the Peace Commission. On application for affiliation, and annually thereafter, the League shall report :

- a. The names of its officers and committees.
- b. The names of the constituent churches and their pastors.
- c. The statistics of the active and associate membership of the various Church Peace Societies.
- d. The outstanding features of the year's work.

4. That official bulletins of the Peace Commission shall be published and sent to each branch in sufficient quantities to supply each church with one or more copies as may seem desirable.

In a word, provision should be made for the close linking up of the entire Protestant peace movement of the country so that it may become an increasingly strong, intelligent, and finally effective body when called upon for actual peace work. The relation of the Federal Council Peace Commission to the local Church Peace Leagues would be in substance the same as the relation of the Federal Council itself to the local and state church federations.

Power comes through the complete electrical connections of all the cells in a battery. Isolated churches, however many, like isolated cells, count for little in national affairs.

(d) **The Church Peace Union.**—The Church Peace Union might well be made the highest coördinating center of the Peace Movement of American churches. The Roman Catholic and Jewish churches might be asked to organize their respective local bodies for peace work in harmony with their general principles so as to parallel in some way the peace organization of the Federal Council. And then by mutual agreement these three distinct religious Peace Movements might synchronize and harmonize their activities by means of the Church Peace Union. This Union, moreover, should be the means of coördinating the religious peace movement of America with that of other lands. The World Alliance of the

Church for the Promotion of International Friendship, established in Constance at the outbreak of the war (Aug. 2, 1914), already provides the means for bringing together the Protestant sentiment of the world for the establishment of world-peace.

The question will naturally arise whether there is need for a new organization. Why not let the peace activity of the churches be carried on as hitherto by occasional sermons? If more is needed, are not local branches of the American Peace Society adequate? They could bring together all classes of people regardless of their religious connections. Would not that be better than to establish distinctively Christian groups? Or where Church Federations exist, would it not be simpler for them to establish peace committees to serve the peace interests of their communities? The answer to these queries is entirely a question of *efficiency*. An occasional sermon is not enough, as experience shows, to give the needed interest and intelligence. Except in large centers like New York or Boston, can a peace society that includes members of any religion or no religion really flourish and take in all right-minded men? As for Church Federations, moreover, have they not already their several duties and lines of work definitely laid out? They are busily occupied looking after local interests, and there is quite enough for them to do.

The peace problem still further is one of *international* concern and of surpassing importance; its program is as yet to the minds of most Christians vague and intangible. I fear that if the peace question is merely added as one more duty of the Church Federation, for whose care one more committee is created coördinate with its other committees, the efficiency needed cannot possibly be secured. The international problems and interests of Christianity stand in marked contrast to all local problems and interests. They require, therefore, a corresponding treatment. The entire body of Christian citizens and all who wish actually to promote peace and good-will should be drawn into this movement if it is really

to succeed. *Each local church, therefore, should have its own peace movement; it will reach its highest efficiency only by close affiliation with the Peace League and the Peace Commission.* For the institution of nation-wide movements and international policies, it is of the highest importance that each church shall be in full responsive relation with a common national center. Through such local and national connections it will be possible to organize nation-wide campaigns on emergency questions or push peace policies in legislatures and at elections. Suggestions as to important tasks confronting the Church are described in Part III. Will it be possible to carry them out with any less organization than that here suggested? The unification and consolidation of the peace interests and convictions of Christians as such, therefore, seem important.

If it is desired, nevertheless, to have all local union movements connected in some way with the local Church Federation, it might be effected by providing that the Federation shall undertake the initial work of arousing peace interest in the churches, getting them to organize their local movements, and securing their membership in the Community Peace League. Having accomplished this, the local Federation should then pass over to the League its aggressive peace work. The Peace Leagues might maintain continued organic relations with the Church Federations which brought them into existence by making annual reports to the Federation and by having as members of the executive committee one or more individuals elected by the Federation.

The conclusive reason, however, why the Peace Leagues should be organically distinct from the Federations is because they must in time undertake distinct political activities, into which the Federations as such should not enter.

Neither the Church Peace Union nor the Peace Commission of the Federal Council should, of course, impose any rules or exercise any authority over local movements. Every church and Church Peace League should have complete freedom; it should have full rights of initiative and be able to experiment

with various forms of organizations and methods of activity. Different methods of providing for this new work of the churches will doubtless be found useful. That method which proves most effective in any center is the one to be chosen.

Should Christian citizens generally adopt some such methods of peace organization and coöperation as those outlined above, great things could be accomplished.

1. Intelligent interest and definite knowledge would become quite general among American citizens. This is the primary condition for united and therefore effective action.

2. The Peace Commission, through its bulletins, could keep all the leagues promptly informed as to specific questions and movements. Should legislation be proposed in Congress or State Legislatures inimical to international righteousness and in conflict with treaties, the leagues could be informed and an avalanche of disapproval would overwhelm the legislators, letting them know exactly what the opinion is in regard to the matter held by the peace-loving citizens of America. Should local or national elections involve questions of international right dealing; should men be proposed for office known to be tools of militarism or advocates of unjust legislation, the Christian peace forces, instead of being manipulated and divided by crafty politicians, would have full knowledge of the facts and be able to mass their votes for righteousness and international peace.

3. Positive, constructive national programs in promotion of international righteousness and good-will could be launched and carried through, because of the unification of the forces of Christianity.

There are in the United States (1913) nearly 24,000,000 Protestant church members. There are more than 13,000,000 communicants of the Roman Catholic Church. Who can measure the power of these great bodies for righteousness if they should feel and act unitedly?

Such a peace organization as that here proposed in no wise involves the doctrinal or ecclesiastical differences of the citizens of America. It would bring men of diverse training and tendencies, long isolated by the incident of denominational connections, or the lack of them, into hopeful and joyful co-

operation. It would discover them to each other and promote fellowship and brotherhood along new lines.

This method, however, can be effective only as there is *spontaneous action* by the ministers, deacons, elders, vestrymen, Sunday-school teachers, Young People's Societies, leaders, and responsible members of churches throughout the land. If it is spontaneous it will be effective. If it is only slowly evoked by promoting activities from headquarters, not much may be expected, and the splendid opportunity of to-day will be lost. World-militarism will in the meantime have made still greater headway. But has there ever been a time so suitable as this for the launching of an effective peace movement? Are not professed Christians and all sane men longing for some effective method of overcoming rampant militarism throughout the world? And is it not easy now to show that there is no remedy for world-militarism but the remedy of the Golden Rule?

How in detail this remedy is to be applied is the subject of subsequent chapters. Here I stress the fact that the churches will never contribute their part to the establishment of world-peace unless they undertake it in some organic way. The present divisions in the churches make it imperative that we establish a new organization along new lines. In this new organization everything will be voluntary. No league, no church and no individual citizen will be coerced or compelled or advised by any higher authority to think or do anything that does not commend itself. The Peace Commission will have only so much influence over peace leagues and local church peace movements, and even over individuals, as the reasonableness of its suggestions and proposals may secure.

The proposed method of organization, moreover, in no wise involves in political programs the present ecclesiastical bodies as such. Each individual Christian is perfectly free to follow the dictates of his own conscience as a Christian citizen. In this way the respective realms of the state and the Church are fully respected and protected.

It follows that only as there is spiritual and intellectual unity in regard to peace policies and programs will anything be accomplished. Joyful spontaneity in the service of the Prince of Peace is the only service that He desires or can use. Enforced or unwilling action is contrary to the very spirit of the Peace Movement.

VII

PEACE EDUCATION AMONG THE YOUNG

THE peace organization of the churches is only a means to an end. And the first end is naturally the cultivation among Christians themselves of thorough knowledge of and real interest in the problems and methods of peace. Only so will they take active part in establishing international peace policies. For the day is practically past when international policies are to be settled by rulers. The people in every land are more and more responsible. And just this is one of the ominous factors of the new situation. *Can democracies develop and carry out righteous international policies?* Mass ignorance, race prejudices and national ambitions are facts of malign and terrible power. They largely produce militarism and easily lead to war. Whether or not mass psychology can be controlled and utilized in the promotion of world-peace depends in large measure upon the churches.

The first distinct work to which the Church should set itself, after providing for the development of intelligence among its own members, is the introduction into Sunday-schools of regular instruction in regard to peace. When we consider how much has been accomplished for temperance by systematic teaching of children in schools and Sunday-schools, there is every encouragement to do the same thing for the cause of world-peace.

Pressure should be put on all who prepare regular Sunday-school lessons to introduce not less than once a quarter one lesson on peace. The material is surely adequate to make the lessons of absorbing interest to both pupils and teachers. But of more importance than the formal lessons on peace is the

systematic introduction into every lesson of peace ideals and postulates. For it is a fact that certain parts of the Old Testament may easily and unconsciously be used in the promotion of militarism.

The second great educational undertaking is to do the same thing with regard to elementary and secondary schools. All the historical text-books should be examined with regard to the ideals they seek to establish and postulates they unconsciously leave with the children. Do they glorify wars and military heroes? Is there any corrective exalting the ideals of peace? Do they point out the essential failure of most wars and the inability of war-methods to provide for justice? Do they show that a few heroes gain glory, but that the millions who fight and suffer as a rule gain nothing? Do they teach that though aristocracy and capitalism gain financially, the people pay the bills? Do our histories teach right views of war losses? Or are they vitiated by Bernhardt's illusions? As in teaching temperance it has been found effective not to teach it as a separate discipline, but to teach hygiene and physiology and town and city administration in such ways as to make the correct impressions and leave the right ideals with the children, so must it be done in regard to war and peace. Formal peace instruction to children will probably have no effect so long as our school histories remain what they are.

The Commission on Christian Education of the Federal Council, accordingly, has appointed a Committee on Peace Education whose duty it is to examine all historical text-books with an eye to their influence on the children in regard to the question of peace education. It will also make suggestions as to what is needed by those who prepare and publish text-books. This Commission has already prepared Sunday-school Lessons on International Peace.

The local churches likewise should, through suitable committees, interest themselves in this undertaking. As soon as knowledge of facts has been gained, pressure should be put on school boards and whoever selects text-books to use only those

that leave the right impressions and establish the right ideals. The Peace Commission should, of course, report to all branches the results of its findings; it should suggest wise methods of activity for local work.

This program is not one that will enact itself, although teachers and publishers may be ready, even glad to do their part. Throughout the country there must be intelligent and persistent watching and pressure.

This is a program too that cannot be carried out for the whole country from one central body. Each locality must do its own part, in harmony with the political genius of American democracy.

When the millions of children passing through our schools for a generation shall have been suitably educated along these lines, the United States will surely be ready for an effective world-peace program.

In closing I quote a paragraph from the stirring address of Dr. John Clifford, delivered just after the opening of the war, entitled, "The War and the Churches."

"The Churches must labour to change the thought and opinion of the people with regard to war. Nearly all our teaching about war is wrong. We begin in a wrong way with our children. Boys are taught to play at soldiering, to admire generals as the greatest heroes, and instead of being made sick with the horrors and savagery of war, they are led to regard the soldier's life as noble and glorious, an altogether desirable career. The history we give them is made up of war stories, whilst the heroes and achievements of commerce and literature, of art and science, of morals and religion, are assigned a secondary place. The Churches have to teach that nations are members one of another, that they are interlocked, and that damage inflicted on one is a hurt to all; that war is murder, premeditated, deliberate, unmitigated murder; that the patriotism of peoples is exploited in the favor of military castes and for private firms; whilst the people themselves have no voice in regulating the costs they have to pay or the terms on

which citizens shall kill each other. The Churches should create an educated body of peace messengers, show nations that they should spend money in making apostles and advocates of Christian ideas of war and peace, and not upon the invention of instruments of destruction. Oh! when will the Churches understand their duty and use their opportunity as the representatives of the Prince of Peace?"

PART THREE



A Constructive Peace Program

Fresh visions, peace organization of the churches and peace education of the youth are, however, but preparations for that real and constructive program of Christianity by which alone true world-peace can be established.

At present, as militarists assert and all admit, every nation is actuated by selfishness ; and selfishness is, moreover, regarded as natural and inevitable. International relations from the beginning of mankind have been so selfish and the conduct of peoples and races has been characterized by such brutality, with suffering incalculable, that nearly every people is suspicious of every other. Jealousy, hatred, fear, and revenge control more or less consciously the attitude of each to all.

Permanent world-peace, however, can come only as these feelings are overcome and good-will is established in their place. These animosities, distrusters, indignations, have been evoked by positive deeds. They can be overcome only by positive deeds. The way to conquer evil is to do good. "Overcome evil with good" is a universal principle ; it applies to nations as well as to individuals. Our Christian ideals and practices must now be definitely and consciously applied to nations, to international life. *The golden rule must be given universal application.*

Here, therefore, is the platform of the Christian World-Peace Program. Christians must seek to establish the Kingdom of God on a world-wide scale through methods of *international righteousness and helpfulness*. Nations become friendly only by doing deeds of good-will for each other. Treaties of peace and arbitration are well, but they are not enough. Promises not to declare war until time has elapsed for a commission to investigate and report are thoroughly worth while. They are not, however, adequate substitutes for active good-will and mutual confidence. What the world now needs are international actions that remove now existing suspicions, distrusters, animosities, and prejudices. The following chapters are devoted to concrete suggestions as to how the Golden Rule, the Christian principle of love, may be applied to specific cases.

VIII

FRIENDLY TREATMENT BY A NATION LARGE AND STRONG OF A PEOPLE SMALL AND DEFENSELESS POSSESSING VAST NATURAL RESOURCES: THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

WE first consider the case of the relations of a large and powerful country to a small defenseless one whose territory possesses vast natural wealth, which, therefore, might stimulate greed. Between two such countries difficulties easily arise through aggressive acts of irresponsible individuals. Reprisals occur, force or cunning is used, injustice is done. In these ways mutual animosity and suspicions are developed.

What is the Christian method of dealing with such a situation? To pass from the abstract to the concrete, let us consider the relations of the United States and Mexico.

For a century we have lived side by side. We have not been the best of neighbors; there has been more or less of friction. We have occasionally fought each other. That Mexicans suspect us of aggressive designs and that they regard us as ill-mannered and as cowards and look upon us with scorn and derision are facts that need no elaboration.

They feel that we have repeatedly done them wrong; that we have seized their territory, wantonly invaded their cities, interfered with their sovereign rights. Deeds that we regard as magnanimous they consider pusillanimous. They think that we greedily desire to annex the whole country; we have not done it in the past because we could not; intrinsically cowardly, we have not dared to risk a serious conflict with them. Some of us look upon them with disdain. Their history, their ancestry,

their habits, personal and national, moral and political, fall under our ban. We regard them as intrinsically incapable of appreciating our magnanimity. Whatever we may do to them, kindly and helpful, most believe would be useless. The only way to treat them, many insist, is to hold them in their place by force and punish them when they destroy American property, kill American citizens, or insult the American flag. They cannot possibly attain, it is asserted, that high standard of personal and national life essential for stable government and for international relations of trust and good-will. We even consider the need of intervention unless they stop their revolutions and assure the safety and prosperity of our citizens residing in their land.

What now can be done to change these feelings, ours and theirs? How can we learn to trust and love them and persuade them to trust and love us? How can we discover their good traits and help them to discover ours? How can we become good neighbors to them and help them to become good neighbors to us? How can we establish such right feelings here and there that both they and we shall be convinced that never again will conflicts arise between us? Such are the questions we must answer if we are serious in our proposals to establish world-peace. Not until we have in some way aroused feelings of mutual confidence and good-will shall we have made much headway in establishing permanent peace between us; and, on the other hand, not until these feelings of mutual good-will and confidence shall have developed in us and in them will it be possible or even wise for us or for them to adopt the policy of disarmament. And if America cannot influence her nearest neighbor and enter into relationships of permanent good-will and mutual trust, how can we reasonably expect to influence the whole world? How can we think that other nations whose relations have been far more bitter and disastrous can possibly establish friendship and permanent peace?

What then is to be done to change these international feelings? So long as masses of Americans feel, talk and act as

they do, how can Mexicans help reciprocating? Evil begets evil; ill-will, ill-will.

There is in fact only one possible way out. "The way to resume is to resume." We must begin to practice the Golden Rule in our relations with Mexico without waiting for any change in her or even in our own feelings. We know what is Christian, let us do it. Christian citizens must insist that whatever may be our conceptions of the personal, national or racial defects of Mexicans, our duty as Christians is clear. We must be brothers to them. Even though it cost us much, we must be righteous and kindly.

What then shall we do? It will not answer to be vague at this point; our prescription of remedies must not end with generalities. I venture, therefore, to suggest a number of things that we as a nation might well do in the near future.

1. According to the custom of nations, American citizens are doubtless presenting to our Department of State claims for damages incurred in the recent Mexican revolution. The Department will investigate and, after sifting out what may seem to be false or excessive, will present the bill to Mexico, and in the course of time Mexico will be expected to pay these claims. Here is an opportunity for America. Let the claims be presented, investigated, sifted; let the bill be presented to Mexico, and let her investigate and sift. And then when agreement has been reached as to the amount of the indemnity to be paid by Mexico, let our Department of State be instructed to say that in view of all the circumstances and of our good-will to Mexico, Congress has decided to meet these indemnity expenses itself from our own sources. No further claim, therefore, will be made upon Mexico in this matter.¹

2. To help us become acquainted with the better side of Mexico, let Congress establish fifty scholarships for American college graduates for a year of residence and study in Mexico; let them associate with the best of their people, mastering their language, becoming familiar with their history, ideals, etiquette and customs.

¹ An alternative method would be to allow Mexico to make the payment either in one lump sum or in installments, and then return the same to her.

3. Let Congress also establish, say two hundred scholarships for worthy Mexican youth for study in the United States. Arrangements should be made for such students to live in our best educational circles. Should America's Christian families open their homes to these Mexican students and treat them as we have treated Japanese and Chinese students, what a mighty factor it would be for international acquaintance and good-will!

4. To help Mexico get upon her feet educationally, let the United States appropriate, say \$5,000,000 annually for ten years for elementary non-sectarian education in Mexico with which to erect school buildings and pay salaries of school teachers. It would be well naturally to make certain conditions—agreeable, of course, to Mexico—providing, for example, that she raise a similar sum and that the administration of Mexico's educational department be so conducted as to assure us that our gifts were not absorbed by unworthy individuals or organizations.

5. To help Mexico recover financial prosperity at an early date, might not the United States appropriate \$50,000,000 for the immediate reconstruction of her railroads? This gift also could be made with suitable conditions.

What, I ask, would be the effect on Mexico of such deeds? Who can doubt that their distrust of us would gradually, or perhaps even suddenly, be removed? Would not the inner politics of Mexico undergo thorough transformation through the silent but potent influences of our own political methods and spirit? For knowledge of us and admiration of our methods would surely spring up and sweep through the entire people in the course of a couple of decades. Popular education would advance. The prosperity of Mexico likewise would grow. The financial returns through increasing trade would in the course of a score of years far more than repay our expenditure. But of more value would be the good-will growing between us, and the establishment of lasting peace.

What, too, would be the effect of such a policy on our own people? Beyond question our interest in Mexico's progress and welfare would become fraternal and real. What joy would be ours to see her saved from revolutions and started permanently on the pathway of internal peace and prosperity! We

would see splendid qualities in them that we had not suspected. By establishing right relations, each would reveal to the other his better side and in proportion as we see the better side our mutual esteem would advance.

What, moreover, would be the effect of such a policy on the other nations? They would, of course, distrust us at first; they would suspect us of playing a long shrewd game of some kind. But as time passed and we consistently carried out our program, they also would come to believe and trust us. The nations of South America would be particularly keen in watching us, and later they would develop real confidence in us. For once in the history of the world men would see a powerful nation really Christian in its international relations. Confidence in us would spring up, moreover, in every land. And would they not begin to see that after all "Godliness is profitable for all things," even in international politics?

From every possible point of view, the expenditure of money in the ways indicated would appear to be good business as well as truly Christian.

Some will of course begrudge such sums to aliens. Before completing this program, they will argue, it would cost us more than \$100,000,000. What right have we to take this vast amount out of the pockets of poor American workingmen and give it to worthless Mexicans?

How much, I ask in reply, would we willingly have expended had President Wilson decided to avenge the honor of our flag? Would it not have cost us *many hundred millions in a few months*? Thousands of our young men would have been killed and tens of thousands wounded. By the time all the bills for military and naval repairs had been made and Mexico had been ruled by our army and educated by our teachers, and the pension roll had been completely paid off from fifty to seventy-five years hence, the total would have passed the billion mark.

Does any one doubt, however, that unless we find some way of making friendship between Mexico and ourself, sooner or

later there will be serious conflicts and enormous expenses? So long as suspicions and animosity remain, are not increasing armaments inevitable? But how much will that cost—for us and for them?

If by the expenditure of \$100,000,000 we can establish permanent peace with Mexico, it will be a good bargain. I am not sure that we can do it for so small a sum as that. But whatever the peace method may cost, will it not cost less than the war method? The cost of peace preserved by readiness for war is endlessly expensive. It aggravates suspicion and animosity, and when the "inevitable" conflict comes, the murder, destruction, pillage, crimes and atrocities only serve to inflame feelings on both sides. Whichever side is victorious passions smoulder on for decades ready to be fanned to flames by the breath of circumstance.

The tragedy in Europe to-day is a part result of "glorious" victories on one side and pitiful defeats of a century ago on the other.

To make Mexico truly friendly, then, possessed of absolute confidence in our good-will, we must change our feelings and our conduct toward her; this will surely lead her to change hers toward us. All will see that we really mean it if it really costs us something, and if we keep it up year in and year out. Unless we do this the day will come when America will have to spend hundreds of millions in conflict. And after that the task of making Mexico friendly will be far more difficult and expensive than now.

IX

FRIENDLY TREATMENT BY A POWERFUL WESTERN NATION OF A PEACEFUL EASTERN PEOPLE: THE UNITED STATES AND CHINA

THROUGH the entrance into Occidental civilization of Japan fifty years ago, and but yesterday of China, a new era has opened in the relations of the East and West.

