



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Love of war is decreasing, but reliance on huge armaments is seemingly increasing. Decreased danger is paradoxically accompanied by growth of the military spirit, for which the newspapers and the military class, jealous of their profession, are chiefly responsible. A college education is no guarantee that one knows anything about these practical questions of danger and defense—far more important for success as voter, editor or parent than dead languages or higher mathematics.

WHAT YOU CAN DO.

1. You can learn these facts and pass them along.
2. You can join the American Peace Society, whose central office is 31 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass., by paying \$1.00 a year, which includes subscription to the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, the strong organ in America of internationalism. If you cannot spare \$1.00, you can send a post-card, ask for sample literature and application blanks, and try to get your friends to join.
3. You can try to induce the church or club to which you belong to have at least one address annually given by some expert on internationalism.
4. You can promote the observance of May 18, the anniversary of the opening of the first Hague Conference.
5. You can interest yourself in the Intercollegiate Peace Association, whose Secretary is Mr. George Fulk, Cerro Gordo, Ill. This sorely needs funds, and a generous donor has promised to double every dollar given to it. You can also interest yourself in the new American School Peace League, Mrs. Fannie Fern Andrews, 378 Newbury Street, Boston, Secretary. Money contributed toward this will likewise be duplicated. It aims to promote through schools and the educational public the interests of international justice and fraternity.
6. You can see that the following books, for sale by the American Peace Society, are put into your Public Library:

"World Organization," R. L. Bridgman	\$0.65
"Addresses on War," Sumner65
"Discourses on War," Channing65
"Moral Damage of War," Walsh90
"Patriotism and the New Internationalism," a manual for teachers, Lucia Ames Mead20
"The Future of War," Bloch65
"The Federation of the World," B. F. Trueblood . .	.75
"Lay Down Your Arms," Baroness von Suttner . .	.65

The United States and Universal Peace.

BY GLENN PORTER WISHARD.

[At the second Interstate Oratorical Contest on Peace and Arbitration, held at De Pauw University, Greencastle, Ind., May 16, under the auspices of the Intercollegiate Peace Association, Mr. Wishard of Northwestern University, whose oration we herewith print, won the first prize of \$75.—ED.]

Political and religious reforms move slowly. We change our beliefs and at the same time hold fast to old customs. Far-sighted public opinion has declared war to be unchristian; sound statesmanship has stamped it as unjust; the march of events has, in the majority of cases, proved it to be unnecessary,—and yet we continue to build mammoth engines of destruction as if war were inevitable. Truly, the millennium is not at hand, nor is war a thing of the past; but whereas war was once the rule, now it is the exception. This is an age of peace; controversies once decided by force are now

settled by arbitration; Europe, once the scene of continuous bloodshed, has not been plundered by conquering armies for more than a generation, while the United States has enjoyed a century of peace marred by only five years of foreign war. The four notable conflicts of the last decade have been between great and small powers; and have been confined to the outposts of civilization, while during the same period more than one hundred disputes have been settled by peaceful means. The willingness to arbitrate has been manifest; the means have been provided; the Permanent International Court, established by the Hague Conference in 1899, actually lives, and has already adjudicated four important controversies. But arbitration, you say, will never succeed because the decisions cannot be enforced. You forget that already some two hundred and fifty disputes have been settled by this method and in not one instance has the losing power refused to abide by the decision.

Yesterday the man who advocated universal peace was called a dreamer; to-day throughout the world organized public opinion demands the abolition of war. Yesterday we erected statues to those who died for their country; to-day we eulogize those who live for humanity. Yesterday we bowed our heads to the god of war; to-day we lift our hands to the Prince of Peace.