For hundreds of years China, the largest of all the nations, has been the least warlike. Every European nation has found it an easy matter during the past century to browbeat her. Even Japan has done the same in recent decades. For this ill treatment, however, China is herself in part at least responsible.

But China is changing. She has discovered that she can neither ignore nor exclude the white man. She has decided therefore to follow in the footsteps of Japan, familiarize herself with the secrets and methods of the white man's civilization and power, and then defend her sovereignty and demand her rights in ways that the white nations understand, respect and heed.

How then shall America treat China?

To answer this question intelligently we need to ask how we have treated her in the past and how we are treating her now. What has been and what is our national attitude toward China, and what has been and is her attitude toward us?

The story of our dealings with China is as a whole one of which we need not be ashamed. We have not shared in the aggressive designs of European peoples. We have not seized her territory, bombarded her ports, extracted indemnities or pillaged her capitals as have other nations. On the contrary, we have helped preserve her from "partition" at a grave crisis in

her relations with western lands. We returned a considerable part of the Boxer indemnity that came to us. We have stood for the open door and a square deal. Our consular courts have been models of probity and justice. The work of our missionaries in hospitals, education, and in famine and flood relief has been highly appreciated.

In consequence of such factors the Chinese as a nation hold to-day a highly gratifying attitude of friendship toward us. So conspicuous has this friendship and preferential treatment become since the establishment of the Republic that other nations have begun to note it. In the reforms taking place in China, especially in her educational system, in her political and social reorganization, and in her moral and religious awakening, the influence of Americans is far beyond that exercised by any other people.

A more detailed statement in regard to the Boxer indemnity and also concerning the work of missions will enforce the above more general remarks.

During the last decade of the last century China became aroused by the encroachments of foreign nations. Japan conquered her in 1895 and took away Port Arthur. This was immediately returned, however, because of the concerted threat of Germany, Russia and France, who had their own aggressive designs to achieve. Within three years Germany had Kiau Chau; Russia, Port Arthur; England, Weihaiwei; and France, Kwang Chau. Railroad concessions and mining privileges were being urgently demanded by foreign capitalists and speculators. All this, in addition to the so-called opium wars and to various other collisions with aggressive grasping foreigners, led to that extraordinary politico-hysterical movement known as the Boxer Rebellion. It failed, the allied troops easily capturing Peking (1900).

At that juncture America befriended China in an especial way. The United States insisted that, appearances to the contrary notwithstanding, the Chinese Government was still in existence. This, among other friendly acts, preserved China

at that time from suffering "partition among the powers," which partition had been prophesied and was earnestly desired by many.

The allies imposed an indemnity on China, ostensibly to cover expenses, but really to teach China to fear the consequences of meddling with the white man's "rights." It amounted altogether to more than \$687,000,000. America's share was above \$24,000,000, with interest at four per cent., to be paid off in installments, the final payment to be made in 1940. Finding, in 1908, that this sum was far more than the combined expenses of the Peking expedition and the losses of American citizens caused by the Boxer uprising, the United States arranged that the annual installments should be diminished by definite sums. The total thus remitted year by year will amount by 1940 to more than \$39,000,000.

Now this act of mere international justice on the part of the United States has had a wonderful effect on China. It has produced an astonishing attitude of friendship and confidence. The Chinese Government decided at once to utilize the amounts annually remitted as a fund with which to send Chinese students to America. This policy, inaugurated by the Chinese Imperial Government, has been continued by the Republic. There are now (December, 1914) studying in our higher institutions of learning some five hundred Chinese youth. The first group of sixteen Chinese young women to come over on this remitted Boxer indemnity arrived in September, 1914.

The friendship of Chinese for America is also in part due to the wide-spread missionary work of Americans in China. There are to-day in that land some 5,200 Protestant missionaries of whom two-fifths are Americans. Missionary work in China has been in progress for a century with constantly growing volume and power. Missionaries have not only preached the gospel, but they have established schools, built hospitals, published papers, and in times of flood, famine, or epidemic have patiently, courageously and honestly administered large sums in relief work. These varied activities, with many other

influences, have finally won a remarkable victory over indifference, suspicion and opposition. Chinese respect for and confidence in the white man, especially in the American, and China's desire to utilize the best of his civilization, have made rapid strides the past decade. This movement has been re-enforced by the sight of "pigmy" Japan victorious over gigantic Russia, victorious because Japan for forty years had been learning from the West. Abandoning, therefore, her ancient system of classical education and taking up Occidental science, mathematics and history, China is looking, in part at least, to mission schools, and to Chinese trained in them, to teach her. Certain provinces in the north where missionaries were killed and thousands of native Christians were massacred in 1900 have recently placed the care of their entire educational system in the hands of missionaries. Even in matters of law and diplomacy New China is looking to America more than to any other country.

All this is certainly reassuring. But how long may we expect to retain China's gratitude, appreciation and friendship? For a forecast, we need to ask ourselves how we are treating Chinese in America.

When we turn to the story of what many Chinese have suffered here, our cheeks tingle with shame. The story would be incredible were it not overwhelmingly verified by ample documentary evidence.¹ Treaties have pledged rights, immunities and protection. They have, nevertheless, been disregarded and even knowingly invaded; and this not only by private individuals, but by legislators and administrative officials. Scores of Chinese have been murdered, hundreds wounded and thousands robbed by anti-Asiatic mobs, with no protection for the victims or punishment for the culprits. State legislatures,

¹ The student of American Chinese relations should familiarize himself with Prof. M. R. Coolidge's volume entitled "Chinese Immigration." Especially should the significance of the facts be pondered that are presented in the chapters dealing with the enactment of restriction laws and with the treatment of Chinese.

and even Congress, have enacted laws in contravention of treaty provisions. Men appointed to federal executive offices have at times administered those laws and regulations in highly offensive methods.

Throughout this entire period of over half a century Christian churches, nevertheless, that were sending their missionaries and relief funds to China took no active part in securing legislative and political protection for Chinese lawfully in this land. This is one of the amazing anomalies of our times.

Let us consider briefly some of the details of the situation. It will be well to premise that all in all Chinese in America have not been treated badly. In general they have received police protection; their lives have been safe; they have been able to carry on successful business. So attractive to them is the opportunity of life here that they have stayed on and every year not a few succeed in smuggling their way into our land. The dark picture about to be sketched, accordingly, is not to be understood as describing the regular features of Chinese experience.

Adequately to appreciate the full significance of our anti-Chinese legislation we must begin the story with a few quotations from the treaties by which America invited Chinese to this country.

Article V of the treaty of 1868 reads in part:

“The United States of America and the Emperor of China cordially recognize the inherent and inalienable right of man to change his home and allegiance and also the mutual advantage of the free migration and emigration of their citizens and subjects respectively . . . for purposes of curiosity, trade or as permanent residents.”

But Article VI, after promising reciprocal “most favored nation” enjoyment of “privileges, immunities and exemptions,” adds that this does not “confer naturalization” upon their respective citizens. This clause doubtless meant that the mere fact of residence in the other’s land did not of itself alone carry

citizenship in that land. For up till 1880 a few Chinese were granted naturalization in the United States. In harmony with the provisions of this treaty considerable Chinese immigration into the United States occurred during the sixth and seventh decades of the last century.

Anti-Chinese agitation soon developed in the Pacific Coast states. Growing violent in the seventies, it led to the sending of a Commission to China which negotiated the supplementary treaty of 1880.

The principal provisions of this treaty are as follows :

Article I provides that "the Government of the United States may regulate, limit or suspend such coming or residence (of Chinese laborers), but may not absolutely prohibit it. The limitation or suspension shall be reasonable and shall apply only to . . . laborers."

Article II provides that "Chinese laborers who are now in the United States shall be allowed to go and come of their own free will and accord, and shall be accorded all the rights, privileges, immunities, and exemptions which are accorded to citizens and subjects of the most favored nation."

Article III provides that in case of ill treatment the "Government of the United States will exert all its power to devise measures for their protection and to secure to them the same rights, privileges, immunities and exemptions as may be enjoyed by citizens or subjects of the most favored nation, and to which they are entitled by treaty."

Article IV provides that legislative measures dealing with Chinese shall be "communicated to the Government of China," and if found "to work hardship upon the subjects of China, consultations shall be held to the end that mutual and unqualified benefit may result."

In spite, however, of the complete cessation of Chinese labor immigration, and in spite of the promises of our Government to provide protection, "and most favored nation treatment," the unjust and disgraceful treatment of Chinese did not cease. The outrages committed on the Chinese during the eighties were

even more frightful and inexcusable than those of the preceding decade.

In his discussion of the question whether the Federal Government should protect aliens in their treaty rights,¹ Ex-President William H. Taft cites the cases of fifty Chinamen who suffered death at the hands of American mobs in our Western States, and of one hundred and twenty others, many of whom were wounded and robbed of all their property. The list does not profess to be complete. All these outrages have occurred since 1885.

“In an official note of February 15, 1886, riots were reported at Bloomfield, Redding, Boulder Creek, Eureka and other towns in California, involving murder, arson and robbery, and it was added that thousands of Chinese had been driven from their homes.”

None of the criminals were punished in spite of the article in the treaty which expressly provides that in case “Chinese laborers meet with ill treatment at the hand of other persons, the Government of the United States will exert all its power to devise measures for their protection and secure to them the same rights, privileges, immunities, and exemptions as may be enjoyed by citizens or subjects of the most favored nation and to which they are entitled by treaty.” Congress, it is true, has voted indemnities for families of those murdered, but financial remuneration can hardly be supposed to take the place of justice or to be a substitute for observance of treaty pledges.

It is sometimes said that Italians and other aliens suffered similarly from mob violence and they too were not protected, nor were the criminals involved punished, and that therefore China cannot complain of exceptional treatment. But is it not obvious that failure of the United States to fulfill its treaty pledges to Italy and other countries in no wise justifies similar failure toward China? Does it not rather show that the United States is morally culpable for making treaty promises for the fulfillment of which it makes no provision? This moral and

¹Cf. “The United States and Peace,” Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1914.

legal defect has become most conspicuous in our relations to China, but its moral culpability is in no wise lessened—rather it is aggravated—as soon as it becomes clear that the defect is entirely due to the failure of the necessary Congressional action for which provision is made by the Constitution of the United States.

The failure of Congress seems inexcusable for it has found time to enact not only the first general exclusion law in harmony with the treaty with China, but also several supplementary laws, of which important clauses are admittedly in contravention to the treaty.

The Scott Law of 1888 and the Geary Law of 1892 are still in force, though the essential injustice of some of their provisions and their disregard of Chinese treaty rights are now recognized. They are producing constant anti-American feeling among Chinese legitimately in America. Even in cosmopolitan New York and in Boston Chinese sometimes suffer from the senseless and brutal methods of federal officers who supervise Chinese residents in the United States.

With regard to the Scott Law Senator Sherman said that it was “one of the most vicious laws that have passed in my time in Congress.” It was passed as a “mere political race between the two houses . . . in the face of a Presidential election.” Senator Dawes sarcastically referred to keeping the treaties as long as we had a mind to. The law was “a rank unblushing repudiation of every treaty obligation . . . unwarranted by any existing danger—a violation such as the United States would not dare to commit toward any warlike nation of Europe.”¹

With regard to the Geary Law Professor Coolidge makes the following statement :

“Meanwhile the Chinese Minister at Washington, the Consul-General at San Francisco and the Yamen at Peking were also protesting against the act. The Chinese Minister had steadily protested

¹ “Chinese Immigration,” pp. 216-217.

ever since the Scott Act against the plain violation of treaty; just preceding the Geary Act he wrote six letters to Mr. Blaine only two of which were so much as acknowledged. He now declared that the Geary Act was worse than the Scott Act, for it not only violated every single article of the treaty of 1880 but also denied bail, required white witnesses, allowed arrest without warrant and put the burden of proof on the Chinese. He quoted our own statesmen on the harsh and hasty character of the act, not required by any existing emergency, whose political motive was well understood both in China and the United States. In his final protest he said: "The statute of 1892 is a violation of every principle of justice, equity, reason and fair-dealing between two friendly powers."

The history of anti-Chinese legislation as it has been carried through Congress under the pressure of legislators from the Pacific Coast states from the seventh decade of the last century, even down to the present, and the way in which the Asiatic problem has been made the "football of party politics" are ill omens for the future relations of America with the Orient. That legislation has violated plain provisions of the treaties, to say nothing of the spirit, and has disregarded courteous protests of Chinese ministers and ambassadors. China sent in a "stream of dignified and ineffectual protests which has continued to the present time." The Chinese Minister even charged us with duplicity in negotiating the treaty of 1880. "Mr. Bayard assured him that the President would veto any legislation which might be passed in violation of the treaty."¹

Still more surprising and also discouraging is the act of Congress of 1902. It then enacted a law *in flat contradiction to the express terms of our treaty*. Let me specify.

The treaty states that "The United States may regulate, limit or suspend such coming or residence (of Chinese labor immigration) *but may not absolutely prohibit it*. The limitation or suspension shall be reasonable." Congress, nevertheless, after providing in 1882 and in 1892 for two periods of a decade

¹ "Chinese Immigration," pp. 209-233.

each for the temporary suspension of Chinese labor immigration, enacted in 1902 that "All laws regulating, suspending or prohibiting the coming of Chinese persons . . . are hereby reënacted, extended and continued, *without modification, limitation or condition.*"

If the action of Congress has been disheartening, that of the Supreme Court has been still more so, for it sustained (1888) the action of Congress (the Scott Act of 1888) in clear contravention of a still standing treaty (that of 1880), admitting that it was a contravention of the treaty.

Judge Field, who presented the judgment of the court, said: "It must be conceded that the act of 1888 is in contravention of the treaty of 1868 and of the supplemental treaty of 1880, but it is not on that account invalid. . . . It (a treaty) can be deemed . . . only the equivalent of a legislative act, to be repealed or modified at the pleasure of Congress. . . . *It is the last expression of sovereign will and must control.*" "The question whether our government was justified in disregarding its engagements with another nation is not one for the determination of the courts. . . . This court is not a censor of the morals of the other departments of the government."¹

This makes it clear that a treaty is *not* the "supreme law of the land," except as Congress makes it so. Any subsequent act of Congress can repeal or amend any part of a treaty without the consent of the other party to the treaty, and even without conference. Treaties are declared by this decision to have no binding power upon Congress. The Supreme Court declines to take note of the moral obligations of treaty pledges. Aliens deprived by Congress of rights promised by treaties, though still acknowledged as valid, may not appeal to the Supreme Court for the enforcement of those rights. The Administration can use the entire military force of the country to make a foreign nation keep its promises to us, but, according to the interpretation of our Constitution now prevailing, neither the

¹ 130 U. S., p. 600.

Administration nor the Supreme Court can take even legal steps to hold Congress to the observance of treaty pledges. The President has of course the power to veto an act of Congress, but experience shows that even Presidents do not always regard treaties as binding, for all the treaty ignoring laws of recent decades have been signed by the Presidents then in office.

Dr. Bernhard Dernburg, defending Germany's invasion of Belgium, argues that the *United States takes the same attitude toward treaties as does Germany*, and cites this very decision of the Supreme Court rendered by Judge Field. If we maintain that the United States was justified in its disregard of our treaty with China, what right have we to condemn Germany for its disregard of its treaty with Belgium? The degree of the consequences indeed differ enormously, but are not the moral issues identical?

If the faithful observance of treaties between the nations of Europe constitutes the very foundation of civilization, as we are now vehemently told—and this is said to be the real reason why Great Britain is in the war—is not the faithful observance of treaties with Asiatics the foundation of right relations with them? In other words, *do not treaties ratified by Congress have moral aspects which should place them on a higher level of authority than the ordinary acts of Congress?* The disregard by Congress and the Supreme Court of this fundamental principle for the maintenance of right international relations is fraught with ominous consequences. Congress of course has the right to abrogate a treaty, but there is a right and also a wrong way to do it. Is it any more right for a nation to abrogate an inconvenient treaty by simply passing laws in contravention to certain of its pledges than it is for an individual who has made a promise to another individual giving *quid pro quo* suddenly and without conference to ignore that promise? Is it conceivable that Congress would have treated China as it has, had she been equipped as Japan is to-day with the instruments of Occidental civilization?

The latest infringement of Chinese treaty rights is California's Alien Land Law (May, 1913). It was designed particularly to hit the Japanese. But it hits Chinese no less effectively. It provides many important privileges for aliens "eligible for citizenship in the United States." The privileges of other aliens, however, are strictly limited. They may enjoy such as are specified "in the manner, to the extent and for the purpose prescribed by any treaty now existing . . . and not otherwise." It can hardly be maintained that this law intends to grant any aliens ineligible for citizenship "most favored nation" treatment, even though provided by the treaty. Chinese in California were so incensed by this law that they petitioned their government to refuse to participate in the Panama-Pacific Exposition.

In spite, moreover, of the pledge of our government to "exert all its power to devise measures for their (Chinese) protection and to secure them the same rights and privileges . . . as may be enjoyed by citizens of the most favored nation," our government after trying moral suasion on California excuses itself from further effort on the ground that the Federal Government cannot interfere with state rights, apparently unconscious of the fact that there are other methods for solving this problem that would not invade the rights of states. A later chapter will outline a program by which I believe the essential rights of California can be conserved and also those of Asia. Were China and the United States in reversed positions, no such excuses would be either suggested or tolerated.

Now when the Chinese people learn these facts, and when they discover that even the churches of America which for a century have been sending missionaries to China to teach them the gospel of love and truth and righteousness have not made one vigorous protest or any sustained effort to have the American Government keep its treaties, fulfill its promises or enforce the laws protecting Chinese, can Chinese friendship for and confidence in us be maintained? Is it not certain that when

China as a whole learns these things, Chinese friendship and admiration will cease, and serious possibilities arise?

What now shall we do? To see clearly what our duty is, let us realize a little more fully what is involved.

For ages China was so vast, preponderant, self-sufficient and self-satisfied that she simply ignored the white man when he appeared on her horizon. Her haughty manners and methods incensed him deeply. Even the war by which England practically forced opium on China did not apparently disturb her much.

But when port after port was taken by foreign powers, and even an entire province, as when Germany took Kiau Chau (1897) for the killing of two missionaries; and when Russia took Port Arthur (1897), and England Weihaiwei, and France Kwang Chau, "to preserve the balance," and when foreigners were clamoring for and gaining mining rights and railroad concessions throughout China, Chinese began to realize that something must be done, or they would soon cease to exist as a self-governing people.

China's first reaction was like Japan's (1620), namely, a policy of expulsion. That brought on the Boxer uprising (1900). It was, however, too late. The armies of the allies relieved Peking and proved to China that the white man and Western civilization could neither be excluded nor ignored.

After a few years of vacillation, confusion, turmoil and revolution, came Japan's victory over Russia (1905), which announced to the world that an Asiatic race *can* hold its own against the white man and that the way by which to do it is to learn what the white race knows. China listened and learned.

One month after Japan made peace with Russia, China abolished her system of classical education, over 2,000 years old, and started on the new policy. Since then China has been introducing Western education, Western science, Western political life at a tremendous rate. The Manchu dynasty is gone. The characteristic Chinese queue is gone from large sections of China. We now have the beginnings of a new

China, ambitious, energetic, resourceful, progressive and becoming self-conscious. Her young men are in all the capitals of Christendom learning Western ways. As a short cut to Western knowledge, tens of thousands of Chinese students have studied in Japan.

Some decades will doubtless be needed before China will reach the stage of Occidentalization already reached by Japan. But that she will get there is as certain as the rising of the sun.

China is awaking. She is following in the footsteps of Japan, convinced by Japan's victory over Russia that the only way to meet the aggressive white peril is to do what Japan has done—learn the secrets of the white man's power, master modern civilization, and then, arming with the white man's weapons, defend herself from the white man's aggressions and defy his arrogance.

Asiatic acquisition, however, of Occidental civilization, and especially of its armaments, is the beginning of vast interracial military competition, ending doubtless in conflicts, whose results no one can foresee. Incalculable waste of wealth and destruction of life will be inevitable, if the militarism of Europe is taken up by every people of Asia. To-day's tragedy in Europe suggests what must eventually come when every important nation in the East as well is equally prepared by military might either to defend its rights, its honor and its existence against supposed or real aggressions, or possibly to enter upon courses of ambitious expansion and of punitive retaliation.

During his eventful career Emperor William has been guilty of not a few unfortunate utterances. Among them all, however, none is more keenly resented by Orientals and none has had more effect in arousing Oriental antipathy for the white man than his famous "mailed fist" speech on sending his brother Prince Henry to the Far East to avenge the death of two missionaries. "If any one dares interfere with our rights, at them with the mailed fist," he is reported to have said. The result of that expedition was German possession of Kiau Chau,

And not long after, on despatching German troops to take part in the China expedition in 1900, the Emperor personally addressed them in these words:

“When you meet the foe you will defeat them. No quarter will be given; no prisoners will be taken. Let all who fall into your hands be at your mercy. Just as the Huns a thousand years ago, under the leadership of Attila, gained a reputation in virtue of which they still live in historical tradition, so may the name of Germany become known in such a manner in China that no Chinaman will ever again dare to look askance at a German.”

Japanese no less than Chinese resent this utterance of a “Christian” Emperor, and quote it in discussions dealing with the causes of the war.

The problem confronting those who seek world-peace, therefore, is not one that is limited to Christendom. It includes Asia, with one-half the world's population. *The problem for peace advocates, so far as it concerns Asia, is to devise some method whereby Asia may receive such just and honorable treatment by the white nations that she will feel no need of adopting Occidental militarism.* Japan did not receive that treatment. She discovered that only by mastering Occidental military and naval science could she meet and hold back the white man. Is China to be forced by the white nations along the same road? The arguments and proposals of the United States Navy League cannot fail to evoke suspicion in China and to promote militarism there. “Upon the 800,000,000 yellow and brown men of Asia,” it declares, “is now dawning a similar age of electricity and steam and easy communication. . . . The Monroe Doctrine is only as strong as the United States navy.” So threatening does the Navy League regard the Asiatic menace!

A navy consisting of forty-eight “capital” (all-big-gun) ships instead of the present number—eight (building, five)—is being seriously proposed. In proportion as China is threatened, or is even supposed to be threatened, and in propor-

tion as Chinese in the land of white men are refused the rights and the courtesy accorded to men regarded as equals, she will inevitably feel compelled to arm. And in proportion as China arms, white nations will suspect and fear her. We shall feel compelled, not only to keep up our armaments, but to increase and maintain them at a point assuring supremacy. This is the definite proposal of the Navy League. Thus will militarism, with its international hatred, suspicion and distrust, and with its spies, lies and intrigue, be fastened upon the whole world. And the more we arm, the more will they think it necessary for them to arm. Who can foresee the end?

The problem, therefore, to be solved is this: *How to secure for Christendom that attitude toward and that treatment of Asia and of Asiatics as shall make it needless for them to arm? There is only one possible and real solution. It is the consistent and persistent application of the Golden Rule in international politics.* We must deal with Asiatics on a basis of justice and good-will, doing to them as we would have them do to us. But what Western nation will adopt so unselfish an international method? And who are the individuals or the organizations among us that will insist upon it, unless it be Christian citizens? If they do not, what hope is there for the world? The past of the churches, it is true, in regard to war, does not give much ground for hope. Thank God, however, the past is past; we are living in a new era. The Christian conscience is awaking. Not only has science given us a new physical, social and political world, and a new understanding of the past and new ambitions for the future, but the moral forces of Christianity are gaining new vigor. The tragedy in Europe, moreover, is giving us a new vision of international responsibilities and duties, a new sense of world solidarity, of possible world-disaster, and of need of world-remedy. There is good ground for hopefulness.

What then shall we do? First, all Christian citizens must be aroused to their national and international responsibilities.

In addition they must be organized adequately for persistent aggressive campaigns through continuous decades. This is an opportune time for such an appeal. American Christians must make American international policy positively Christian. These are the general principles; but what in particular shall the churches do in regard to China?

1. First of all, treaty obligations must be met; officials who deal with Chinese in America must be just and courteous. Even though Chinese are guilty of breaking our laws, they are to be dealt with righteously and courteously. How are these requirements to be secured? Resolutions passed by ministerial conferences or general assemblies merely urging Congress and administrators to observe treaties will not suffice. Responsible Christian citizens must investigate the situation, find out the facts, formulate a definite Christian policy and the needed legislation, present it to Congress, to state legislatures, to the country, and especially to Christians all over the land, and then at the opportune moment secure nation-wide demand for righteous legislation. If legislators fail us, they must be put down at the polls and men sent up who will enact into law righteous international policies. The matter, moreover, must be followed up after proper legislation has been secured. The actual practice of officials in every city and port of entry must be investigated; officials (a small minority no doubt) who transgress the requirements of the laws, dealing unjustly or even harshly with Chinese, must be dropped and men put into office who will carry out the spirit of our Christian policy. Why should not immigration officials who deal constantly with Chinese be men able to speak their language? Why should they not be friendly with them? Should not discourtesy be a ground for dismissal as well as incompetence in other respects?

The "practical" politician will, of course, laugh at these suggestions as "Utopian"; they are nevertheless the only methods really practical. And, what is more, they can be carried out if Christian citizens demand it and adopt common-sense organized methods and stick to their job to the end.

2. The perplexing problems raised by Asiatic immigration to white men's lands I consider later (Chapter XIV). This, however, may be said at once; I by no means advocate free Asiatic immigration. Rather I propose strict limitation. The only policy permanently satisfactory will be one that not only does justice to Asiatics but that also conserves our distinctive American institutions, and recognizes and provides for the rights of white labor in our own lands. We must find some method of dealing with Asiatic immigration that does full justice both to our own Pacific Coast states and also to our Asiatic neighbors.

3. Our statesmen, moreover, should be directed to seek out practical methods of helping China in matters of education, of industry, and of beneficial international relations. For this purpose our government might well appropriate a substantial sum yearly. In addition to those students who come to America on the remitted Boxer indemnity, let Congress provide scholarship aid for, say two hundred Chinese students each year, to be supported by genuine American funds. Let Congress also provide for scholarships for American students in China.

4. Still further, American statesmen and ambassadors should be instructed to approach each of the European powers with a view to securing from them assurances in regard to the permanent integrity and independence of China. *International plans should be made and agreements entered upon at an early date for the return to China by the European powers of all the sections of her territory that have been taken from her.* Naturally, this return must be arranged for in such wise that injury shall not be done to private individuals. Such return can, of course, be effected only when China is prepared to administer these "concessions" with justice and equity to all. But the knowledge on the part of China that the Powers are ready to return these ports and provinces as soon as she qualifies for their administration would not only remove animosity and suspicion, producing a fine feeling of trust and good-will,

but would be a powerful factor in the promotion of Chinese development.

What now would be the effect of such a policy toward Asiatics upon our own people and upon Christendom? Would there not arise among us a new mental and moral attitude toward Asiatics as such? Would we not rejoice in their progress rather than fear it? Would we not discover in them traits of character and aspects of culture commanding our respect? Would we not be ready to learn from them those achievements in art and mental poise in which they surpass us? And would not this new attitude of the West to the East prove highly valuable in overcoming prejudice and antipathy among us and also among them?

Who can estimate, moreover, the effect of such a policy upon China? Would it not produce that attitude of confidence in us and in Christendom that would inhibit all thought of arming? If we voluntarily do them justice and help them, for what would they arm? How earnestly and how rapidly China would learn our ways and enter into world-life! Instead of wasting precious wealth on armaments, China could utilize all her resources for education, for roads and railroads, for factories and mines and rolling mills, for dyking rivers and building her merchant marine. What prosperity this would bring to China! And how the nations trading with China would share in that prosperity!

Consider also the effect on every other nation of our adoption of such a generous policy toward China. When they see us giving justice to the Chinese in this country and observe that no harm comes of it, but rather that mutual advantage is the result, will not European scorn for "Asiatic barbarians" vanish, and they too begin to deal justly with them and feel right toward them?

Is it not clear, moreover, that only some such policy can possibly prevent China from arming? But if China arms, world-militarism, as we have seen, is practically inevitable. Is it not clear that any other international policy than that of

the Golden Rule is bound to fail? The only really practicable peace program for the world is the Christian program.

Surely the time will come when the nations will look back with astonishment on their present hatred toward each other and their vast military equipments for mutual destruction.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER IX

Professor Coolidge sums up the discussion of "Chinese Immigration" in a highly valuable "Conclusion," from which we quote the following paragraphs :

"The remedies for the impolitic and unjust treatment of the Chinese by the United States are already suggested by the history of immigration, detailed in the previous chapters. They are obviously a reasonable administration of the laws in force by non-partisan officials, and the modification of the law to harmonize strictly with whatever treaty may be negotiated. Already the first step toward practical repentance has been taken in the open acknowledgment by American officials that the law, as it stands, is a violation of the treaty, and that its administration has been unwarrantably harsh.

"But neither acknowledgment nor apology will serve as a remedy while the same laws, the same officers and the same methods are continued. If all the hostile traditions of the Chinese Bureau could be at once destroyed, there would yet remain a mass of contradictory laws and decisions, and a machinery for exclusion which must inevitably work injustice. To renovate, to modify, perhaps to do away with a large part of the existing bureaucratic practice, is a work for new men. It is a work for men with a knowledge of world relations broad enough to enable them to see that the period of exclusiveness is past, not merely for China but for other nations as well; or, if not wholly past, so limited in its scope that those nations that would maintain it for their own protection must give *quid pro quo*—equal value for the industrial and commercial privileges which they demand in Oriental countries.

"It is not the province of the historian to devise a technical solution for the inadequacy of either laws or methods, but rather to point out those principles which have emerged fully justified from

the examination of the past fifty years and by which the men of this generation must be guided if they would not repeat its experiments, errors and injustice. Nothing is clearer than that *all the evils of Chinese immigration, both real and prospective, have been greatly exaggerated*;¹ now that it is all but past it appears that the Chinese who would not or could not assimilate have gone home or are dying out in this country without descendants, leaving only the memory of their industry, their patience, their picturesque attire, and the labor without which California would have been infinitely less rich and comfortable than it is. *The few hundreds who have tried to assimilate with us are living peaceably and usefully with their families, bringing up their children in American fashion with American ideas and contributing as stable and useful a factor as any foreign element in California to its cosmopolitan population.*

“*In the light of this result there seems to be no reason whatever to debar the Chinaman any longer from naturalization when he shall have fulfilled the new law which requires five years continuous residence, a declaration of intention two years in advance, ability to speak the English language, and a renunciation of allegiance to his native country.*

“It has been for many years the unanimous opinion of those who have made a study of the Chinese in this country that *if they had been naturalized even in small numbers it would have caused their rights to be respected and would have protected them from many of the outrages which they have suffered.* It is not to be expected that the illiterate European foreigner, conscious of his own value as a potential citizen and intoxicated with the apparent license of an easy-going democracy, should respect the yellow man whom he cannot understand, of whose economic competition he is afraid, and whom the native American has considered unworthy of naturalization. *The denial of naturalization can no longer be justified by the excuse that the Chinese are inferior either intellectually or industrially; or that they are anarchistic and incapable of citizenship; or that they are vicious, unstable and immoral.* Fifty years of experience with them here and the disclosure of their national characteristics at home has shown that they are quite as desirable, tested by the ordinary tests of immigration, as many that we have already received and assimilated, and perhaps even more so than many that are now coming into the country.

“One of the most astonishing things in connection with the ex-

¹ Our italics.

clusion of the Chinese is the fact that the general immigration laws shutting out undesirable aliens—diseased, paupers, insane, criminal and the like—were not applied to the Chinese until 1903. They were constantly charged with all these defects, but the California statesmen who secured the exclusion laws never asked that the general exclusion law be applied to them. The records of prisons, asylums, hospitals and almshouses after fifty years show why; if those laws alone had been applied to the Chinese there would have been very few shut out—too few to suit the advocates of no-competition with American-European labor.

“It may as well be confessed that the sole basis of the present exclusion of Chinese laborers from the United States is their virtues, not their vices, either positive or negative. They can assimilate and have assimilated in small numbers under most adverse conditions, along with many Europeans; they can and do raise their standard of wages and of living to those of many European immigrants; they have a less proportion of paupers, insane, criminal and diseased persons in proportion to their numbers than most of the foreign-born in this country. They are, in fact, industrious, thrifty, shrewd, conservative, and healthily selfish—like many Europeans.

“They were excluded because they were a menace to American labor—by which is meant a menace to the policy of monopoly of labor which is the present ideal of the American trade unionist. Yet it may be doubted whether Chinese labor is any greater menace to the growth of free, self-respecting, rationally organized labor than the less desirable of those European thousands whose low standard of living, wages and intelligence now threaten it; for these comparatively unintelligent and underfed additions to the body of labor must continually be educated, absorbed and uplifted by the partially Americanized laborers already in the field.

“The Chinese, on the contrary, are already thoroughly organized, trained in the essential principles of trade unionism and the benefit society; and they afford an extraordinary opportunity for trade unionism to strengthen itself in California if race prejudice did not prevent.

“From the Chinese standpoint, *nothing has been more illogical and unwarrantable in the treatment of the Chinese in the United States than the denial of our treaty obligation to protect them.* The hiatus between State and Federal control in our national constitution which permits the Federal Government to refuse protection to

foreigners on the ground that it cannot interfere with a state ; and which allows any locality to practice race discrimination and its criminal classes to perpetrate injuries,—protected by local sympathy from interference by state authorities and leaving no means of redress except through local courts permeated by the same sympathies—is an inexplicable weakness in the mind of a Chinaman. China may be slow to coerce or to interfere with local authorities, but she has never denied the obligation nor refused to pay ample indemnity for injuries upon Americans in China. The more aggressive nations whose emigrants have received injuries in this country have shown an intention to demand the fulfilment of such treaty obligations. President Harrison expressed the opinion that it was not only possible but desirable for Congress to make offenses against the treaty rights of foreigners domiciled in the United States cognizable in the Federal courts. Recent outrages and discriminations in the case of the Japanese have again brought the question into prominence, and foreign nations, including China, will be likely in the future to demand a fulfilment of such treaty promises.

“ But the history of Chinese immigration to the United States, however interpreted, constantly returns to *two considerations : the violation of treaty stipulations by legislation ; and the extension of legislation by official regulation. Both together have resulted in the loss not only of our prestige in China but of the good feeling long standing between the two nations.*

“ The imperative reforms demanded in the light of the history of our treatment of Chinese immigrants is that the law should strictly conform to treaty phraseology and intent ; and that the regulations necessary to enforce that law should as strictly conform to the reasonable interpretation of both treaties and legislation. To this end *the immigration service must be purged of officers imbued with the anti-Chinese traditions of past administrations, from dishonest and incompetent employees ; and from the overweening influence of organized labor, whose nominees cannot or do not carry out the law for the interest of the country, nor with equal justice to the Chinese, but solely in the interest of their class.* Although the Chinese exclusion law was made at the demand and by the representatives of organized labor chiefly, it does not solely concern them ; the propagandists of trade, religion and international friendship have an equal right to be heard. The law should therefore be a reasonable compromise to meet the demands of all the classes concerned.

“After all, the exclusion of Chinese labor, acquiesced in by many who have not approved the method, is not the immediate and vital question. It is rather, *whether a bureau of officials and the consular service shall continue to jeopardize the relations of two nations by methods of administration unwarranted either by treaties or legislation or even by the selfish interests of the country.* In short, whether the non-laboring Chinese shall not be treated with such courtesy as befits the people of a most favored nation. The remedy for present conditions necessarily involves special and highly trained officers of the service stationed in China; the devising of a passport which upon identification shall be final, not mere prima facie evidence of the Chinaman's right to enter this country; and such that when here he shall be free from molestation. It involves also a new registration of all the resident Chinese and a non-partisan board of inquiry or an immigration court, to which all debarred Chinese may appeal.

“Some of these obviously imperative reforms are already bruited but they will be purely superficial in their effect unless a strict conformity of laws and regulations with the treaty is secured; for without this formal legislative expression of our intention as a nation to fulfill our obligations, the friendship with China cannot be restored nor her coöperation be obtained; and without her coöperation no immigration service established in China on the part of the United States can attain satisfactory results.”

X

FRIENDLY TREATMENT BY A POWERFUL WESTERN NATION OF A POWERFUL EASTERN PEOPLE: THE UNITED STATES AND JAPAN

TENSION exists to-day between Japan and America. Papers in both countries frequently assert in startling head-lines that war is certain. Multitudes in both lands accept these statements without question, and are developing mutual suspicion, distrust and animosity. Many false stories are widely circulated in each land about the other which are readily believed.

What now should American churches do to establish right relations, overcome this growing animosity, remove this tension, and stop the frequent war scares? This is a matter of importance. It involves, however, delicate questions and far-reaching considerations.

When Japan first came in contact with the white man (1553), she welcomed him. For sixty years she gave him full opportunity. Several hundred thousand Japanese became Christian. But when Japan learned of the white man's aggressions and ambitions, she concluded that the white man meant a White Peril, to avoid which she turned him out, exterminated Christianity and for 250 years carried out her policy of exclusion.

By that policy, however, she lost the stimulus of international life and fell behind. In 1853, when Commodore Perry knocked at her doors, she discovered how belated and helpless she was, due to her policy of exclusion. She wavered for a decade, suffered revolution due to conflicting conceptions as to the right way in which to meet the white man, and finally, late in the sixties, adopted the policy of learning the

secrets of his power, in order thus to maintain national existence and honor on a basis of equality with him. This has been Japan's controlling ambition for fifty years. Her success was proclaimed by her war with Russia. Japanese cannon at Mukden were heard around the world, proclaiming to the white man the end of his undisputed supremacy, and to the Oriental the way in which to meet the White Peril. All Asia awoke to hope and effort.

Japan, however, is not satisfied with mere existence. That indeed is assured, provided she maintains adequate military and naval forces. But her citizens are not admitted to equal treatment, rights and opportunities with those of other lands—in America, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and British Africa. Her sense of national dignity is affronted. The limitations recently placed upon her by California, and the anti-Asiatic policy urged by the Pacific Coast on the United States as a whole has pained her deeply. Our action is regarded as contravening our treaty pledges. Should general Asiatic exclusion laws be enacted, Japan would regard them as highly humiliating.

This situation is the more painful to her because until lately our mutual relations have been ideal, helpful, friendly. For more than forty years Japan has been profoundly grateful to the United States. We brought her out of her long seclusion—watched patiently over her, guided her through those trying decades when she was first learning from the masterful white man the ways of the modern world. We protected her interests in international matters. We returned in 1868 the Shimonoseki indemnity (\$785,000). Thousands of Japanese students have had ideal treatment in our high schools, colleges and universities and even in our Christian homes. Our aid and support at the time of the war with Russia were invaluable to her and were highly appreciated. While there are doubtless Jingoës in Japan who have uttered foolish words and threats, the prevailing temper of the people as well as of the government has for decades been one of gratitude and good-

will. In spite of recent rebuff, anti-Asiatic legislation, unkind words, a suspicious attitude, and unfriendly treatment, there has been in Japan a remarkable spirit of patience and moderation. The Japanese are still proceeding with expensive plans for the Panama-Pacific Exposition at San Francisco, expending thereon nearly two million dollars.

Japan is still hoping that some method will be found of providing for California's just demands without subjecting her to humiliation. She has taken at its face value the first treaty she ever made with a white race, namely with America, which reads:—"There shall be perfect, permanent and universal peace and sincere and cordial amity between the United States and Japan and between their people respectively, without exception of persons and places." This friendship, solemnly pledged, has been loyally carried out by Japan. But it cannot be denied that her friendly feelings and her admiration for America have considerably cooled. Many indeed are indignant; all are waiting eagerly to learn if America as a whole will support the anti-Asiatic policy so urgently pressed by the Pacific Coast legislators. Indefinite continuation, however, of Japanese patience under treatment regarded as humiliating is not to be assumed.

In California and indeed throughout America wide misunderstanding prevails as to what Japan wants. Not for free immigration does she ask. She recognizes that any large entrance of Japanese labor into America would produce both economic and racial difficulty. She is ready to do anything consistent with national honor to save America from embarrassment on both lines, as her faithful administration of the "Gentleman's Agreement" witnesses. She is willing to continue holding back all Japanese laborers from coming to this country.

What Japan earnestly asks is that there shall be no differential race legislation; for it is regarded as invidious and humiliating. For those Japanese who are lawfully here she asks the treatment which is promised by the treaties and is

accorded to citizens of other lands. Japan stands for national dignity and honor in international relations. She asks for full recognition among the nations. For this she has been strenuously striving for half a century. Is she not to be respected for it? Is not this sensitiveness and insistence one of the evidences that she deserves it? Economic opportunity in California is not the point of her interest or insistence, but recognition of manhood equality. Is not the honor of a nation of more importance than everything else? Is the maintenance of friendship possible between two nations when one insists on treatment or legislation that humiliates the other?

If now America desires to maintain the historic friendship with Japan and do her justice, we must first of all understand the real point of her contention. We must look at the questions involved from the standpoint not only of our interests but also of hers; we must gain her viewpoint, appreciate her problem, sympathize with her efforts, and recognize her attainments. As an aid in this, let us first seek the exact facts as to the treaties concerned and the laws involved.

The treaty under which practically all the Japanese came to America was promulgated in 1894. Among its reciprocal pledges are the following:

“The citizens or subjects of each of the two high contracting parties shall have full liberty to enter, travel, or reside in any part of the territory of the other contracting party, and shall enjoy full and perfect protection for their persons and property.

“In whatever relates to rights of residence and travel; to the possession of goods and effects of any kind; to the succession to personal estate, by will or otherwise, and the disposal of property of any sort and in any manner whatsoever which they may lawfully acquire, the citizens or subjects of each contracting party shall enjoy in the territories of the other the same privileges, liberties, and rights, and shall be subject to no higher imposts or charges in these respects than native citizens or subjects or citizens or subjects of the most favored nation.”

Under these provisions over 70,000 Japanese, mostly laborers,

came to America, over 50,000 settling in California. Of these the large majority, contrary to the habit of immigrants from most lands, and especially from China, pushed out into the country and became farm hands. At first none of them expected to remain for more than a few years. They sought good wages and had no thought of permanent residence or of land purchase. But as the years passed and they became accustomed to the new conditions and realized the superior advantages afforded them in America, their plans of life, even their ideals, began to change. In proportion as they became Americanized a return for permanent residence in Japan became distasteful to thousands.

Accordingly, the more thrifty began to purchase property by means of their hard earned and carefully treasured cash. Many began to bring over their wives. During the past three or four years several thousand women have come to join their husbands. It has now become evident that Japanese have come to America to stay. The attraction is not merely that of superior economic advantages, but especially those of liberty and expanding opportunity in every line. Immigrants from every land who have once become Americanized highly prize the land of their adoption.

Meanwhile, however, difficulties inevitably arose between the bright, capable, ambitious, and in many cases unscrupulous Japanese laborers and labor bosses, and their white employers, and especially their white competitors. On both sides no doubt wrong was done; advantage was taken of helplessness, strikes forced wages up. The long standing anti-Chinese feeling and agitation was soon transferred from Chinese to Japanese.

Not, however, until 1906 did the anti-Japanese agitation lead to overt acts. Although in California strong local feeling was developing, it had not marred the historic international friendship. In that year, however, the San Francisco School Board established an Oriental school for Chinese, Japanese and Korean children. In support of the act all sorts of falsehoods were circulated regarding Japanese; lurid pictures were drawn

of Japanese young men sitting at the same desk with young American girls.