I do not mean to say that we have entered the utopian age, for the present international situation is a peculiar one, since we are at the same time blessed with peace and cursed with militarism. This is not an age of war, yet we are burdened by great and ever-increasing armaments; the mad race for naval supremacy continues; while the relative strength of the powers remains practically the same; the intense and useless rivalry of the nations goes on until, according to the great Russian economist, Jean de Bloch, it means "slow destruction in time of peace or swift destruction in the event of war." In Europe to-day millions are being robbed of the necessities of life, millions more are suffering the pangs of abject poverty, in order to support this so-called "armed peace." Note the condition in our own country. Last year we expended on our army, navy and pensions sixty-seven per cent. of our total receipts. Think of it! In a time of profound peace more than two-thirds of our entire expenditures are charged to the account of war.

We do not advocate radical utopian measures; we do not propose immediate disarmament; but we do maintain that when England, Germany, France and the United States each appropriate from thirty to forty per cent. of their total expenditures in preparation for war in an age of peace, the time has come for the unprejudiced consideration of the present international situation. Why do the great powers build so many battleships? President Roosevelt, Representative Hobson and others would have us believe that England, Germany and France are actually preparing for war, while the United States is building these engines of destruction for the purpose of securing peace. But what right have we to assume that our navy is for the purpose of preserving peace, while the navies of the European powers are for the purpose of making war? Is it not an insult to neighbors to make such an assumption? As a matter of fact, England builds new battleships because Germany does, Germany increases her navy because France does, while the United States builds new Dreadnaughts because the other nations

pursue that policy. Call it by whatever honey-coated name you will, the fact remains that it is military rivalry of the most barbaric type, a rivalry as useless as it is oppressive, a rivalry prompted by jealousy and distrust, where there should be friendship and mutual confidence. There is not one of the powers but what would welcome relief from the bondage of militarism; the demand for the limitation of armaments is almost universal. Believing that to decry war and praise peace without offering some plan by which the present situation may be changed is superficial, we hasten to propose something practicable. How shall we put an end to this useless rivalry of the nations? At present a general agreement of the great powers to the limitation of military establishments seems impossible. It remains for some powerful nation to prove to the world that great armaments are not necessary to continued peace with honor and justice. Some nation must take the first step. Why not the United States?

The nations of Europe are surrounded by powerful enemies, while the United States is three thousand miles from any conceivable foe. They are potentially weak, while our resources are unlimited. They have inherited imperialism; we have inherited democracy. Their society is permeated with militarism; ours is built on peace and liberty. Our strategic position is unequaled, our resources are unlimited, our foreign policy is peaceful, our patriotism is unconquerable. In view of these facts, I ask you, what nation has the greatest responsibility for peace? Are not we Americans the people chosen to lift the burden of militarism from off the backs of our down-trodden brothers?

Now what are we doing to meet this responsibility? On the one hand, we are performing a great work for peace. Many of our statesmen, business men and laborers, united in a common cause, are exerting a tremendous influence in behalf of arbitration and disarmament. On the other hand, we are spending more on our military establishment than any other world-power; we are building more battleships than any other nation; we are no longer trusting our neighbors; we are warning them to beware of our mailed fist; we are thereby declaring to the world that we have lost our faith in the power of justice and are now trusting in the force of arms.

And why this paradoxical situation? Why do we at the same time prepare for war and work for peace? It is simply because many of our statesmen honestly believe that the best way to preserve peace is to prepare for war. It is true that a certain amount of strength tends to command respect, and for that reason a navy sufficient for self-defense is warranted. Such a navy we now have. Why should it be enlarged? Naval enthusiasts would have us to prepare not for the probable, but for the possible. Seize every questionable act of our neighbors, they say, magnify it a thousand times, publish it in letters of flame throughout the land, and make every American citizen believe that the great powers are prepared to destroy us at any moment. Having educated the people up to a sense of threatened annihilation, burden them with taxes, build artificial volcanoes, dedicated to peace, parade them up and down the high seas, and defy the world to attack us. Then, they say, we shall have peace. Is this reasonable? As sure as thought leads to action, so preparation for war leads to war.