Japanese in California, and also in Japan, were highly incensed by the insulting falsehoods which aspersed the moral character of the entire nation. The total number of Japanese children involved was but ninety-three and they were distributed through twenty-three schools, and the number of boys over seventeen years of age was only twelve. Inasmuch as the action was in contravention of the treaty, both of the words and of the spirit, the Japanese Government took up the matter diplomatically. The prompt action of President Roosevelt secured a solution by consultation with the California authorities who modified their action and by the arrangement with Japan known as the "Gentleman's Agreement."

The authorities on both sides of the Pacific had become convinced that continued unrestricted Japanese labor immigration would lead to increasing anti-Japanese agitation and legislation. Japanese, however, would keenly resent differential race legislation as humiliating. In order to avoid these ominous difficulties a mutual understanding was reached between the two governments that Japan would voluntarily withhold all Japanese labor immigration to this land. This agreement has been so effectively carried out since 1907 that the number of Japanese in America has diminished by nearly 7,000.

After the matter had been thus satisfactorily settled, Senator Elihu Root in an address reviewed the whole case, asking what were the real questions at issue (April, 1907). He showed that "there was *no question of States' Rights* involved," for the treaties are the "supreme law of the land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding" (U. S. Constitution, Art. VI). Senator Root, after many quotations from the Constitution, treaties and laws involved, says:

"No State can set up its laws as against the grant of any particular right, privilege, or immunity any more than against the grant of any other right, privilege, or immunity. *No State can say a treaty*

may grant to alien residents equality of treatment as to property but not as to education, or as to the exercise of religion and as to burial but not as to education, or as to education but not as to property or religion."

Senator Root concludes that the real question at issue was this: "Are the people of the United States about to break friendship with the people of Japan?" He thought it had been happily answered in the negative. The importance of maintaining friendship he urged in most impressive words.

"It is hard for democracy to learn the responsibilities of its power; but the people now, not governments, make friendship or dislike, sympathy or discord, peace or war, between nations. In this modern day, through the columns of the myriad press and messages flashing over countless wires, multitude calls to multitude across boundaries and oceans in courtesy or insult, in amity or in defiance. Foreign offices and ambassadors and ministers no longer keep or break the peace, but the conduct of each people toward every other. The people who permit themselves to treat the people of other countries with discourtesy and insult are surely sowing the wind to reap the whirlwind, for a world of sullen and revengeful hatred can never be a world of peace. Against such a feeling treaties are waste paper and diplomacy the empty routine of idle form."

But the anti-Japanese movement in California was not to be so easily overcome as Senator Root anticipated. Agitation continued, which finally resulted in the Alien Land Law of California, enacted in May, 1913. The treaty with Japan had in the meantime been modified, unfortunately for Japan, as events have proved. The provisions in the treaty of 1911 particularly involved are the following:

"The subjects or citizens of each of the high contracting parties shall have liberty to enter, travel and reside in the territories of the other, to carry on trade, wholesale and retail, to own or lease and occupy houses, manufactories, warehouses, and shops, to employ agents of their choice, to lease land for residential and commercial purposes, and generally to do anything incident to or necessary for trade, upon the same terms as native subjects or citizens, submitting themselves to the laws and regulations there established.

“The subjects or citizens of each of the high contracting parties shall receive, in the territories of the other, the most constant protection and security for their persons and property and shall enjoy in this respect the same rights and privileges as are or may be granted to native subjects or citizens, on their submitting themselves to the conditions imposed upon the native subjects and citizens.”

The anti-Japanese agitators took the ground that Japan was not to be trusted in the administration of the “Gentleman’s Agreement”; that there was imminent danger of an increasing and finally overwhelming Japanese labor immigration; that Congressional Japanese exclusion legislation was needed similar to that enforced against the Chinese; that until that was secured California should take independent steps by which to defend herself from the danger.

To justify these contentions a fresh batch of exaggerations and falsehoods was spread abroad over the state and nation. It was asserted that Japanese were buying land so rapidly that there was danger lest they buy up all the best farm lands in the state; that they were swarming in over the Canadian and Mexican borders; that they were aided by the Japanese Government and even provided with funds with which to buy land.

The state statistician showed that 331 Japanese owned less than 13,000 acres of farm land, and that some 17,500 acres were leased to Japanese.

To meet this “threatening danger,” in the two sessions of the California legislature meeting in 1911 and 1913, fifty-one drastic bills were proposed, all of which were reported to Japan and served to check Japan’s friendliness and to stir up animosity.

The Alien Land Law, passed in 1913, aroused such feeling in Japan that President Wilson sent Secretary Bryan to the Pacific Coast to try to prevent its passage, but in vain.

The law discriminates between the rights granted to aliens eligible for citizenship and those not eligible. The law is adroitly worded. By express terms it professes to grant to aliens ineligible for citizenship all rights specifically guaranteed by treaty, but no more. It in fact, however, withholds the

right to transmit real property to heirs which seems to be granted by the treaty. But the chief cause of Japanese objection to the law is its invidious differential race treatment, which differential treatment, however, is securely grounded on the differential race treatment of the Federal Government itself, which holds that all Asiatics are ineligible for citizenship. If Asiatics are intrinsically unfit to become citizens anywhere in the United States, why is it not right for California to refuse them privileges allowed to aliens eligible for citizenship which renders residence in that state less attractive?—such is California's very logical contention.

As it has become clear that California's Alien Land Law is firmly grounded upon the national refusal of citizenship to all Asiatics, Japanese resentment, which was first directed against California, is now beginning to turn against the United States as a whole. They begin to feel that the spirit of all American-Japanese treaties is being broken, and that the professed friendship of America for Japan has not been sincere.

A detailed statement of the California-Japanese contention is highly technical and would demand a full and long chapter.¹ The judgment of the writer, after considerable study of the matter, is that Japan makes out its case, namely, that the California law contravenes the treaty provision; that the counter-argument presented by the Department of State evades the real issue; that its refusal to take the next logical step, namely, provision for a test case in the Supreme Court, is not adequately grounded; and that the allowing of the matter to remain in the present deadlock is producing a serious international situation, for Japan is coming to the conclusion that we either will not or cannot execute our treaty pledges; that is to say, our treaties are practically "waste paper," if a state chooses to override them.

What now have the American churches done or tried to do

¹ Those who desire to study its details should by all means procure the published correspondence between the Japanese and American Governments.

to correct the evil? They keep on, it is true, supporting the missionaries in Japan; they hear them speak at missionary gatherings and listen to their missionary sermons. But as a whole the churches of America have been quite indifferent to the entire campaign of international slander fomenting distrust and ill-will, the sinister harbingers and real causes of international conflicts. As a rule Christians throughout the land accept what the yellow press says instead of what the nine hundred American missionaries in Japan know. American opinion of Japan has been practically transformed during the past half dozen years by the countless anti-Japanese utterances of irresponsible or scheming men widely proclaimed by the sensational press. The churches do not yet perceive that the only real "yellow peril" to-day is the "yellow press," and the anonymous inventor of malicious news. The success of the yellow press may ultimately create a real yellow peril in the decades to come.

Our relations with Japan are somewhat ominous, but by no means critical as yet. She has been waiting for our churches to act. When California's anti-Asiatic legislation in 1913 evoked in Japan an anti-American wave of indignation, Count Okuma stated that Japan's hope lay in an appeal to the Christians of America. But what response have the churches made? The majority of them have never even heard of it. On the contrary, led by our unchristian press, multitudes are highly suspicious and are coming to believe that war with Japan may be "inevitable."

There is, however, no danger of war between Japan and America if simple justice is maintained in our international relations. Neither country will be so foolish as to attack the other. Nevertheless, there is arising mutual suspicion, distrust, animosity and resentment which are in themselves unchristian; they find expression in conduct, and especially in the popular press, which foments the difficulty rather than allays it.

Many in this country and Europe are already looking forward to the day when all Asia, united and armed as Japan is

to-day, shall confront the white man. If the white races follow the policy of Asiatic exclusion and disdain, grounded exclusively on race difference, will not our attitude evoke a corresponding attitude on the part of Asiatics? But if enmity widely prevails in Asia against the white man there will also be suspicion and unfriendly deeds; and these will be reciprocated by the West. And because of this mental condition there will be felt in both East and West the need of progressive armament to preserve peace and prevent attack.

The present policy, therefore, so widely adopted by the white race in Canada, on our Pacific Coast, in New Zealand, Australia and British Africa, the policy of invidious differential race treatment, and of holding these vast, sparsely peopled continents for exclusive opportunity for the white man, regardless of the conditions, needs or abilities of the other races, this, I say, is a policy fraught with grave danger.

So far as the relations of Japan and America are concerned differential race legislation is needless, for under the effective operation of the "Gentleman's Agreement" Japanese labor immigration has ceased and the number of Japanese in America has already diminished. There is, therefore, no danger whatever of a swamping Japanese invasion nor of any considerable purchase by Japanese of agricultural or other land. The number of acres bought by Japanese during the two years preceding the passage of the law was less than 2,000, and the total acreage owned by Japanese November, 1914, was, as we have seen above, less than 13,000 acres divided up among 331 farms.

The proposal, therefore, for Japanese exclusion legislation is misleading; for it implies an issue which does not in fact exist.

It is humiliating to Japan; for it misrepresents her attitude and conduct, treats her as though her "Gentleman's Agreement" could not be trusted, and ignores her friendship, which, however, has been consistently maintained for sixty years.

It disgraces the United States by presenting us in a wrong attitude to a friendly nation and also by making it appear that

we cannot distinguish between facts and illusions. We seem to be ruled by hallucinations.

This agitation on the Pacific Coast is positively injurious ; for it antagonizes Japanese landowners, interferes with the process of their assimilation, and tends thus to keep them as a permanently alien element in the midst of our people, helping to create the very difficulty it fears.

It is based on ignorance of the Japanese. It exaggerates their defects and overlooks their virtues.

The whole agitation is unscientific. It does not seek accurate and verified facts ; being highly suspicious, it accepts as true every maligning story. Moreover, it defends and justifies itself by discredited theories of race psychology and sociology. It confuses biological and sociological assimilation, regarding the two as inseparable.

It is unjust and unkind. The spirit which prompted the fifty-one bills in the last two sessions of the California legislature is not one that seeks to deal justly or kindly with the stranger in our land. We criticise the Japanese for lack of the spirit of fair play and for failure to keep an open door for us in Manchuria. Are Americans carrying out the spirit of fair play and an open door ?

The anti-Asiatic policy, moreover, ignores the new Orient and the entire modern situation. The world has irrevocably entered on a new era of human development. All the nations of the Orient are awakening to a new life and a new self-consciousness ; they are increasingly sensitive to their plight, their needs, and their rights. They are also developing military power. All this is ignored.

It is willing to create international difficulty and promote increasing alienation of Asiatic good-will. As Mr. Rowell well says, "ninety-nine per cent. of the whole Japanese question is National and International." The policy in question ignores the large relations and seeks to settle the local problem exclusively from the standpoint of local interests.

It is short-sighted. Even from the standpoint of selfish in-

terests, it is calculated to bring disaster. Our international commerce depends in no small degree on the good-will of the purchasing nations. The Chinese boycott of 1905-6 shows what possibilities lie in that direction. All the nations are competing in the Orient for commercial opportunity. Should wide-spread and strong anti-American feeling in Japan and China be put into the commercial scales, who can foretell the results to our commerce?

Moreover, this anti-Japanese agitation little notes how important for the promotion of a higher standard of living and of wages in the Orient is the movement back and forth of considerable tides of Asiatic travel of members belonging to the industrial and agricultural classes. In proportion as the standard of living advances in Asia will the coming economic and industrial competition of those lands with ours be lessened in severity.

Nor does this agitation recognize the benefits, direct and indirect, that would come to our land as the decades pass through the presence here of Asiatics. Those who despise and dislike them cannot apparently see these benefits. Nevertheless, there will be such, not only in the manual work done by them, but also in the realm of culture, of religious feeling, and of art. Of these latter benefits little, it is true, has yet been received; the time has been too short, and our attitude toward Asiatics has been too unfavorable. We have lacked the teachable spirit. Moreover, those who have come to us from Asia have encountered severe economic struggles and social ostracism. Should Asiatics assimilated to our civilization acquire financial prosperity comparable with that of our own middle classes, it is altogether probable that they would make valuable contributions to our life. In all these respects America's anti-Japanese attitude and agitation are short-sighted.

The policy is contrary also to the spirit of all American treaties with Japan. She opened her doors at our earnest request. We led her out among the nations, much against her will. We pledged mutual friendship. Japan has carried out

her side of the compact faithfully. She allows Americans to become citizens of Japan. We refuse to naturalize Japanese, whatever their character or qualifications. Japan allows American residents in Japan, though alien, whether as individuals or as regular corporations, to own land. Several states refuse this privilege to Japanese in this country.

The agitation is hysterical. Those who advocate it invariably talk of the threatened swamping Asiatic invasion, the Japanization of our entire Pacific Coast, the ease and even the likelihood of a Japanese military invasion, and the horrors of intermarriage. These are all the creations of ignorance and fear. There is no danger whatever of any of these calamities, not even of war with Japan. The very talk of it is absurd. There is, in truth, nothing whatever in the situation to call for anti-Japanese legislation.

And finally, the anti-Asiatic policy is unchristian. There are few more important teachings of the Old Testament than that of dealing justly and kindly with the stranger in the land. The peculiar new insight of the Apostolic Church was the fact that Gentiles are co-heirs with the Jews in the Kingdom of God, who is the Father of all men, and that men of all races are brothers.

A policy open to so many and such serious criticisms surely cannot be the only one. Advocates of anti-Asiatic legislation seem to assume that there are only two alternatives—one, this policy of complete exclusion, hampering legislation, and social ostracism; the other, that of complete surrender to an overwhelming Asiatic invasion, resulting in the economic ruin of white laborers, the establishment on the Pacific Coast of an Asiatic civilization, and free intermarriage of the races.

There is, however, a third alternative, a policy adapted to conserve all real interests, on the side both of America and of Japan, dignified, courteous, honorable, and mutually advantageous. The details of this third alternative are presented in a later chapter.

Should not the Christian forces of America promptly grapple

with this tendency of American communities to enact disastrous anti-Asiatic legislation? Should the settlement of the unquestioned difficulties raised by Asiatic immigration be left to those who are controlled by race prejudice and selfishness?

This question of the Occidental treatment of Oriental nations and individuals is no new one in the Orient. Fresh discussion of it, however, is beginning. They call it "the white peril."

To see how Japan feels on this question, consider this utterance of Professor Nagai in his article on the "White Peril" (May, 1913):

"If one race assumes the right to appropriate all the wealth, why should not the other races feel ill-used and protest? If the yellow races are oppressed by the white races and have to revolt to avoid congestion and maintain existence, whose fault is it but the aggressor's? If the white races truly love peace and wish to preserve the name of Christian nations they will practice what they preach and will soon restore to us the rights so long withheld. They will rise to the generosity of welcoming our citizens among them as heartily as we do theirs among us. We appeal to the white races to put aside their race prejudice and meet us on equal terms in brotherly coöperation."

While I was lecturing in 1912 in the Imperial University of Kyoto, the Secretary of the Young Men's Buddhist Association brought me a letter from the Secretary of the Young Men's Hindu Association of Calcutta describing the evil deeds of the white race and asking if Hindu and Japanese young men should not combine to oppose the white man and to drive him out.

In August, 1913, a summer school was held in Osaka under the auspices of the great daily, the *Morning Sun* (Asahi). One of the addresses was delivered by A. Dharmapala on "Japan's Duty to the World." I give a few quotations.

"Islam destroyed India, Christian England demoralized China.
 . . . Only Japan escaped these destructive icebergs. . . .
 It is the white peril that the Asiatic races have to fight against.
 . . . The white peril is a reality, the yellow peril is only a

phantom. . . . How are we to subdue the arrogance of the white races? . . . Japan by her superior morality subdued the most powerful of European nations."

These discussions are but mutterings now, and the feelings they represent may still be allayed. If we treat the Asiatic with a consideration for his needs and welfare, if we help him to walk in the modern ways, and aid him in maintaining his sovereignty and national dignity, we shall unquestionably win and hold his friendship. There will then be no white peril for him and no yellow peril for us.

But if we disregard his problems, his needs, his ambitions, and his dignity; if our first aim is white race supremacy established by force, with a crushing heel on the yellow man's head; if we refuse him a fair share or opportunity in the world's great storehouse; if we humiliate him and insist on certain disqualifications regardless of personal character or ability, disqualifications based entirely on race, then the future relations of East and West are indeed ominous.

The yellow peril is not exclusively military. To some, the economic aspect is even more serious. When all Asia is fully awake, educated in modern science, equipped with schools, a press, and telegraphic and postal facilities, and with factories, railroads, steamships and mines, what will become of our commerce, and of our industrial classes? Will not Asia by her low standard of life put up an invincible industrial competition? Will she not pull us down to her level? Can we permanently maintain a high scale of life against a world living on a low level? That is a problem for economists.

But one or two things can be said. The solution of this problem, both for us and for them, can be found far more easily on a basis of friendship than of enmity between East and West. *We can solve the economic problem more certainly if neither they nor we are crushed by the excessive military expenses which would be inevitable if the military yellow and white "perils" are rampant.*

And further, no small part of the solution consists in raising the ideals and scale of life among Asia's millions. By raising their manhood and their entire mode of life—the economic competition will be diminished. This is visibly beginning to take place in Japan. The cost of living has doubled during the past decade. Moreover in proportion as the higher standard and scale of life rises will Asia's purchasing power from us advance, with all that that signifies.

Now it is not hard to see that the best conditions under which to elevate the masses of Asia and bring them up to our level is on a basis of friendliness. Help them to learn. Let them come and live among us and go back, carrying with them their new ideas and ideals. Set the best possible conditions for the promotion of the knowledge of the Fatherhood of God, and of man's own divine nature. Help them to accept the universal brotherhood of man, regardless of race. These are the great creative ideas which lift individuals and peoples to higher levels of life and to nobler manhood. Even though our wish to lift Asia were wholly selfish, these are the means by which to do it. In imparting these ideas, would it not be of incalculable value if missionaries in China could point to America and say, "There is the land where those ideas are being carried out, not only in the relations of private life, but in business and industry and also in international relations."

Inability to make this statement to-day, except in a limited way, is probably the most serious obstacle to the propagation of the Gospel in non-Christian lands. Increasingly difficult will the missionary work become if there is rising racial animosity and injustice. For the very substance of the Gospel is denied by the conduct of these peoples who know the Gospel ideal most completely.

A fundamental solution of the Oriental problem, however, is not so difficult as many suppose. The alternative to Asiatic exclusion is not of necessity a free open door to all Asiatic immigrants. That would indeed soon beget an intolerable condition.

The true solution is the enactment of an immigration law which treats all races exactly alike—this, and this alone, is friendly. A law, moreover, which admits only so many annually as we can reasonably expect to assimilate—this preserves our institutions and provides that the white man's land shall remain white in civilization and control.

And these two provisions lead on to a third provision that those who are admitted to our country shall be aided in the process of assimilation. In other words, we need to provide for the rapid and certain assimilation of those who enter. For our own sake, as well as for those who come to us, we cannot afford to have any considerable population residing here and taking no essential part in our national life. The full statement of this solution, however, must be deferred to a later chapter.

If my argument has been correct, the new world-situation and especially the New Asia requires of America changes in her international policies, especially as they concern the Orient. The continuance of flat Asiatic exclusion promises to bring serious disaster. A policy of restricted immigration, of general application, looking to the welfare of Asia no less than of our own, together with adequate provision for the assimilation to our ideals and life of all who come to our shores, will alone secure those right and helpful relations which will promote the permanent peace and prosperity of both East and West.

To America is offered the opportunity of mediating thus between the East and the West. Our conduct during the next few decades seems likely to settle for centuries to come the character of our mutual relations. This question may possibly be hanging in the balance for a half century. The longer we delay starting upon the friendly and helpful course, the greater will be our difficulty both in entering upon it and in overcoming the anti-white suspicion and enmity already existing in the Orient and bound to grow with every decade of delayed justice.

XI

PRINCIPLES OF RACE ASSIMILATION AS BEARING UPON ASIATIC IMMIGRATION

IF we admit Asiatics to our land, can and will they become truly American? If it indeed be true that the Japanese and Asiatics generally are not assimilable to our American civilization, then, of course, any plan for their admission to permanent residence in America and to naturalization is out of the question.

The nature of the Asiatic policy, therefore, which American citizens should adopt depends on the degree and rapidity of their assimilability. This problem is confessedly difficult. In the "American-Japanese Problem" I have discussed the question in three long chapters. Here I must content myself with a mere outline of the considerations there presented.

Assimilation has two aspects—biological and social—to be sharply distinguished. In the one, through race intermarriage inherited race nature is combined and amalgamation takes place. The laws of the amalgamation are biological, operate spontaneously, and are wholly subconscious; the process is completed before the birth of the offspring. What occurs in those mysterious processes of generation and growth, our best science only dimly surmises. Their regulation is beyond human control.

In social assimilation, however, inherited race culture is transmitted both consciously and unconsciously, not only from parent to offspring, but from every influence that moulds thought, feeling and conduct. Social inheritance, given to the offspring only after birth, is a factor of superlative force in creating the personality of the individual. This inheritance is

given, not by biological processes, but by education, by language, by every influence that moulds the heart and mind and will. Moreover, wholesome nurture, transmitting wholesome social inheritance, can alone provide the right environment in which human biological heredity can produce its best results.

This distinction between social and biological heredity and inheritance is of the highest importance in considering the problem of race assimilation. Civilization, mental habits of every kind, moral and religious ideas and ideals, with all the practices to which they lead, are matters of social, not of biological heredity and processes. These are the factors which make a man to be the man he is. They form his mind, furnish the categories of his thinking, provide the motives and standards of his conduct, and, in a word, determine a man's race, sociologically speaking.

Now man's marvelous psychic nature provides that these things can be imparted to individuals of any race when they are young and plastic. Under ten or twelve, any child can completely learn any language, enter into any civilization, and become fully possessed of its social inheritance. Advancing years with loss of plasticity deprives one of this capacity. A full-grown adult has diminished capacity for acquisition of new languages and civilizations. A man's personality is formed by the civilization in which he is reared.

The social assimilation of races, then, can proceed independently of their intermarriage. The Jews are a case in point. Sociologically speaking, Jews born and bred in America are Americans—biologically speaking, they are Hebrews.

Now from the standpoint of capacity to learn our language, acquire our ideas, and enter into our corporate democratic life, young Japanese and Chinese are just as assimilable as are Italians or Russians, if we give them the same opportunity, the same welcome. Indeed Asiatic children, reared in America, are more completely cut off from their social inheritance than are the children of any European people, because of the extraordinary difficulty of learning to read and speak Chinese and

Japanese. Japanese children born in America can speak English freely, even though both parents are pure Japanese and are quite ignorant of English. In Hawaii, in spite of the large Japanese population and thousands of Japanese children for playmates, English is the language with which they play and quarrel. For all children in Hawaii are required to attend the public schools where English is the one language used.

The degree to which Japanese in California have already become Americanized, especially American-born children, is amazing to those who know them in Japan. The complete social assimilability of the Japanese is beyond question for any one who will investigate the facts scientifically.

In regard to the question of the intermarriage of whites and Asiatics ignorant dogmatism prevails. Race antipathy and prejudice play a large rôle here. It is a question which has not been carefully studied by experts. Intermarriage under wholesome and right relations is still limited. The disastrous results of the immoral sexual relations of the races should not be regarded as throwing light of any value on this problem.

We need, accordingly, a commission of expert biologists, sociologists and psychologists to collect and collate the facts already available that we may know what are the biological consequences of race intermarriage. Personally I deprecate strongly the marriage of whites with Japanese. The differences of ideals as to the respective rights and duties of husband and wife are so great that the intermarriage of Americans and Japanese is a hazardous venture. Moreover, the biological results of such intermarriage are by no means clear. Many hold them to be as a rule bad. President Eliot contends that "pure races" are far superior. He asserts, moreover, that as a rule Japanese "do not intermarry with women of foreign races, affording thus a strong contrast to the white race in foreign parts. The question of immigration, therefore," he argues, "need not be complicated by any racial problem, provided that each of several races abiding in the same territory keeps itself pure, as the Japanese do, wherever they live,"

But dogmatism is out of place. We need such scientific knowledge on this problem as can be collected only by experts. The question of the wisdom of race intermarriage surely should not be left to the decision of individuals moved by momentary emotional impulses nor by ignorant dogmatism based on race prejudice. Full knowledge is required, and then if intermarriage is unwise we need an adequate national law forbidding it.

The question, therefore, of the intermarriage of whites and Asiatics can be and should be kept distinct from that of social assimilation. The latter can go forward independently of the former. The policy, moreover, which America should adopt in its treatment of Asiatics in this land as well as in its permission for them to come should be framed in the light of this distinction between biological and social assimilability.

XII

A NEW POLICY FOR THE ADMISSION, TREATMENT, ASSIMILATION, AND NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS

FOR the solution of the difficulties presented in the preceding chapters dealing with the relations of the United States with Asiatics a policy is needed that provides for the real interests of both continents. California's insistent claim that she must not be exposed to the dangers of Asiatic immigration is perfectly just. No less just, however, is Japan's claim that her treaty rights shall be respected, and that Japanese lawfully in America shall be accorded a treatment free from invidious race discrimination. In this claim Japan stands, it is to be remembered, as the spokesman of all Asia.

These conditions make it plain that no solution of this perplexing Oriental problem can be satisfactory that deals with it exclusively as Oriental. The new policy, whatever it may be, must be general. It must solve the Oriental problem by dealing in a fundamental way with the entire immigration question.

The present policy of the United States, as we have seen, is, in important respects, humiliating to the Oriental, and disgraceful to us. Professing friendship in words, we deny it in important deeds. Demanding an open door for Americans in Asia and equality of opportunity for our citizens with that accorded to citizens of the "most favored nation," we do not ourselves grant these same things to Asiatics in our land.

This disgraceful, humiliating, and inconsistent policy, for which some extenuating explanations may doubtless be made, has grown up through a series of exigencies. The time, however, has come for clear recognition of the radical defects of

our present policy and for the formulation of a policy more in harmony with our national ideals and more suited to the new era of cosmopolitan life on which the world is rapidly entering. The opportunity opening before us at this unique juncture in the history of human evolution is unparalleled.

This is an opportune time, also, for fresh study of the no less perplexing problems raised by European immigration. While the war continues the number of those coming to our shores will be small. But what is likely to happen after the war is over? Many anticipate an enormous flood of European immigrants. Are we prepared to care for them? Shall we allow more to come than we can possibly handle at our ports of entry or provide for in our economic system? Shall we permit countless shiploads to be landed in our already congested cities and then left to shift for themselves, finding occupation when and where they can and exposed to the exploitation of countless sharpers? Shall we not rather adopt the proposals of the National Congress of Charity Organizations and establish a National Employment Bureau? Shall we continue the present methods of naturalization, with their obstacles and absurdities? Shall we not rather devise a scientific system, adapted to secure the wholesome and rapid assimilation of aliens, transforming them into happy, intelligent and loyal citizens as rapidly as possible? Do not the interests of labor and capital as well as of all honorable citizens demand that Congress shall take up this entire immigration question afresh and provide a new comprehensive national policy dealing scientifically with the question of the admission, treatment, employment, education, assimilation and naturalization of aliens?

Of even more importance than the details of such a policy, important though they are, are the spirit and the principles that underlie them. These I venture to state in the following paragraphs.

The new policy, so far as it concerns Asiatic countries and peoples, must consciously abandon the assumption, so tenaciously held for centuries, and still unconsciously held by many, that

the white race is superior to all others and has, therefore, a kind of right to rule the world, to own whatever territories it can seize, and to exploit the native populations. America must insist on the abandonment of all predatory ambitions on the part of its citizens in foreign lands. She must stand for equality of rights and privileges of every race. No race or people may be the objects of plunder or exploitation by whites merely because the latter possess superior power. This is, indeed, no new principle in America's foreign policy, but it needs to be emphasized and consistently carried out. We should, moreover, grant to Asiatics lawfully in this land the same privileges which we demand for Americans in Asia and which we grant to citizens of the "most favored nations" residing among us.

This policy must recognize that there is a new Orient, a rising self-consciousness in the vast populations of Asia which must be won to friendship; that the new Asia can no longer be treated as the old Asia was during the nineteenth century. This means that we must inaugurate a policy of courtesy in all our relations with Asiatics—when they enter our ports, live in our land, come before our courts, or deal with us in treaties, and are the objects of proposed legislation whether local or national. We must deal with Orientals as we deal with members of other nations. Our international policy must be universal and free from race discrimination.

The new policy should sympathize with the difficulties and problems confronting Oriental peoples, economic, political, social, and educational. Americans should regard themselves as their friends, to aid them in the arduous road on which they have started, protecting them from the grasping policies of individuals, governments and nations whose aim is exploitation of foreign lands.

So far as it deals with immigrants, whether from European countries or from Asia, the new policy should provide that no larger numbers may come from any land than we are prepared to receive and care for humanely in our ports of entry and

assimilate into our national life. And after they are admitted, their protection from exploitation, their distribution, employment, education, and naturalization should be provided for by a comprehensive scientific system devised by experts.

The new policy must, of course, have as a fundamental principle the conservation of our distinctively American institutions. The true welfare of the population and races now here must be provided for. The policy must provide for the coming from other lands and permanent residence here of only those individuals who can and will become full American citizens, sharing in the national life in all its aspects, political, economic, industrial, moral, and religious.

The new policy, in dealing with Asiatic immigration, must take full cognizance of the actual situation on the Pacific Coast, both as regards the work and character of the various Asiatic peoples now there, and also as regards the psychological state of those who are opposed to Asiatics. It must not run counter to the mature, sober judgment of responsible citizens; but neither must it regard ignorant and partisan views as the views of sane and intelligent judgment.

And finally, the new policy must cut loose from discredited theories of race psychology and sociology, and must build on the assured results of our best modern knowledge.

We turn next to the concrete application of these principles.

Since differential race treatment on the one hand must be given up and since on the other hand free Asiatic immigration is not to be tolerated, it would seem as though we were caught on the horns of a dilemma. In reality, however, the problem is not so difficult as it appears. The alternatives are not either free immigration or complete exclusion. There is a third way.

Since we must limit Asiatic immigration, and since we must also treat races equally, it follows that *we must limit all immigration*. It follows likewise that we must find some method or principle which, applied equally to all, will secure the desired results. We find this in *an immigration law which bases limitation of immigration on the assimilability of immigrants*.

An immigration law which treats all races exactly alike—this, and this alone—is friendly to all. A law which admits only so many annually as we can reasonably expect to assimilate—this preserves our institutions and provides that the white man's land shall remain white in civilization and control.

And these two provisions lead on to a third, namely—provision that *those who are admitted to our country shall be aided in the process of assimilation*. In other words, we need to provide for the rapid and certain assimilation and naturalization of those who enter. For our own sake, as well as for those who come to us, we cannot afford to have any considerable population residing in our midst but taking no active part in our national life.

We should admit into the United States as immigrants, therefore, only as many aliens from any land as we can expect to assimilate. Assimilation, however, takes place largely by means of those already assimilated and naturalized, for they know the languages, customs, ideals, political and social life of both peoples, theirs and ours, and the processes they themselves have passed through in becoming Americans.

All immigration, therefore, should be limited to a definite per cent. per annum from each people, of those from that people already assimilated (naturalized) with American born children of the first generation. Children of the second generation do not as a rule know their ancestral language and therefore do not aid in the assimilation of newcomers. Five per cent. suggests itself as a suitable rate with which to begin the experiment. Experience, however, may show that some other rate will give better results.

In order to present this proposition in regard to immigration with as much definiteness as possible, I have formulated it in the shape of a proposed amendment to the present immigration law.

Be it enacted, etc., That Section 2 of the Immigration Act of February 20, 1907, shall be amended by the addition of the following proviso :

Provided, That the number of aliens of any race (single mother tongue group), who may be admitted to the United States in any fiscal year shall be limited to five per cent. of the number of native-born persons of the first generation, together with the number of naturalized citizens of that race in the United States at the time of the national census next preceding; except that aliens returning from a temporary visit abroad; aliens coming to join a husband, wife, father, mother, son, daughter, grandfather, grandmother, grandson, or granddaughter; aliens who are government officers; aliens who have had an education in their own land equivalent to the American high school with not less than three years' study of some European language foreign to their own, and aliens who are travelers or visitors and who do not engage in any remunerative occupation or business in the United States, shall not be included within the five per cent. limit above provided. Provided further—That five hundred may be admitted annually from any single mother tongue group having less than 10,000 naturalized and American born citizens of the first generation. Provided, further, That all laws relative to the exclusion of Chinese persons or person of Chinese descent are hereby repealed.

Certain questions will at once arise. What is a "single mother tongue group"? There is a certain amount of theoretical difficulty here; but the general principle is clear. A German or Egyptian Jew, though completely assimilated, would be of no particular aid in assimilating a Polish Jew. The central principle is the power of those already assimilated from a particular foreign group to serve as an assimilating agency for later comers from that group. For this they must have belonged, in a not distant past, to the same social group and must still have ability to speak the same language.

The determination of the names and boundaries of such groups might be left either to the Bureau of Immigration or to the Department of Ethnology.

The Federal Census does not show how many naturalized

citizens there are. This is certainly a difficulty, but it can easily be remedied at the next census. In the meantime the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization could be instructed to make estimates, which estimates could be used as a working basis until the next census gives the correct figures.

Does the number whom we can expect to assimilate from any particular race really depend on the number of those from that race already assimilated? There is probably one real exception to this principle, namely, members of the British Empire who speak English by birthright. Such individuals are already members of our mother tongue group. On this ground it might be desirable to make one more exception in the proposed amendment, to the effect that all members of the British Empire who speak English as a birthright should be admitted without regard to the five per cent. rate.

Individuals from North Europe, moreover, can doubtless learn the English language more easily and gain the inner principles of our civilization more promptly than those from East and South Europe or from Asia, Africa or South America. But whether this supposition be true or not, they should be required to conform to the conditions of acquiring citizenship as a test of their individual fitness. If immigrants from any land, as a matter of fact, meet the test more readily than those from other lands, that will automatically open the door more quickly for their fellow citizens to enter. No exceptions, therefore, should be made for such peoples.

What would be the effect of this five per cent. rate on present European immigration?

I have devoted considerable study to this question, and offer the following figures. Columns 1-3 are taken bodily from the last Federal Census. Column 4 is taken from the Report on Immigration, being the sum for the past ten years. I assume for column 5 that the deaths and departures of those admitted as immigrants has been twenty per cent. I assume still further that of those immigrants who have come to us in the past ten years, forty per cent. have been naturalized, leaving sixty per

cent. who are still aliens—column 6. The difference between columns 3 and 6 gives the number of estimated naturalized citizens and American-born children, column 7. Column 8 is five per cent. of column 7, the maximum number of possible annual immigrants. For purposes of comparison I have placed beside it the actual immigration for 1912.

If these assumptions are regarded as fairly plausible and the calculations have been correct, we reach the result that the proposed five per cent. rate would allow free immigration from North Europe and cut down immigration from South Europe. It is impossible to estimate from the available statistics how many of the immigrants from Europe would fall within the classes for which exception is made by this proposal. It is quite possible that the five per cent. rate might not reduce present immigration from South Europe in the least.

	1	2	3
		<i>American born children, one or both parents foreign</i>	<i>Total foreign white stock</i>
<i>Country</i>	<i>Foreign born</i>		
Germany . . .	2,500,000	5,780,000	8,280,000
Great Britain . . .	2,570,000	5,160,000	7,730,000
Scandinavia . . .	960,000	1,490,000	2,450,000
Russia	1,730,000	1,020,000	2,750,000
Italy	1,340,000	750,000	2,090,000
Austria	1,670,000	1,030,000	2,700,000
China	56,000	14,775	
Japan	67,000	4,410	

	4	5	6
	<i>Immigration Past Decade</i>	<i>Estimated deaths and departures</i>	<i>Estimated resident aliens</i>
<i>Country</i>			
Germany . . .	350,000	70,000	168,000
Great Britain . . .	958,000	191,000	459,000
Scandinavia . . .	491,000	98,000	235,000
Russia	1,725,000	345,000	822,000
Italy	2,071,000	414,000	993,000
Austria	2,097,000	419,000	1,006,000
China			56,000
Japan			67,000

Admission and Naturalization of Aliens 141

<i>Country</i>	<i>7</i> <i>Estimated citizens and children</i>	<i>8</i> <i>Possible annual immigration</i>	<i>9</i> <i>Actual immigra- tion</i>
Germany	8,112,000	405,600	27,788
Great Britain . .	7,270,000	363,500	82,979
Scandinavia . . .	2,215,000	110,750	27,550
Russia	1,928,000	96,400	162,395
Italy	1,097,000	54,850	157,134
Austria	1,694,000	84,700	178,882
China	14,775	738	
Japan	4,410	220	

What would be the effect of such an immigration law on Chinese immigration?

Since there are, according to the United States census of 1910, over 14,000 American-born Chinese in the United States, the five per cent. rate would allow over 700 Chinese immigrants annually. During 1913 over 6,000 Chinese citizens entered America in harmony with the present exclusion laws, consisting chiefly of those who return and relatives. It is generally admitted that a considerable number smuggle their way in. It is a fair question whether the opening of the door to the extent of five per cent. would not serve to diminish the number of those who smuggle their way in. As soon as China gains the new administrative efficiency which her internal reforms are securing, would she not cooperate more loyally in administering a five per cent. rate than in enforcing the complete exclusion laws now on our statutes?

What would be the effect on Japanese immigration? The five per cent. rate would allow about 220 to enter yearly. Inasmuch, however, as this is below the minimum provided for (500), Japanese immigration would begin at that minimum figure. Of the 6,859 Japanese arrivals during the last fiscal year, 6,715 brought passports acceptable to our officials under the present "Gentleman's Agreement," while 144 brought passports not regarded as satisfactory. But under the circumstances it was impossible to deport them. Of the 6,715 arrivals, 5,920 come within the number for whom special exception is made in all restriction proposals, such as relatives

and those returning after an absence. Within the remaining 753 are included travelers, visitors, students provided with means of support, and others, who would also be admitted in any case. Skilled laborers and professionals who plan to make a living by some remunerative occupation would be affected by the proposed five per cent rate. But in any case the number affected would not be large.

Would not the enforcement of any numerical limitations cause intolerable suffering, possibly, to tens of thousands of immigrants who might find on arrival here that they could not land because the maximum number from their land had already been admitted? And would not such a law cause a rush of immigration in the early months of each year? These difficulties are purely administrative and can, moreover, be easily resolved. At the beginning of each year, for instance, the Immigration Bureau should inform the steamship lines as to the number of immigrants they would be allowed to bring over that year from each people. The various companies would have to agree among themselves as to their respective proportions. The shippers would see to it that none should be brought over whom they must later carry back. The danger of a rush of immigration because of the law could easily be obviated.

An important consideration in favor of some such general law in restriction of immigration is the fact that immigration officials could know in advance the maximum numbers whom they would be called upon to examine for admittance. This would aid greatly in the celerity, humanity and efficiency of their work. So great is the importance of treating all immigrants humanely that for this, if for no other reason, it would seem desirable for our government to fix for each country a maximum figure beyond which steamship lines would not be allowed to bring immigrants.

With regard to methods for the protection of immigrants from exploitation, for their distribution and for their employment, I would merely refer to the numerous suggestions of ex-

pert students of these subjects. The single point on which I would lay emphasis here is that the moral sense of our land should be placed in support of those who seek to carry through the needed reforms. Much good work is being done but much more might be accomplished but for the obstacles put in the way by politicians and grafters. The churches should aid in the removal of those obstacles. Through their Federal Council the churches should appoint special experts whose duty it shall be to know what is happening, to represent the conscience and demands of Christians in these matters, and to appeal to the moral support of Christians at the polls if need be and in Congress on behalf of those men and measures which stand for righteousness and square dealing.

It is important, however, that all aliens permanently residing in America should be making steady progress in assimilation, steady preparation for citizenship. Only so can they live here profitably for themselves and satisfactorily for us. For this, however, they need help and stimulus. In addition, therefore, to a general immigration law, and to laws dealing with the distribution and employment of immigrants, our new policy should include provision for rapid and certain assimilation. In promotion of this end the following suggestions are offered.

Laws Providing for Alien Registration.—The working classes of Europe and Japan are accustomed to registration and to constant police supervision. This serves as a restraint from crime. The removal of this restraint on arrival in this land is far from wholesome. All aliens should be required to register and to keep registered, paying a substantial annual fee of, say, ten dollars, until naturalized. They should keep the bureau informed of changes of residence. Failure to pay the annual fee or to keep registered should be punishable by fines, and, if persisted in, should be a cause for deportation. All unregistered aliens should be liable to deportation.

The administration of this registration law might be placed in the hands of the "National Employment Bureau" whose entire attitude to the immigrant and alien should be that of a

friend to aid rather than that of a policeman to enforce obnoxious laws.

Laws Providing for Alien Education.—To aid in assimilation and preparation for intelligent citizenship provision should be made for the systematic education of all aliens. I do not advocate their compulsory education; nor would I have the Federal Government establish schools for aliens. What is needed is that a new standard of qualification for citizenship shall be carefully thought through and enacted into law and then that a Bureau of Alien Education be established—possibly as a coördinate branch of the Employment Bureau.

The work of this Bureau should be first to prepare suitable text-books, the mastery of which should be required for naturalization. There should be at least four text-books, on the English language, on the history of the American people, on the ideals of democracy, and on the methods of local and national government. They should, of course, be in simple English and deal only with general features and principles.

All the actual education of aliens should be conducted by local bodies, such as Y. M. C. A.'s, churches, night schools. No charge should be made for tuition, nor, if possible, for text-books. The Federal Alien Education Bureau should arrange for periodical examinations, which should be free to all candidates. The passing of these examinations should be an essential prerequisite for naturalization. There might be six examinations all told; three on English and one each on the other topics.

Would it not be well to provide also that the annual registration fee be diminished by, say one dollar for every examination passed? Aliens then would be impelled to pass examinations as rapidly as possible, reducing their registration fees.

Of course, the establishment and development of such an educational undertaking would entail enormous work, expense and patience; much common sense would be required to avoid needless red tape; those in charge should ever seek to embody the spirit. The incidental yet important advantages of this

system would be innumerable. No small part of our national difficulty with immigration has been our *laissez-faire* policy in regard to their distribution and education for citizenship. The methods of registration, distribution and education here suggested would not only meet the difficulties due to congestion and ignorance of our American system of government and life, but would also enable the authorities to detect and deport such as may have made their way into America illegitimately. The systematic care and education of all aliens in America is essential to the welfare of the country, of far more practical and also of more pressing importance than our splendid educational enterprise in the Philippines.

Laws Making Eligibility for Citizenship Dependent upon Individual Qualification.—Race of itself alone should no longer be a disqualification for citizenship. The law of 1790 (amended in 1875) which provides that eligibility for citizenship applies only to “aliens being free white persons and to aliens of African nativity and to persons of African descent” should be changed to read, “Aliens of any race are eligible for citizenship.” Let us raise the standards for naturalization as high as may be needed, but, whatever the standards are, let us apply them impartially to all races. Whoever qualifies should be admitted.

This and this alone will meet the demand of every self-respecting people for treatment that is in harmony with their national honor and make continued friendship possible. This, moreover, is the only condition upon which the United States can really carry out its comprehensive democratic experiment announced to the world in the Declaration of Independence—that all men are born free and equal. This single provision will do more to solve the problem of right dealing with Asiatics in the United States than any other single measure; for it will make the vote of citizens of Asiatic ancestry an object of concern to politicians. This will save Asiatics from being the object of attack by every scheming politician and crafty party leader. The most fruitful source of all the ill-treatment of Asi-

atics in America has been the fact that they could be made the football of politics both local and national, and this is because there was no Asiatic vote for politicians to win.