This argument that the United States, since she is a peace-loving nation, should have the largest navy in the world in order to preserve peace is illogical and without foundation. By what divine right does the United States assume the role of preserving the world's peace at the cannon's mouth? Since when has it been true that might makes right and that peace can be secured only by acting the part of a bully? It is unjust, it is unpatriotic, it is unstatesmanlike, for men to argue that the United States should browbeat the world into submission; that she should build so many battleships that the nations of the Eastern Hemisphere will be afraid to oppose the iron-clad dragon of the Western Hemisphere. Peace purchased at the price of brute force is unworthy of the name. Surely the United States cannot be guilty of such injustice. If we wish to be free, if we wish to remain a true republic, if we purpose to continue our mighty work for humanity, we must limit our preparations for war. The best way to preserve peace is to think peace, to believe in peace and to work for peace.

The extent to which the great powers will go in order to secure enthusiasm for their military establishments is almost beyond comprehension. Each nation has its great military rendezvous, its grand naval parades, its magnificent display of gorgeous military uniforms, its wave of colors, blare of trumpets, and bursts of martial music. The United States is now sending her navy around the world for the purpose of training the seamen certainly, but also that the youth of our land may be intoxicated by the apparent glory of it all, and thus enlist for service; that the American citizens may be aroused to greater enthusiasm by this magnificent display of the implements of legalized murder, and thus be willing to build more floating arsenals rather than irrigate arid lands, develop internal water ways, build hospitals, schools and colleges.

The trouble with such exhibitions is that it displays only the bright side of militarism. If, in place of the Russian battleships, they should display the starving masses of dejected and despised beings who pay for those battleships; if, in place of the gay German uniforms, they should exhibit the rags of the disheartened peasants who pay for those uniforms; if, in place of the grand parade, they should produce masses of wounded men and rivers of blood; if, in place of the stirring martial music, they should produce the writhing agonies and awful groans of dying men; if, in place of sham war, they should produce actual war, — their exhibition would make militarism unbearable.

Again, we are told that we have suddenly become a world power, and that we must prepare to exercise a new diplomacy under new conditions. We must increase our navy, they say, to enforce this new diplomacy. We must prepare to fight in behalf of the Monroe Doctrine. But why, I ask, cannot this new diplomacy be enforced as American diplomacy has always been enforced? We promulgated the Monroe Doctrine without a navy; we have maintained it for over eighty years without show of force. If our new diplomacy is right, it is as strong as the world's respect for righteousness; if it is wrong, a hundred battleships cannot enforce it.

We have become a world power, and therefore we have a world-wide responsibility, and that responsibility is to establish justice, not force; to build colleges, not

battleships; to enthrone love, not hate; to insure peace, not war. Our mission is to strike the chains from the ankles of war-burdened humanity. Our duty is to proclaim in the name of the Most High our faith in the power of justice as opposed to the force of arms. May it be said of us that we found the world burdened with militarism, but left it blessed with peace; that we found liberty among the strong alone, but left it the birthright of the weak; that we found humanity a mass of struggling individuals, but left it a united brotherhood. May it be said of us that we found peace purchased at the price of human suffering, but left it as free as air; that we found peace bruised and stained with militarism, but left it ruling the world through love and liberty. May it be said of us that we fulfilled our mission as a world power; that we were brave enough and strong enough to lead the world into the path of universal peace.

New Books.

THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF SOCIAL REFORM. Edited by William B. P. Bliss and Rudolph M. Binder. New York and London: Funk & Wagnalls Co. New edition, 1321 pages.