Laws Regarding Naturalization.—The responsibility of granting naturalization to aliens should be taken away from courts which were not constituted for such a function, and vested in a body specially formed for that purpose. Every candidate for citizenship should present a certificate of graduation from the Bureau of Alien Education. The Bureau of Naturalization should also procure certificates of good behavior from the Bureau of Registration. Naturalization should be given only to those morally as well as educationally qualified.

The ceremonial of naturalization, moreover, should be of a character fitted to impress the new citizen with the nature of the step being taken; namely, the renunciation of allegiance to his native land and the acceptance of the sovereignty of the adopted land.

A single day, or at most two days, might be selected for the naturalization service—Washington's Birthday and the Fourth of July. The oath of allegiance should be administered with full solemnity. Might not all American citizens reaching the age of twenty-one also take the oath of allegiance at the same service? Let each national group march by itself to the court, or schoolhouse or open square, each group bearing its own national flag; American born young men, however, might carry a flag of pure white. At the appointed signal let all the flags be lowered. Let all right hands be raised and let the new citizens take the oath declaring their allegiance, with bowed heads and subdued voice, using the words, "I do." Then let each new citizen receive a miniature American flag with the year woven into its fabric, to be kept as a memento of the event. There should of course be welcome orations and responses by representatives of the groups. Patriotic music and banquets and speeches, with appropriate pins, banners and badges could make the event of supreme significance in the lives of the new citizens. Might it not be wise also to extend this system of edu-

cation for citizenship, with examinations, to all native-born Americans who reach the voting age? Surely the responsibilities of citizenship are too great to be intrusted to those who are not qualified, and the mere fact of birth in America, or even of graduation from the grammar-school, is not an adequate guarantee of such qualification. Especially important does this suggestion appear to be in the case of children one or both of whose parents are foreign-born.

Laws Providing Direct Federal Responsibility in all Legal and Legislative Matters Involving Aliens.— Aliens are guests of the nation, not of the states; and the nation is responsible to foreign governments for their just treatment. Foreign governments have no relation with the states, but only with the Federal Government. It is, therefore, the duty of the Federal Government to provide that the treaty rights of aliens are accorded them. It logically follows that legal proceedings involving aliens should be handled exclusively in federal, not in state courts. The nation should provide that treaty rights are accorded aliens, regardless of the ignorance or prejudice of unfriendly localities.

It would doubtless be wise by special provision to allow local courts to handle minor matters, such as misdemeanors and transgressions of police regulations and city ordinances. The general principle, however, should be as stated above. To some this suggestion may seem a matter chiefly of theory, yet it is at this moment one of international importance. States to-day hide behind the national flag for protection from the consequences of their ill-treatment of the citizens of Japan and China.

The anomalous, not to say self-contradictory, position of the United States in its relations to foreign nations has already been brought out in our discussion of the Chinese and Japanese problems. The serious character of this situation is not really appreciated by most of our citizens. Our treaties are declared to be the supreme law of the land. Yet the Administration has not been given the legal power to enforce treaty

obligations upon any state that chooses to ignore or override them.

Presidents Harrison, McKinley, Roosevelt and Taft all desired Congress to enact laws that would enable the Administration to provide for aliens the care and safety promised by the treaties. No constitutional difficulty intervenes. Yet no action has been taken.

At present the most serious danger of war with a foreign land arises through our failure at this point. When white men are murdered in China, no European country accepts the statement that Peking is not responsible. Occidentals at once send gunboats and insist that the culprits shall be punished. Yet the United States has repeatedly said to foreign governments that it is unable either to protect their citizens from race or mob violence, or to punish Americans involved in crimes against aliens, because all such matters come under the jurisdiction of states. Outrages of this character began in 1811, the last case having taken place in 1910. Many scores have been killed and hundreds injured in person and property yet, according to the statement of Mr. Taft,¹ in not a single case have the perpetrators of these outrages been punished. The bill proposed to give adequate jurisdiction to the federal courts is as follows :

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, that any act committed in any state or territory of the United States in violation of the rights of a citizen or subject of a foreign country secured to such citizen or subject by treaty between the United States and such foreign country, which act constitutes a crime under the laws of such state or territory, shall constitute a like crime against the peace and dignity of the United States, punishable in like manner as in the courts of said state or territory, and within the period limited by the laws of such state or territory, and may be prosecuted in the courts of the United States, and, upon conviction, the sentence executed in like manner as sentences upon convictions for crimes under the laws of the United States.

¹ "The United States and Peace," page 44.

Hon. Wm. H. Taft closed his address on this matter (Dec. 10, 1914) with the following words:

"We are under obligation by many of our treaties to give aliens peaceful residence and right to do business in this country. Congress could give to our national government, to the President and the Federal Courts the power to protect those rights, punish their violation and satisfy the countries with whom we have made the agreement that we were sincerely trying to perform it. *The only real possibility of a war that I can foresee is the wanton, reckless, wicked willingness on the part of a narrow section of the country to gratify racial prejudice and class hatred by flagrant breach of treaty rights in the form of state law, or by lawless violence. Congress should at once assume authority for the national government to see to it that it cannot be dragged into international difficulty through such blind selfishness, and this step would be quite as effective as improving our military defenses. Indeed I think it would be more effective to prevent the possibility of war.*"

Such are the outlines of a comprehensive policy for the treatment of all races and nations and the care of all resident aliens in our land.

The early adoption of some such policy as this is important. Unless something is done there is every reason to anticipate further invidious race legislation in one or another of the states and possibly also in Congress. Further discriminative legislation, however, would still further alienate the friendly feeling of Japan and China and render still more complicated and difficult of solution the international situation. The early adoption of the main features of this policy would assure the Pacific Coast on the one hand that no swamping Asiatic immigration is to be allowed. It would give the labor unions assurance that capitalists could not suddenly import Asiatic labor with which to fight white union labor. It would remove the blot on the fair name of the United States for failure to observe treaty obligations. It would satisfy Japan, for it would

do away with that differential race treatment which is to them so mortifying.

As regards the Chinese also, the situation would be much improved. The fairness of our policy, adopted by us with no pressure from her side, would serve to strengthen and deepen the spirit of friendship for America and render still more effective American influence in guiding that new republic through the troublous times that are surely ahead.

If America can permanently hold the friendship and trust of Japan and China through just, courteous and kindly treatment, she will thereby destroy the anticipated anti-white Asiatic solidarity. If America proves to Asia that one white people at least does not despise Asiatics as such nor seek to exploit them, but rather, on a basis of mutual respect and justice, seeks their real prosperity, they will discover that what they feared as the white peril is, in fact, an inestimable benefit. And that change of feeling will bring to naught the yellow peril now dreaded by the whites. Such policy, moreover, as the one here briefly sketched, promises to solve the many perplexing questions that envelop immigration from Europe.

Even from the lower standpoint of commercial and economic interests, the policy of justice toward and friendship with the Orient is beyond question the right one. Armed conflict or even merely sullen hostility mightily hampers trade success. Rapid internal development in China and a rising standard of life among her millions means enormous trade with America—if we are friendly and just. And unselfish friendship and justice on our side will hasten mightily the uplift of China's millions. Our own highest prosperity is inseparable from that of all Asia. So long as friendship is maintained and peace based on just international relations, the military yellow peril will be impossible. In proportion as the scale of living among Asia's working millions rises to the level of our own is the danger of an economic yellow peril diminished.

Every consideration, therefore, of justice, humanity, and self-interest demands the early adoption of the general prin-

ciples of this new policy. It conserves all the interests of the East and the West and is in harmony with the new era of universal evolution of mankind.

In his notable address at Mobile (October, 1913) President Wilson well stated the general principles of true international relationships. He was speaking, it is true, with the South American nations in view, but his words are equally true of the world as a whole. As reported by the press, he said:

“We must prove ourselves their friends and champions, upon terms of equality and honor. You cannot be friends upon any other terms than upon the terms of equality.

“You cannot be friends at all except upon the terms of honor, and we must show ourselves friends by comprehending their interest, whether it squares with our interest or not. It is a very perilous thing to determine the foreign policy of a nation in the terms of material interest. It not only is unfair to those with whom you are dealing but it is degrading upon the part of your own actions.

“Human rights, national integrity and opportunity, as against material interests—that, ladies and gentlemen, is the issue which we now have to face.

“I want to take this occasion to say that the United States will never again seek one additional foot of territory by conquest. She will devote herself to showing that she knows how to make honorable and fruitful use of the territory she has. And she must regard it as one of the duties of friendship to see that from no quarter are material interests made superior to human liberty and national opportunity.”

These are the principles which should underlie the policy of every nation in Christendom in its relations to the Orient and to each other. Who can foretell the changes in the attitude of the Orient toward Christendom in its receptiveness of our ways of life and thought if the national policies of the world should be really controlled by principles of true friendship?

Who, now, are the individuals and groups to inaugurate and carry through such a policy as this unless it be the professed followers of the Prince of Peace?

XIII

THE CHURCHES AND THE SENSATIONAL PRESS

ON the twenty-seventh of September, 1914, I had an interview with reporters of six of the principal New York papers. Baron von Shoen had a few days before startled the country by an unqualified statement of Japanese hatred for America and asserted their universal expectation of an inevitable war with us. Repudiation of the interview had been promptly announced both by himself and by Ambassador Baron von Bernstorff. The papers, however, were eager for any information bearing on Japan's attitude and also on Baron von Shoen's truthfulness. In order to avoid danger of misreporting I prepared a careful statement of what I was ready to say; and when the reporters arrived, after a few minutes' chat, I read them my statement, answered some questions, put a copy of what I had read into the hands of each, and let them go. The next morning one of the papers came out with the head-line:

"Treaty Didn't Force Japan Into War, Says Gulick."

What I had said on that point was: "I do not see how any one acquainted with the terms of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance can say that Japan was not under obligations to unite with England in driving Germany out."

On the second of October one of the New York papers had a column with the head-line:

"Conflict With Japan Certain, Asserts Mann."

Under this head-line was a report of Representative Mann's speech in Congress opposing the Philippine Bill. He was arguing that the awakening of China means at some future date a

vast war between East and West and that America should retain the Philippines permanently as a base in that conflict. In view of the contents, how misleading the head-line!

At the Japan Society dinner of welcome to Dr. S. Takata, Hon. G. Masuda and their traveling companions, October 2, 1914, Dr. Hamilton Mabie and I both spoke in strong terms of the international crime committed by irresponsible reports and sensational head-lines. As the meeting broke up a group of reporters lingered and we had a frank talk. They told me not to consider reporters responsible for the head-lines. The latter are all written by specialists. The blame should fall on them. The reporters themselves are helpless victims of a vicious system. The man in the office even adds quotation marks if he thinks they will add to the interest!

The following day another New York daily contained this startling assertion:

“U. S.-Jap War Sure, Says Dr. S. L. Gulick”

Of the ten lines given below the startling head-line cited above I acknowledge the substantial accuracy of this sentence, “So long as the people of the Western world treat the people of the Orient unfairly we can look forward to nothing but a gigantic struggle so soon as the people across the sea are ready for it.” But I deny in toto the following sentence also credited to me with quotation marks, “Representative Mann’s fear that the Philippine Islands will be the cause of a great struggle in the Pacific Ocean is well founded.”

But what is the result of such misleading and sensational head-lines? In the first place, the continual assertion year after year of inevitable war begets suspicion and animosity among the masses against the nation maligned. Indeed, as result of these methods and for no other reason large sections of the American people are to-day quite prepared mentally for conflict with Japan. Where there is so much smoke there must be some fire, they argue. It would not surprise them if Japan were to attack us on some small pretext at any time. If war

with Japan is inevitable, many are thinking, the sooner we undertake it the better—before Japan gets any more prepared for it.

In the second place, startling head-lines are cabled to Japan. The corrections contained in the column fail to cross the seas. Belief is thus engendered in Japan that we want war.

In a word, irresponsible, sensational head-lines definitely predicting war with a certain country are potent factors in producing that state of belief and emotion in the two nations concerned that may easily seize on some relatively trivial event and make it the cause of a needless war.

The awful tragedy in Europe indeed is an instructive warning of what a chauvinistic press can accomplish. The murder at Serajevo was no proper cause of an all-Europe conflict. But the assertions hurled back and forth over the various boundaries for a couple of years, some of them true, no doubt, but many of them untrue, had produced such a tension in every country, such suspicions and animosities, such scorn, distrust and contempt for each other, that each nation felt a struggle was inevitable and each had long been preparing for it; each wished to begin the war under conditions most favorable to itself.

Nations may be hypnotized as well as individuals. They may be swung off their balance by small but suggestive events because the nation-wide hypnotic conditions have been previously produced. The late American-Spanish war is a case in point. Newspapers take an increasingly important part in determining nations for war or for peace by the state of mind which they cultivate among their readers.

Now in proportion as nations become democratic and the people determine war or peace, it is of the highest importance that they be given *correct* and *adequate international news*. They need not only news in the usual narrow meaning, but information in a large way, prepared by writers of adequate training, sympathetic insight and generous spirit. This attitude can be cultivated among peoples no less than the attitude of animosity, suspicion and ill-will.

In confirmation of this general contention as to the dangerous character of fallacious head-lines, I cite a recent illustration from Japan.

On August 8th one of the most important papers of Tokyo published an extra giving a telegram to the effect that America was about to send her Atlantic fleet to the Orient. All Tokyo was excited to a higher pitch than at any time during the California Alien Land Law agitation. In view of the situation in Europe and the conflict of Great Britain with Germany, it was assumed that the United States was going to take advantage of the opportunity to crush Japan while her allies could render no help. Thoughtful Japanese and Americans, of course, discredited the rumor. The excitement was allayed the following day by the statement of the American Ambassador that the rumor was without foundation. But what a disclosure it was of the possible disastrous consequences of false international news! The repeated utterances of America's and Japan's chauvinistic, irresponsible press have produced in Japan such a state of mind that it was possible for masses of Japanese to think of America as ready to pounce upon and do to Japan what Germany had just done to Belgium.

In ordinary times of peace the average American daily contains practically no information about foreign lands. When war clouds suddenly loom on the horizon or war rumors are afloat, scare head-lines lure the pennies from pockets of the curious and give them incidentally international opinions and prejudices. The press is the instrument of every interest, many of them wholly to be commended, but many of them crafty and deceitful. These latter have studied how to manipulate popular feeling and secure desired ends. Unscrupulous capital owns many a paper whose object is wholly selfish. Truth is suppressed, facts distorted, suspicions aroused, even direct falsehoods boldly declared.

These are facts widely known, yet the Christian Church makes no adequate effort to abate the enormous evil. It takes no steps to insure that the press shall tell the truth, and possibly

because it has no power to act effectively. The harm wrought to national politics need not here be considered. It is fairly well-known. Moreover, each blatant sheet in a measure corrects its foe; and after all the real damage is perhaps not so great. All learn to make allowances for political slanders. It is important, however, to emphasize the injury wrought by international slander. The reader as a rule has no corrective; he possesses no background of personal knowledge from which to estimate assertions about foreign lands. All the news is accepted with unsuspecting alacrity and every malicious story about ambitious designs and crafty methods of neighboring countries is readily accepted and calls forth resentment and wholesale condemnation.

A frequently repeated story of Japanese financial irresponsibility is that all Japanese banks have to employ Chinese clerks. This is absolutely false. Equally false is the recurrent story that Japanese in California have formed military companies and are drilling preparatory to "the day." Having investigated both these stories, I know they are groundless.

Beyond question the present tragedy in Europe has been deliberately engineered by crafty use of the press. The peoples of each land have been persuaded to believe the very worst of each other. Not until those who love truth take this matter in hand and insist that international news shall be honest will the time come when nations will consent to diminish their armaments and world-peace be possible. People arm because they are afraid of a possible attack; they are afraid because they distrust their neighbors. They distrust their neighbors because of their supposed knowledge of their character. "If the light that is in you be darkness, how great is that darkness." Today every nation is neighbor to every other. Never before was it so important, therefore, that international news should be honest.

To see an evil, however, is one thing; to remedy it another. Many are deploring the damage and the menace of an irresponsible press. But what is to be done? What especially is

the duty of Christians and of the Church in this matter? We note first three important cautions :

Efforts to prevent the evils of a free press must not ignore its benefits. The crimes of the guilty few must not blind our eyes to the many who are in this matter following splendid ideals. Neither should we forget that the modern newspaper is a highly complex organism, run at high pressure and in the midst of noise and confusion indescribable. The daily press is one of the most astonishing creations of this astonishing age. It is the great national educator. It unifies the life of the nation, helping us all to know at the same time the events of the current life of the world.

We must, moreover, distinguish between the occasional slip of papers ordinarily accurate and conscientious and the steady stream of evil poured out on society by those papers whose habit is irresponsible sensationalism. The former constitute the large majority. Nevertheless, the harm done by the latter is enormous, and its habits are contagious. Evil communications corrupt good morals, even among papers.

And in the third place, the freedom of the American press is of priceless value. It is vital to a real democracy. A muzzled press is in the long run more dangerous to the best life of a people than a sensational press, if really free. For the latter produces in time its own anti-toxin. By the former, the people are officially kept in complete ignorance of specific matters—are systematically hypnotized. All the papers are compelled by their government to aid in the hypnotization and deception. A sensational press, however, becomes tiresome in time to the majority. Moreover, if the press is free, critics of sensational utterances have an open field to denounce and expose.

Liberty of the press, accordingly, must be preserved. But liberty of the press surely does not include unlimited right to manufacture news in San Francisco and send it out to the country as the latest telegrams from Tokyo or Peking. Yet that is the kind of influence that crafty men are exerting on the international policies of the United States.

I make four suggestions as to how the international dangers of yellow journalism may be combated.

1. Each local Church Peace League might well provide for public discussions of this problem. Local campaigns should be carried through the churches of a city and the community should be aroused. The general character and accuracy of the local press should be a matter of local interest and be secured through the action of local public opinion. Pressure might also be brought to bear upon local papers to publish more, and more reliable, international news. But the most important single demand should be that foreign news should be a matter of *personal responsibility*; the name of the man who is authority for the news should be given. The possibility of continued international slander is largely due to its impersonal irresponsibility. Who, for instance, is the man who reports fake "news" from Japan? We need to know who the men are that mislead us.

2. Let the churches through the Federal Council Peace Commission or the Church Peace Union establish a Committee on International News. The duties of this Committee should be to watch the sensational head-lines dealing with foreign lands. Head-lines should be compared with the contents. Where serious discrepancy occurs the attention of the paper should be called to the misleading character of its head-lines and to the possible damage to international relations resulting from such head-lines, for multitudes of the readers see nothing but the head-lines. Request should be made to the editor for more care in the future. Subsequent action of the paper concerned should be watched.

When it is found that any particular paper indulges in such misleading head-lines, a general warning should be given it that unless it changes its method, its name will be entered on the list of papers whose treatment of news dealing with foreign lands is to be distrusted.

From time to time the Committee on International News should report to all papers, secular and religious, and to pastors throughout the country the list of such papers. In this

way the wholesome pressure of publicity and public opinion and the universal demand for honest news might be brought to bear upon offending papers.

This method of combating misleading head-lines and falsified news will, of course, be resented by those whose vicious or careless practices are interfered with. But responsible papers would doubtless welcome any honest endeavor to check in legitimate fashion the practices of the irresponsible few, which bring opprobrium on all and work incalculable damage. Of course, common sense must characterize the acts of such a Committee on International News.

This same Commission might also have as one of its duties the investigation of the reliability and veracity of alleged foreign news which, by its very nature, is harmful to international relations of friendship and appears to be malicious in character. Such "news" is almost invariably anonymous. "It is reported from Tokyo on the best of authority" is the vague way usually adopted for introducing the material. Mr. Chester H. Rowell, for instance, writing in the *World's Work* for June, 1913, said: "As I write these lines a mob of 20,000 Japanese is surging through the streets of Tokyo demanding war with America." As a matter of fact I myself happened to be in Japan at the time and know that it was not so. Mr. Rowell doubtless relied on some supposedly trustworthy telegram. He did not, however, give the source of his information. Whoever read Mr. Rowell's article was persuaded that a situation existed in Japan which in point of fact did not exist.

Now what should be done in such cases? Should it not be the duty of some responsible parties, say the Commission on International News, to find out from Mr. Rowell whence he got his information? He would doubtless refer to some telegram. The matter should then be followed up and the paper publishing it should be asked as to the source of the telegram in question; the fact should be made certain *when* and *where* and *by whom* the alleged news was *manufactured*. It should be traced to its *personal* source.

Should it be found that such malicious "news" continuously comes from any single paper or individual, then the Commission on International News, after suitable warning and failure to secure proper response, should take methods of warning the papers and the people generally against the culprit.

Reasons exist for thinking that certain foreigners in Japan are continuously sending so-called "news" to America of a malicious nature that is published always anonymously. If we could find out with certainty the names of these individuals, public opinion would soon eliminate them. If the authors of malicious "news" were in danger of public exposure, knowledge of that fact would serve as a wholesome preventive.

Few of those who indulge in such matters probably realize the extent of the harm they are doing. It is probably to them either a matter of amusement, of making a few dollars, or of venting some personal spite. International slander, however, is a crime of the gravest character, even though it is not punishable by the laws of any nation. It does inestimable wrong to both the peoples involved. For it evokes those feelings of animosity, suspicion, scorn, and condemnation, which are unjustified by facts, and they make impossible the mutual appreciation which knowledge of the real facts would normally secure.

What, however, should be done in the case of papers that refuse to give the names of those who manufacture malicious news? If such "news" could be traced to one paper as its source, the publication of its name in the list of the untrustworthy might possibly answer. But in the case of telegraphic news that appears simultaneously in many papers, what should be done?

To meet the situation adequately, do we not need a federal law that would compel papers to disclose the names of the persons from whom they receive news? *The important point is to fix personal responsibility.*

Should not the law also provide that any paper convicted of publishing telegraphic or other news which is either fabricated or maliciously exaggerated should be required to publish, in

equally conspicuous type and place as the original news, the fact of its conviction, the correction, and the name of the responsible individual. Some specially appointed officer should have the right to institute proceedings in the proper court. Repeated offenses should render the offender liable to fine or imprisonment. In such ways as these papers would be led to utilize only trustworthy reporters of international news; for no paper would be willing repeatedly to proclaim its own villainy or stupidity, or both. Is it not clear that the continuous malicious poisoning of the public mind in regard to other lands is one of the great crimes of modern times for the suppression of which a wise national policy would provide?

In closing, I venture one general suggestion. In view of the fact that the press is the most important educational institution of our country, and in view of the importance of establishing and maintaining its high quality, might not each local community bring pressure to bear on the responsible management of each paper to establish certain moral and intellectual standards of qualification for all who make writing for the newspapers their regular means of livelihood? Why should our people be exposed to every uneducated and irresponsible youth who thinks to climb to fame by his imaginative reports of private or public affairs? If public school teachers must qualify before they may instruct a few score children, why should not all be required to do the same whose writings instruct or poison the minds of thousands? Might not the respectable papers of each locality establish such standards without waiting for the pressure of public opinion?

Arguing for the liberty of the press, many no doubt will vehemently oppose all systematic effort to make it honest. They should, however, not be heeded. In war time no government hesitates to censor the press in drastic fashion. Why should not the people insist on an honest press in peace times for the maintenance of peace?

Those who stand for the moral life of the nation and for right international relations—the churches—are they not the

ones to grapple with this hydra-headed monster of a sensational, money-making press? The Golden Rule must be made supreme in speech as well as in conduct, in the activities of the press no less than in those of diplomacy. If the churches are in earnest in their program for world-peace, they should provide for honest and adequate international news. Not until then is there prospect for the permanent peace of the world.

XIV

THE CHURCHES AND THE NATIONAL POLICY OF INTERNATIONAL GOOD-WILL

THE various benevolent enterprises of an international character suggested in the preceding pages provide for the establishment by the Federal Government of such vast enterprises and the expenditure of such large sums that the creation of a special Bureau would seem to be important. Such a Bureau, moreover, constituting a regular branch of our Federal Government, would give dignity as well as assured continuity to our new national policy of international good-will. The Bureau should of course be a branch of the Department of State.

The work of the Bureau of International Good-Will should always be guided by a spirit of sympathetic coöperation with the local government of the country concerned in any particular enterprise.

In addition to the forms of activity already suggested, backward nations might be aided in opening new industries and in developing natural sources of wealth. Whatever would give real and lasting help to other peoples might be done. Especially should aid be rendered whenever there is sudden emergency and pressing need. In times of flood, earthquake, drought or fire, prompt aid could be given—feeding the hungry; rebuilding dikes; dredging rivers; reëstablishing institutions. In times of plague or epidemic, physicians and nurses could be supplied. In a word, the work of the Red Cross Society in foreign lands would be taken up as a regular part of the nation's duty, and vastly extended. The department splendidly financed should be splendidly managed by the best brains the nation could command.

Among important methods for promoting right relations with neighboring countries is that of making systematic efforts to know them thoroughly. While our knowledge of England is easy and natural because of our common language, and while our acquaintance with Germany and France is fairly full, there being thousands of Americans who have studied in those lands, speak their languages and read their papers, so that the danger of complete misunderstanding of those countries is hardly possible, our acquaintance with Mexico and South American countries is small and that with Japan and China is still smaller. Were it not for the missionaries residing in these latter countries our knowledge of the character and spirit of these great peoples would be slight indeed.

Is it not time that the American nation should adopt a broad-minded policy in this matter? Should not Congress set aside, say half a million dollars annually for scholarships for foreign study? This would provide for five hundred American students. Of this number three hundred might be sent to Mexico and to South American countries for two years of residence and study. The remaining two hundred should be sent to the Orient, to China (including Manchuria, Mongolia and Tibet), to Japan and to Siam. The difficulty of learning those languages and becoming acquainted with those peoples is such that these students should devote not less than three years to the study of their languages, history and customs. Opportunity for prolonged postgraduate study should also be provided.

The advantages of such a policy are many and great. Even from a commercial standpoint there could be no better investment. In the course of a decade our country would be supplied with experts in all matters pertaining to these peoples with whom our relations are to be increasingly close, and either mutually profitable or mutually dangerous. These scholarship students would develop personal friends in each land. They would be fitted for posts of international responsibility as ambassadors and consuls. In this country they would be in demand as professors in colleges and universities and could serve as

experts for our press on South American and Asiatic affairs. In these ways, moreover, the amazing provincialism of the average American would be gradually overcome and a world-viewpoint be secured for our nation. *Thirty years of such a policy would amount to the cost of one equipped battle-ship.* But how much more it would accomplish for the peace and prosperity of America! As an insurance policy, would it not pay splendidly?

The question will inevitably arise as to how Congress can finance so many enterprises as have been suggested. Are not the benevolent projects upon which we might enter innumerable? What limitation shall we place on our benevolent expenditures? What standard shall we set for ourselves?

In seeking for some reasonable answer to this question it has occurred to the writer that the sum expended upon our navy might serve as a suggestion as to the amount we should be ready to expend on our enterprises promoting international good-will. So long as our army remains a mere Federal police force, the navy alone, especially if it is to be considerably enlarged, will constitute the object of suspicion to our neighbors. Should we not expend on constructive deeds of international friendship as much as we expend on preparation for international belligerency? This proposal does not mean that a sum equal to the naval appropriation should go automatically and necessarily to the Bureau of International Good-Will, but only that this sum might serve as a superior limit up to which Congress might be expected to vote appropriations, and within which the Bureau might be expected to bring its work. The Bureau should of course present year by year its budget and the work of the Bureau should be closely scrutinized by appropriate committees of the Senate and the House. The general policy of the Bureau should of course be determined by suitable representatives of the administration and also of Congress.

Would not a powerful appeal be made in this way to the imagination of every nation when they know that we devote to purposes of international good-will large sums commensurate

with our other expenses? If the navy may be properly regarded as insurance, should not the work of this Bureau be similarly regarded?

There is, however, one more international benevolent enterprise upon which we should enter at an early date. Our cultivation of international good-will should not be confined to Mexico, South America and Asia. Europe is suffering a tragedy of colossal proportions. While she is losing frightfully in every way, our merchants and our Congress are joyfully planning for the capture, by newly made laws and special activity in foreign lands, of as large a portion as possible of Europe's international trade.

What now is likely to be the attitude toward us, after the war, of the merchants and manufacturers and laborers of Europe affected by our successes? Our Red Cross Society may indeed send our nurses and doctors and a few score thousand, or even a few hundred thousand dollars for relief work. The Rockefeller Foundation may finance a splendid relief undertaking. But what is all that to the millions of trade we shall capture? The situation is, indeed, perplexing. It is hardly possible to prevent enterprising Americans from developing whatever oversea trade they can. But the indignation and resentment that will accrue to us from every European land and city, town and village, injured by our successes are matters for serious thought.

The discussion of the ethics of international trade competition is no part of our plan. But it is highly important that we should consider how as a nation we may offset, so far as possible, the international alienation which at this special juncture threatens us from these sources.

The work undertaken in Belgium by the American Red Cross Society and the Rockefeller Foundation suggest what should be done on a large and generous scale, commensurate with the resources and position of the United States.

As soon as the war is over and those countries turn once more to restore their shattered cities, reestablish their factories

and build up the new civilization, why should not the United States give them substantial aid ; help them set the liberated soldiers to work at once on remunerative wages in rebuilding destroyed cities, railroads and bridges ? Might not Congress vote a sum adequate for this end ? Might we not give five or even ten dollars per individual in this land that has enjoyed peace and increasing prosperity throughout the war ? Let Congress authorize at once the establishment of the Federal Bureau of International Good-Will and provide it with funds adequate for this vast and vastly important undertaking.

Just how the money should be used need not here be particularly discussed. Of course it should not be squandered ; some of it might be loaned ; some of it should be given outright. Nothing of course should be done without the full and cordial approval and coöperation of local authorities. Administrative expenses would certainly be considerable. But these are matters of detail and do not affect the fundamental principle. What is needed is a generous gift from favored America as a nation to the ruined millions of France and Belgium, Germany and England, Russia and Austria, Servia and Turkey.

We can easily afford it. A slight tax would provide the entire amount in five years. The "pork barrel" might well be held up for a decade. We might suspend all building of new battle-ships for a few years.

Concerning the effect on Europe of such a program hardly a line need be written. Her good-will would be assured. Returning prosperity to Europe would promote our own. Every consideration of humanity and good neighborhood as well as of right business relations calls for some such act on our part.

XV

THE CHURCHES, INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, AND FOREIGN MISSIONS

CHRISTIANITY was first carried to Japan by Roman Catholic missionaries in the middle of the sixteenth century. From that day to this the fortunes of Christianity in that land have waxed and waned with the friendliness of Japanese to the West and with her confidence in its justice and good-will.

From 1553 till the end of the century Christianity made great headway, hundreds of thousands being baptized and still other hundreds of thousands coming under its influence. Then suspicion arose as to the designs of Christian nations. Opposition and finally persecution arose with complete opposition by the Government. With great effort and loss of life Christianity was practically exterminated, and for two hundred and fifty years Japan was a closed nation and Christianity a condemned religion.

In 1853 Japan's fast-closed doors were pried open by our Commodore Perry. For fifteen years there was wide-spread turmoil in Japan and finally revolution over the question how to oppose the white man and his dread religion. When Japan found she could neither keep him out nor ignore him, she adopted the policy of admitting him and learning from him the secrets of his power. That decision marked the turning point in the relations of East and West. A new era in human history began that year (1868), though only now after a half century has it become plain how significant was that decision.

It was reached, however, because already for a decade a few able missionaries had lived in Japan and a few of the young

International Relations and Foreign Missions 169

Japanese leaders had come under their influence and the old suspicions and fears of the West had been somewhat dispelled.

Ten years of increasing foreign intercourse (1870-1880) with increasing adoption of foreign ways, permission of foreign travel, and wide missionary work throughout Japan largely dispelled the popular fear of the white man. He was now (1880) looked upon almost as divine; his civilization was the ideal and even the long hated Christianity was recognized as one of the good and great religions. Until the end of that decade things foreign were in high favor. Especially was America looked upon as Japan's friend; it was the Mecca of students. American missionaries were received with favor and granted many privileges. So rapidly did the Christian work in Japan grow during that decade (1880-1890) that all anticipated the practical completion of missionary work in Japan by the close of that century.

But the political sky suddenly clouded over. Japan found the nations of the West unwilling to revise their treaties and accord her what she regarded as mere justice. Made in the early days the treaties were not acceptable to her after full twenty years of progress. Europe was beginning to suspect this growing, aspiring, Asiatic people. Europe desired to keep Japan under close tutelage and restraint. This the nation resented. It led to a strong anti-foreign movement. "Japan for the Japanese," "Preserve the ancient customs," and other similar phrases became common, expressing the new conservative spirit.

The reactionary movement was especially powerful in checking the growth of Christianity. For ten years (1890-1900) the churches were barely able to hold their own numerically. At the close of the century Japan, instead of being Christian as had been confidently expected in the eighties, was practically agnostic, her acquaintance with Christian lands having disclosed to her little that commended Christianity. During the nineties, not only did international political consideration check the growth of Christianity but so also did the invasion of Japan

by Occidental science, theories of materialistic evolution and crude higher criticism ; but still more disastrous to Japan was the rampant heathenism of Christendom.

With the revision of the treaties in 1899 better international relations were established and by that time the distinction between Christianity and civilization had begun to be widely known. Japan won many plaudits by her war with Russia and acknowledgment by the nations of the West of her place among the "powers." This made her more friendly again toward the West and toward Christianity. Beginning with the present century a new wave of interest in Christianity has been gradually arising. During the last five years a deepening moral consciousness has begun to appear. Many Japanese begin to say that the moral collapse due to wide-spread materialism can be checked only by Christianity. For ten years the churches have been growing again with increasing speed. They are full of hope. They have begun to call for large reinforcements and are now engaged in a three-year nation-wide, evangelistic campaign.

Just at this juncture, however, when the flood-tide of the new movement toward Christianity seemed to be upon us, has come this fresh obstacle to Christian work. The anti-Japanese agitation and legislation in California has evoked wide-spread indignation in Japan. The race-prejudice of a nation that was thought to be Christian, and the refusal of the nation that persuaded Japan to abandon seclusion, and to make treaties of friendship, to keep its own treaty has come as a tremendous shock.

The enactment by the California State Legislature of the Alien Land Law (May, 1913) and the anti-Japanese agitation connected therewith caused deep resentment in Japan. Japanese daily papers were not slow to see the irony of the situation.

"What are the Missionaries doing about it?" "Why do Americans send Missionaries to Japan?" "Why don't the Missionaries return to California and teach them to be Christian?" were titles of their editorials that caught my eye. In a

word the character and spirit of California's anti-alien legislation was so contrary to the spirit of Christianity and the teachings of the missionaries, that Japanese were offended. Publication (July, 1914) of the official correspondence between the United States and Japan relative to California's Alien Land Law has led to the conviction on the part of many educated Japanese that the United States is either unable or unwilling to fulfill its treaty obligations, and this is felt to be contrary to the religion of the land as a whole and also of the men who have been entrusted by the people with its highest international administrative duties. This failure to keep our treaty pledges and to follow the Christian ideals has become a serious obstacle to the success of the missionary enterprise in Japan.

The churches of America should seriously consider the paradox of their apparent interest in foreign missions (for they give some \$17,000,000 annually for this great enterprise), and their apparent indifference to these obstacles that are due to governmental disregard of treaties with Asiatic peoples. For the success of their missions is intimately dependent on the maintenance of the Golden Rule in diplomacy and of Christian treatment of Asiatics in America.

The facts presented in earlier chapters dealing with the relations of America with China and Japan indicate sufficiently what is meant and need not be repeated.

However many missionaries the churches may send to the Orient, however eloquently they may preach the Golden Rule, however generously Christians may endow schools and colleges and hospitals in those lands, however hospitable American institutions and Christian homes may be to Japanese and Chinese students in America, the final effect in commending the Christian ideal and life to Asiatics will be slight, if at the same time our treaty pledges are deliberately ignored and tens of thousands of Asiatics lawfully in America are as a rule insulted, shunned, scorned and in general refused that status and opportunity which we demand for ourselves in their lands and which we accord to representatives of other peoples in our

land. Particularly ineffective will mission work become if it is learned that the churches that send missionaries are quite indifferent to the maintenance of just relations with, and righteous treatment of, Asiatics in the United States.

Two significant movements characterize American attitude toward Asia—Foreign Missions expressing universal good-will and Asiatic exclusion due to fear of the politico-economic “yellow peril.” Hitherto the churches have been content to push the former and ignore the latter. But this is no longer possible. The anti-Asiatic attitude will effectually block the Christian movement in Asia, unless the missionary movement overcomes the anti-Asiatic movement in America. The success of the missionary work in Asiatic lands has come to a turning point. Tens of millions of Chinese and Japanese have begun to listen to the teachings of Christianity. They are asking earnest questions as to its meaning and value. What are its practical results, to the individual, to the family, to the community, to the nation? For an answer they are looking earnestly at us, in our own lands, and in our treatment of aliens.

Just at this juncture, however, the obnoxious pressure of the nations of the West is being forced upon their attention. The nations of the West seek full rights and privileges in the Orient but refuse to grant them to Asiatics in the Occident. Is this the Christian brotherhood and international good-will taught by the missionaries? Instead of coming to the Orient to teach the Christian religion, should not the missionaries first of all make their own nation Christian?

If “Christian” nations do not practice Christian principles does that not prove these principles impracticable? And if impracticable, surely the nations of the Orient should not think of adopting them. Such is the reasoning of many an Oriental to-day.

Moreover, quite apart from the processes of reasoning, an unchristian treatment of Japanese and Chinese in America inevitably arouses indignation in Japan and in China. And this

anti-American feeling constitutes an almost insuperable barrier to the preaching and teaching of the foreign missionary. An attitude of mutual good-will must be established between the missionary and his hearer before the latter can in the least understand the missionary or heed his message.

If the Asiatic hearer is filled with indignation toward America, he inevitably looks upon the missionary not as a teacher of Christianity, but as a representative American who refuses justice and courtesy. The contradiction of his words and the deeds of his countrymen prevent the message from making an impression. The seed, however good, has fallen on stony ground. And the ground has been made stony by the anti-Asiatic legislation and treatment in America. This is one of the consequences of the collapse of space and the increasingly close contact of races.

The problem, however, of Christianizing the Orient has not even yet been adequately stated. Even though treaties should be observed and the treatment of Asiatics in our land be such as is given to citizens from other lands, there would still remain another factor of great importance. I refer to the relative failure of Christianity to make Christendom Christian in its social, industrial and political life. The wickedness that flaunts itself in public places, the crime, lust, graft, and selfishness that come to light in so many forms in every large community in Christendom constitute an obstacle to the success of missions of no mean power. The success of foreign missions depends very closely on the success of Christianity in the towns and cities of Christendom. The wickedness of Christendom discredits Christianity everywhere. Foreign and home missions are inseparable.

XVI

THE CHURCHES AND DISARMAMENT

WITH regard to disarmament, peace advocates may be divided into three groups, Tolstoian, juridical and military.

Disciples of Tolstoi appeal to Jesus. They hold that individuals and nations should follow literally His teaching not to resist evil. Let aggressors have their way. Such pacifists accordingly insist that the duty of a nation to disarm is absolute and depends in no way on what its neighbors do or fail to do. They urge, moreover, that this is the best policy; for if a nation should actually disarm, the absolute sincerity of its purpose to follow reason and good neighborliness would be so clear as to secure its recognition from every side and save it from hitherto aggressive or revengeful neighbors. The complete absence of aggressive designs also would evoke a like spirit among neighbors. Nations that disarm, therefore, would in fact be perfectly safe. They would, moreover, be so evidently happy and prosperous because of absence of all useless military expenses that disarmament would spread from people to people until it became universal.

Some who urge Tolstoian disarmament admit that the nation which makes the first venture of faith might quite likely suffer at the hands of ruthless and ambitious neighbors. They urge, however, that a truly Christian people should, nevertheless, disarm; it should be willing to suffer evil without resistance. Only by willingness to suffer for Christian principles can either the reality of their convictions or the validity of their principles be proved. In spite, however, of suffering from aggressive foes, the nation that suffers would gain much. The loss inflicted by invasion would be nothing compared with that which

would have been incurred by resistance. No lives would be lost, nor wealth wasted. Even from the economic standpoint, therefore, complete disarmament and absolute non-resistance is the better policy. Luxemburg made no resistance and suffered no harm, while Belgium resisted and has in consequence been wiped out.

The intrinsic superiority of the method taught by Jesus, moreover, will never be manifested, they hold, until some nation makes the self-sacrificing venture and undergoes the experience. Absolute non-resistance would of itself alone produce profound changes in the feeling and conduct of invaders. Desires for vengeance and punishment, so common in victors who have suffered even in victory, would be absent. The victors would be overwhelmed with amazement at the character of the conquered, and would in fact be themselves conquered.

Thoroughgoing Tolstoian pacifists, however, are exceedingly few in America or anywhere.

Juridical and military pacifists, as has been suggested in a previous chapter, are much more nearly agreed than is usually thought. The differences between them are chiefly matters of emphasis, expression and spirit. They frequently misunderstand and consequently misrepresent each other. Each is apt to set up a straw man to represent the other and then of course it is easy to knock him down. Colonel Roosevelt affords a conspicuous recent example of this method in his widely syndicated articles on "What America Should Learn from the War."

His belief in the "Peace of Righteousness" is, in fact, no stronger than that of juridical pacifists whom he ridicules. The difference between them amounts to this, that whereas they insist that righteousness and justice between the nations can be secured only by abolishing *ex parte* judgments and therefore by establishing, through mutual conference and on the basis of reason, the principles of international ethics formulated into international laws with suitable tribunals and procedure for the determination of particular cases and securing of judgments, military pacifists insist that so-called international law and

judgments based thereon by tribunals will have only so much weight as there is organized military might for their enforcement. The difference, thus, is at bottom a difference of judgment in regard to the readiness of public opinion in the various nations to submit what are regarded as important national interests to the judgment of an impartial international tribunal. Juridical pacifists expect much, military pacifists expect little. Both beyond question desire peace based on righteousness. One side, however, stresses the method of reaching those judgments, distrusting *ex parte* judgments, and putting little emphasis on the need of force for the enforcement of arbitral judgments; the other side concerns itself little with the methods of reaching just judgments, but stresses the need of military might for their enforcement. Especially do military pacifists emphasize force as essential to national safety, for they are deeply impressed with the aggressive and predatory character of the nations.

American so-called militarists are pacifists no less truly than the so-called peace party, while the so-called peace party by no means urges peace-at-any-price, entirely regardless of justice or righteousness. The differences then between them are merely matters of degree and emphasis. The one would be always ready to enforce right by might; they would use force easily and often; the other deprecates the assumption that right will not be respected as right, and would be slow to resort to might for the enforcement of right. They insist, moreover, that military might seldom if ever secures right. In establishing right it does great wrong. These differences between the two pacifists determine their respective attitudes to the question of armaments and disarmament.

Both schools reject Tolstoian views and arguments, juridical pacifists mildly, military pacifists energetically. Military pacifists are apt to regard as Tolstoian all pacifists who do not subscribe to their particular creed. That is a serious error. For it creates a needless division in the ranks of pacifists, raises false issues, and delays the progress of the Peace Movement.

Because, moreover, of the spirit and arguments of the military pacifists, they are often regarded by others as militarists pure and simple, caring nothing for righteousness.