This is not a revision of an old book of the same title, but with the exception of a few articles is rewritten and put forth in more extended form. It contains hundreds of studies made by university professors and specialists of international reputation. It treats briefly, but comprehensively, of all the great human interests and present-day problems, such as public-service companies, railroads, tariff legislation, the condition of labor, commerce, agriculture and manufacture, with exports and imports of foreign countries, economic and industrial questions, including the relations of capital and trade unions; the moral and sociological problems of the great cities, of the family, the state, the nation; the history and present-day development of political parties, churches, schools and charities; all these with many representative leaders whose lives are summarized in biographical sketches. At the end of every topic of importance is a list of available references. Dr. Trueblood contributes a valuable article on international arbitration, its history and present status, bringing up the subject to the time of the second Hague Conference. The encyclopedia ought to be invaluable to writers, speakers and students in general.

INTERNATIONAL LAW. PART I: PEACE. By Prof. John Westlake. Cambridge: The University Press, 1904. 356 pages. American Agents: G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York City.

In the May number of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* an extensive and appreciative notice of Part II, "War," was given, in which the characteristics of Prof. Westlake's literary style, method of dealing with legal topics and his point of view were considered. That volume contained a valuable commentary on the conduct of war, the rights and duties of neutrals, etc., as regulated by the second Hague Conference. This volume has an article on international arbitration which was printed by Professor Westlake in the *International Journal of Ethics*. The peace measures of the second Hague Conference are

naturally not given in a work which was published three years before the Conference was called together. But an article of great scientific value was published by Professor Westlake on the general aspects of the second Hague Conference in the January, 1908, number of the *Quarterly Review*, which may well be consulted in connection with this volume. The present work, however, is concerned with International Law according to the usage and practice of the present times. It deals with fundamental principles. The definitions of International Law, the classification of states, their origin and continuity, the title to state territory, minor territorial rights, including protectorates, the law with regard to rivers and the open sea, territorial waters, nationality, national jurisdiction, diplomacy, the rights, equality and independence of states, and the protection of subjects abroad, are treated clearly, succinctly, and in a practical manner. This volume is especially useful in dealing with questions that have arisen during the expansion of the great powers in the nineteenth century, such as the relations of colonies, dependencies, spheres of influence and the use of inter-oceanic canals. Written primarily for students and men who are interested in public affairs, it leaves the exhaustive study of the history of International Law to the field of the specialist.

FRONTIERS; THE ROMANES LECTURE FOR 1907. By Rt. Hon. Lord Curzon of Kedleston. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. Price, 2 shillings net. 58 pages.

Very little about Frontiers is found in most books on international law. The special literature of the subject is confined chiefly to treaties and inaccessible documents in the archives of foreign offices. But hereafter there will be ready at hand this lecture by Lord Curzon, the man who of all men, by reason of his British nationality and his experience as Viceroy of India, is qualified to speak on the topic.

The following extract indicates the importance of the subject to Great Britain, and will be information to many people who have not recently studied the development of the Empire:

"Time was when England had no Frontier but the ocean. We have now by far the greatest extent of territorial Frontier of any dominion on the globe. In North America we have a Land Frontier of more than three thousand miles with the United States. In India we have Frontiers nearly six thousand miles long, with Persia, Russia, Afghanistan, Tibet, China, Siam and France. In Africa we have Frontiers considerably over twelve thousand miles in length, with France, Germany, Italy, Portugal and the Congo State, not to mention our Frontiers with native states and tribes. These Frontiers have to be settled, demarcated and then maintained. We commonly speak of Great Britain as the greatest sea-power, forgetting that she is also the greatest land-power in the universe. Not much is heard of this astonishing development in Parliament. I suspect that even in our universities it is but dimly apprehended. Nevertheless, it is the daily and hourly pre-occupation of our Foreign Office, our India Office and our Colonial Office; it is the vital concern of the greatest of our colonies and dependencies, and it provides laborious and incessant employment for the keenest intellects and the most virile energies of the Anglo-Saxon race."

Lord Curzon's style makes easy reading because of his originality and vigor of expression. With the imperialistic ideas of which he is the able exponent many of us do not agree; but he is British, not American, and we are not called upon to answer "Here am I!" as he