Consider, for instance, the following instance of misrepresentation, issued as a card by the United States Navy League.

ANOTHER EASY SOLUTION FOR SECURING PEACE ON EARTH

(Recommended by the Navy League of the United States to Well-Endowed Pacifists and laborers in the Peace Vineyard, obsessed with the theory that disarmament will bring world peace; a theory referred to by Woodrow Wilson, Vol. 3, "The History of the American People," when he describes the War of 1812 as "*A War of Arms Brought on by a Program of Peace.*")

ABOLISH: Kings, Oligarchies, Race Antipathies, Unfair Competition, Land Grabbing, Injustice and Sin. (Professor Giddings would also add "Protective Tariffs.")

ESTABLISH: The Rule of the People, Racial Solidarity, a Satisfactory World Tribunal, Justice, and a Changed Human Nature.

AD INTERIM: MAINTAIN A STRONG NAVY

Does the Navy League regard this as a fair representation of the position of the "Well-Endowed Pacifists and Laborers in the Peace Vineyard"? Does not the argument here offered imply that there is no possible use in developing international law with its tribunals and that the only possible method till "human nature" is changed is a "*Strong Navy*"? Surely the Navy League misrepresents itself in this matter as well as those whom it ridicules.

Military pacifists emphatically reject all Tolstoian ideas. They regard such ideals and proposals as contemptible. They emphasize rights and courage. The loss of independence through unresisting obedience to an aggressive, arrogant foe they look upon with utmost scorn. "Give me liberty or give me death" is a vital principle with them. They laugh at the idea that disarmament would be contagious; that ambitious

peoples would be deterred from aggression by the weakness of those whose territory is desired ; that the amiability of the conquered would save them from ill-treatment or slavery at the hands of the victors, or that prosperity would in any large amount come to the conquered.

Military pacifists, no less than aggressive militarists, believe in force. Only a people with power which they are prepared to use for defense of right and honor and independence is to be respected. However big a country may be, it is contemptible if it lacks organized power or the ability or the willingness to use it. The kind of disarmament, accordingly, which they advocate is one that can arise only among states that trust one another, and agree to federate, maintaining among them a total military and naval force superior to that of their combined foes. The various proposals of Mr. Hamilton Holt, Mr. Edwin Mead and Colonel Roosevelt for a Peace League or a Federation belong to this class. The first two of these gentlemen are juridical pacifists ; the third is a military pacifist, yet their several proposals are practically identical.

Proposals for federation, however, do not as a rule expect to include the entire world in a single system, at least in the near future. At most they hope that five or six of the strongest European nations may combine. This would allow for a certain amount of disarmament ; for by their combination they would no longer need to arm each against the other.

Some urge that in such a league it should be the duty of the whole to coerce any single unit, should it attack any other unit of the league. Only by such an assurance would the several units feel safe even from one another, for always and everywhere the sense of safety is the fundamental preliminary to disarmament.

What attitude now should Christians take to these questions of armaments and disarmament ? Are they under obligations as Christians to accept the Tolstoian interpretation of Scripture and apply it to both individual and national life ? Or may they take the view of juridical or even of military pacifists and still be Christians ? Important though these questions may

seem to be, they are questions, nevertheless, that should not be answered in the abstract. We must deal with the situation as it exists to-day in the concrete. In this world as at present constituted, the use of force to meet force is still inevitable. A thoroughgoing application of Tolstoi's theories to all individual, political, social and international relations of men would reduce society at once to chaos. We use force to restrain the insane, and also violent criminals. Is it unchristian to use force in restraining a nation that has lost its mental balance or that has entered on a course of criminal international destruction and robbery? Tolstoi's view, moreover, is not the only one a Christian may take and remain Christian. Indeed, his interpretation of Scripture is not justified by sound principles of exegesis. No passage may be taken out of its context and be correctly understood. Christ's law of non-resistance must be interpreted in harmony with the rest of his teaching and must also recognize his pedagogical methods.

But we must not forget that the effort to settle questions of social or national relation on the basis of mere force is also disastrous—nay, impossible in the long run. Either extreme of non-resistance or of force is equally impossible in the settlement of human relations as the world is constituted. As civilization advances the resort to force diminishes and the appeal to reason and to character increases. This is of the very essence of civilization. At any particular stage of human development, accordingly, the degree to which it is right or wise to resort to force is a matter of practical experience, concerning which there is wide variety of judgment. Charity must, therefore, prevail between men who hold diverse views.

What, however, should be the policy of our American churches in regard to our own nation at this particular juncture? As a matter of practical international politics should Christians adopt a policy of thoroughgoing disarmament for America and seek hereafter to oppose in Congress every bill appropriating funds for the army and navy? Or should they admit that the world-situation is not such as to justify so radical a course?

That, therefore, as Christians we must provide for armaments sufficient to protect our land, our honor and our rights?

Personally, I take the latter view. In towns and cities a certain amount of local police force is unquestionably needed, if ruffians are to be restrained and civilization maintained. So, too, among the states of the Union experience has shown that a certain amount of military force under the control of the Federal Government is essential. Is the case otherwise in the world at large? Until the whole world is far better organized than it is at present, provision being made for the rights of hitherto submerged peoples and races and for those whose populations are rapidly increasing, and until the military theory of nations is widely abandoned, and until a world-wide peace federation is in fairly good working order, any large measure of disarmament is not to be expected or insisted on. The time has not yet come when peacefully inclined nations can dispense with naval and military armaments.

For us, therefore, the practical question is one of degree. With how small an army and navy can we be safe? Our army should be regarded entirely as a national police force, directed by the Federal Government. Yet should we join a peace federation, which is highly desirable, our army should be adequate to do its share in policing the world. Any enlargement beyond these duties would cause distrust among our neighbors. Should suspicions arise in regard to the purpose of our increasing armaments, our neighbors would feel the need of corresponding military preparations.

In regard to the navy also the general principle should be the same—no larger than is absolutely necessary. But this is an extremely vague standard and must inevitably vary with one's estimate of national dangers. Those who advocate an increase of our present naval force should be required to show good reason for the same.¹

¹ A telegram from Japan of October 30, 1914, announces that Count Okuma, Premier and also President of the Japan Peace Society announced

The reason for an American navy, be it ever remembered, does not arise because of danger from Japan. For Japan's navy exists for other reasons than to attack us, or even to ward off a possible attack from us. Should increase of our navy be urged because of fear of Japan, Japan would naturally reciprocate the fear and feel forced to increase hers.

An important step toward peace and probably as important a feature of disarmament as any other would be the mutual agreement of nations to abandon the international spy system. This system does incalculable harm in countless ways. It ruins the moral character both of those who are its managers and also of those who are its tools. It promotes intrigues, lies and international distrust. Governments believe their own spies, rather than the statements of accredited ambassadors and the prime ministers of suspected neighbors. The ruthless destruction of Belgium was due at bottom to the spy system, for Germany believed what her spies thought they had discovered as to the purposes of France rather than the assurances of the French Government. The actual disposition of the French forces when the war opened shows that the spies had been mistaken.

Essential probably to the abandonment of the spy system would be another mutual agreement by members of the Peace Federation, namely, to show freely to duly accredited officers of other lands all the fortifications and military plans that the accredited officials may desire to see. There should be no military secrets. This more than any other one thing would serve to remove suspicion.

The questions, however, on which Christians should focus attention are not those that deal with methods of organizing the nations, of establishment of an International Peace Federation, or even as to the exact size of the navy needed by the United States to insure its own safety and do its share in providing a

as the policy of the Government the necessity of increasing both army and navy, in view of the "problem of national defense." Who can doubt that this determination in Japan is evoked in part at least by the anti-Japanese speeches and naval proposals of many representative Americans?

police force for the world. These are matters for diplomats, lawyers and governments to determine.

The peculiar contribution for American churches to make in the promotion of world-peace is the adoption of constructive methods for producing international confidence and good-will.

Love even of enemies and doing them good is that which the churches must emphasize. They should insist on the application of the Golden Rule in our international relations. This, after all, is the only effective method for establishing universal peace in a constructive way. Even a World-Peace Federation does not make world-peace certain, so long as national selfishness and the materialistic philosophy of life prevail among individuals and nations. These necessarily produce jealousies, hatreds and wrong ambitions, and these in turn necessarily resort on occasion to fraud and force—that is, to militarism. Peace Federations that rest their final hope for peace on fear of force cannot be permanent. Positive friendly treatment of neighbors with whom there is friction or danger of it is the only true method for constructively establishing world-peace, for it alone really overcomes fear and suspicion and begets in their place true friendship and confidence.

The policy of Christians with regard to armaments and disarmament, therefore, should be an understanding with juridical and military pacifists. Might not an agreement be reached between these groups of pacifists, each making room for the contention of the other? Let juridical and military pacifists agree that Congress shall make large appropriations not only for armaments but also for the Christian method of good-will. Christian pacifists might, indeed, content themselves with a sum equal to that expended on the navy. If the Federal Bureau should expend annually as much on its program as is expended on the navy, an attitude of such friendliness and trust would develop in a few decades among our neighbors that international fear would vanish and the call for many mighty battle-ships would spontaneously cease. Our legislators and people

might then be ready to vote funds for international good-will, regardless of the sums devoted to armaments.

Is not the application of the Golden Rule to international relations the true policy, therefore, for the churches of America to adopt at the present juncture? Let us not demand disarmament, nor refuse to vote the necessary sums for the ships thought needed by experts; but let us insist that the practical expression of international good-will and the positive development of mutual confidence are as important for national safety as are armaments—nay, of far more importance, for they constitute a preventive for the war spirit, an anti-toxin for animosity.

Coast and harbor defenses should not be particularly objected to by Christians, unless it be for their supposed wastefulness, for they can never be used in offensive warfare, and therefore, however powerful or many they may be, they cause no anxiety to peacefully inclined neighbors. The case, however, is different with a navy. It sails the sea, and if powerful can hardly fail to arouse suspicion and fear, especially among neighbors whose navies are weaker than our own. Is it not important that we should make our efforts to allay those suspicions and fears, large in proportion to their aggravating cause, namely, our navy?

Should the proposal here suggested be accepted, the question of the size of the navy might not be as perplexing as it now is. Advocates of say four new battle-ships per annum, in addition to the total current expenses of the navy, aggregating annually \$150,000,000 would probably hesitate to push their demand if it meant an equal grant for international good-will.

Of course, aggressive militarists and all who are more or less dominated by race pride, prejudice and selfishness will scout this proposal. They have no confidence whatever in goodness as a practical policy, especially between nations. In their eyes force is all that really counts.

Those, however, who have learned their lesson in the School of Christ, know that the Christian policy is after all the only

policy that is really practicable. Goodness begets goodness; helpfulness, helpfulness; trust, trust. Mr. Worldly Wiseman is not so wise as he thinks himself. We have good authority as well as much experience for holding that "Foolishness is justified of her children." Complete disarmament can come only when all nations trust one another and are worthy of that trust.

No other country than the United States can so well undertake such an international policy as that proposed in this volume. Is not vast national wealth a divine international trust? The white races have taken possession of the great and relatively unoccupied natural resources of the world. Should not that wealth be regarded as an international trust and be used for the benefit also of nations less favored?

The fundamental principles of human life are as true for nations as for individuals. Should not our nation inaugurate a policy of national good-will commensurate with its other activities, which policy is essential to the final disarmament of nations and the lasting peace of the world? The truly great nation, no less than the truly great man, gives liberally of its wealth, its thought, its time, and its effort for the welfare of others.

Is not unselfish service the true measure of national as of individual greatness?

XVII

INTERNATIONAL CHURCH COÖPERATION FOR WORLD-PEACE

SHOULD not the churches of the United States also seek, in every way practicable, the coöperation of all Christians in every land for the promotion of World-Peace? Every pulpit throughout Christendom should be enlisted for the peace cause. Had the preachers of Austria, France, Germany, Great Britain, Russia, and the United States been proclaiming righteousness and good-will among the nations as an essential part of Christianity; had they denounced war preparations as wicked, with their spies and their lies; had they insisted that militarism and war have no more in common with Christianity than drunkenness, adultery, robbery, or private murder; had they been teaching that a nation has no more moral right to attack, injure or destroy another than has an individual; in a word, had the churches been faithfully teaching the people and had they been making one of the tests of church membership a man's attitude on this question, the present European tragedy would not have occurred.

The call of the pastors of Switzerland in their "Appeal to the Christian Churches,"¹ issued in January, 1914, suggests what should be done on a large scale as soon as conditions permit. As churches the Christians of the world should assemble to consult together and to devise practical measures for the overthrow of militarism and the abolishment of wars between nations that profess to be Christian. "It is absolutely essential that they strive with all their might against

¹ "Appeal to the Christian Churches," by the Pastors of Switzerland, January, 1914.

the prejudice, selfish interest and that false patriotism which sows jealousy and hatred among nations. It is absolutely essential that they work together for the substitution of right for force; of arbitration for war. It is absolutely essential that they rouse the nations, not to a ruinous competition in armaments, but to a fruitful emulation in the arts of peace."

Might not the Protestant Churches of America, through the Federal Council and the Church Peace Union, make overtures to the Roman Catholic Church of America proposing joint peace delegations of representative churchmen to every church in Christendom? While jurists, parliamentarians and statesmen are perfecting machinery for World-Peace, why should not the *churches* of Christendom parallel the movement and do the vastly more important work of moulding the hearts and minds of the masses in each nation?

Why might there not be held in London, Berlin or Paris or Rome an Ecumenical Peace Council of the Churches? What incalculable blessings in countless lines would accrue from such a council! How ancient animosities between the churches would melt away and reconciliations take place! Would they not go far toward making a real peace program effective? Would not the union of all Christians in a positive peace effort reveal the inherent unity of Christians and thus secure that active presence of Christ among us that would insure victory and establish the permanent and universal rule of the Prince of Peace.

If the church organizations and the Christians in each land should coöperate in this matter, ambitious dynasties, scheming bureaucracies and grasping capitalists might be controlled. Unless the churches really do their work of moulding the hearts of the nations, arbitration treaties and the Hague Court will avail little. If the churches abdicate their responsibility for establishing the Kingdom of God in its larger aspects, other organizations will make the attempt. Already it looks as though social democracy would forge ahead and was likely to make international peace one of its strong planks. After the

present European Armageddon is over and laborers in every land discover the cost to themselves of dynastic ambitions, national jealousies and capitalistic schemes, and realize how they themselves have been compelled to fight and suffer and die, leaving widows and orphans in ruined homes, social democracy will raise its head with renewed energy, and possibly venom, to denounce the Church for its apathy and criminal failure and the rulers and capitalists for their positive wickedness. Socialism will doubtless seek to establish international peace. But the peace it will seek to establish will surely be partial; it will not include all mankind, regardless of race in its scope. Nor will it make universal righteousness and goodwill its fundamental principles. That means, however, still further tragedy decades hence. For world-peace can come only through world-welfare—based on a world-righteousness that rejects all race or class preference.

The time has come for Christians in every land to see that the churches insist on righteousness, truth and goodwill in every department of life. And for this the churches of every land should coöperate. For the lands are no longer isolated as they once were. Space no longer keeps them apart. Their interests and their welfare are closely interlinked. The churches of every land, therefore, should take early and effective steps, coöperating in the adoption of practical means in every land to teach the people and to guide the governments.

In arranging for the Ecumenical Peace Conference of Christian Churches suggested above, the Church Peace Union of America might well take the lead. It would naturally take the matter up with the "World Alliance of the Churches for the Promotion of International Friendship" which came into existence at Constance August 2, 1914, just as "the great war" broke out. This organization would communicate with its branches in each land and also with the suitable representatives of the Roman Catholic and the various Greek churches.

That the World Conference of Churches is prepared to take

some such step as this is indicated by the following resolutions which were passed on that memorable day (August 2d) when Europe's international organization fell into complete confusion.

1. "That, inasmuch as the work of conciliation and the promotion of amity is essentially a Christian task, it is expedient that the churches in all lands should use their influence with the Peoples, Parliament and the Governments of the world to bring about good and friendly relationships between the nations, so that, along the path of peaceful civilization, they may reach that universal good-will which Christianity has taught mankind to aspire after."

2. "That, inasmuch as all sections of the Church of Christ are equally concerned in the maintenance of peace and the promotion of good feeling among all the races of the world, it is advisable for them to act in concert in their efforts to carry the foregoing resolution into effect."

3. "That in order to enable the different churches to be brought into touch with one another, steps should be taken to form in every country councils of either a denominational or interdenominational character (as the circumstances of each case require) whose object it will be to enlist the churches, in their corporate capacity, in a joint endeavor to achieve the promotion of international friendship and the avoidance of war, and that for this purpose a central bureau should be established for facilitating correspondence between such councils, collecting and distributing information and generally coördinating the work connected with the movement."

4. "That the duty of carrying into effect the resolutions arrived at by the Conference be entrusted to a committee consisting of the following members: . . ."

Here follow the names of seventeen representative Christians of England, France, Germany, Switzerland, and the United States, to whom is given power to add to their number.

XVIII

THE NEW CRUSADE

MILITARISM is bankrupt. Might never makes right; it brings no real success. Arrogant worldly ambition creates enemies and causes ruin.

Modern civilization begets modern conditions under which the modern man must work out his salvation.

The Peace Movement seeks to establish social and international machinery for the attainment of arbitral justice. It deals with important yet nevertheless superficial factors that make for peace. It provides the method but does not produce the essential spiritual life.

Historic Christianity has been apathetic to the visions of prophets and apostles because it has been seriously paganized; it has been invaded by the spirit of the world. It has believed the Satanic suggestion that worship of force and fraud would really give possession of the kingdoms of this world and the glory thereof.

From the eyes of millions, however, the veil has been stripped; the delusion of Satan is now clear. The scourge of war has disclosed the brutal, degrading character of militarism. In proportion as militarism prospers do civilization and religion perish and human values disappear. Its very successes are illusions, nay, disasters vast and overwhelming.

Christians are to-day seeing new visions. Eternal and invincible principles of life have suddenly become plain. Man's mastery of nature and conquest of space have indeed given him a new heaven and a new earth. Discoveries and inventions, however, do not and cannot of themselves produce the new

social order needful for this new era. This can come only by spiritual regeneration. Christians now begin to see what is needed :

“The establishment of a world-civilization in which all men regardless of race, social or previous moral condition shall together find God and do the day's work happily with Him and with each other forevermore through personal connection with Jesus Christ ” (Prof. Edw. I. Bosworth).

Loud, wide, insistent is the call of millions to war upon war. Denunciations of its folly and wickedness fill our papers. There is much clear analysis of the causes for the tragedy. Preachers and writers convince us that no one people and no single monarch are responsible. Militarism is a disease infecting every nation. “The spirit of materialism and selfishness and belief in the might of the stronger have twined themselves around the roots of Western civilization,” writes Mr. Oldham. “The intellectual classes of Europe have to a large extent turned their backs on Christ, repudiated His ethics and accepted the doctrine that enlightened self-interest should regulate the conduct both of individuals and nations.”

“The war is the result of a false philosophy of national life, a philosophy which maintains that the foundation of power is physical force, and that greatness is to be computed in terms of brute strength ” (Dr. Charles E. Jefferson).

In all these brilliant and illuminating discussions, however, and in spite of their insistence that righteousness must become the ruling force among men and nations, I find no proposals as to how this spirit is to be created, this ideal realized. Such suggestions as do occur in regard to the establishment of world-peace, propose to utilize the conventional methods whether of the Church or of the Peace Movement. These, however, are inadequate. They must, therefore, be supplemented.

We have in America 36,000,000 Protestant and Roman Catholic Christians. The vast majority of these men and women earnestly desire world-peace. But what are they doing—what *can* they do as the Church is now organized? The

vision of world-peace inspires us to-day and we have, I believe, the power. We now need to connect the individual batteries with the central motor and slip on the belt, bringing the power over into our vast administrative political system, and drive all its wheels by Christian instead of by pagan force. Should Christians combine on their Christian program for social and international righteousness incalculable results would follow. Would it not, moreover, be easy under such conditions to win for Christ and His Kingdom millions of those who now regard the Church with scorn and proposals for world-peace with skepticism?


The next great forward step for the Christian world is the Crusade for Peace. Who shall be the leaders in this forward movement of the modern world?

Pastors, awake! Enlist in the new crusade! *Yours is the great opportunity; yours the splendid responsibility.* The suffering war-sick world awaits your response to the call of the Prince of Peace.

Under enthusiastic guidance by the pastors of America, 100,000 strong, the Christian forces can easily be mobilized for the New Crusade, the war against war. Vast campaigns are before us. Ballots shall be our bullets. Legislatures must be captured. Golden Rule laws must be enacted by national and state legislatures.

The Prince of Peace invites volunteers for the New Crusade.

In hoc signo vinces



Bibliography

The following volumes and pamphlets, containing record of the work of the churches in the interest of international peace, may be obtained from the Book Department of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, 105 East 22d Street, New York City:

- “Christian Unity at Work,” edited by Charles S. Macfarland ; \$1.00 ; post-paid, \$1.20.
- “The Proceedings of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America of 1912,” accompanying the volume “Christian Unity at Work.”
- “The Annual Reports of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America for 1914,” post-paid, 20 cents.
- “A Year Book of the Church and Social Service,” paper cover, 25 cents ; post-paid, 30 cents ; cloth cover, 50 cents ; post-paid, 55 cents.
- “The Churches of Christ in America and International Peace,” by Charles S. Macfarland ; printed by the Church Peace Union, 70 Fifth Ave., free.
- “Japan and the United States ” (a report of an investigation conducted for the Commission on Relations with Japan), by Professor H. A. Millis.
- “The Churches and International Friendship,” published by the World Alliance of the Churches for Promoting International Friendship, may be obtained from the Church Peace Union, free.

Pamphlet literature, which is issued constantly, may be obtained from the Church Peace Union.

Pamphlet literature is also constantly issued by the Commission on Peace and Arbitration of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

Lesson Study Courses for Sunday School and General Church use are issued by the Commission on Christian Education of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

