

PRACTICAL PACIFISM
AND ITS ADVERSARIES

SEVERIN NORDENTOFT

**LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
RIVERSIDE**



2-52
942

08

100
—





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

**PRACTICAL PACIFISM
AND ITS ADVERSARIES**

"IS IT PEACE, JEHU?"

PERPETUAL PEACE

By IMMANUEL KANT

CHEAP EDITION

Crown 8vo.

2s. net. Postage 4d.

“‘Perpetual Peace’ may some day be looked upon as the foundation of a new social system.”—*T. P.'s Weekly.*

LONDON

GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD.

PRACTICAL PACIFISM AND ITS ADVERSARIES

“IS IT PEACE, JEHU?”

BY

SEVERIN NORDENTOFT,

Th. 127 Severin Nordentoft

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY

G. K. CHESTERTON



LONDON: GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD.
RUSKIN HOUSE 40 MUSEUM STREET, W.C.

JX 1953

N67

First published in 1917

(All rights reserved)

PREFACE

IN the year 1913 I published in Copenhagen in Danish a book called "The Pacifist Cause," a comprehensive, critical representation of its tasks, material, aims, means and methods, its mistakes, its results, possibilities and prospects, its dogmas and its ultimate issues, but not including its history, organization, and personnel.

To this book I added a Supplement which was intended to illustrate the chief and most deeply rooted causes of war, and to state the aims and to explain the conditions which appear to me to be necessary to the victory of the pacifist cause and to a permanent peace in Europe. This Supplement was a fiery pamphlet, written by a member of one of the oppressed peoples. It contained a description of the reign of terror under which he was groaning, and was provided with footnotes by an intelligent and large-hearted subject of the ruling nation.

Since then the world war has come. But it has changed none of the views I then expressed.

On the contrary, one of the Allies has inscribed upon its banner, and postulated as conditions of peace, word for word, the same demands which I have put forward in my book. As these demands at the present time cannot be too often and too energetically proclaimed from the housetops, as it presumably will be welcome to those who advocate these demands to see their necessity emphasized in a way which must appeal to every honest man's heart and head, and as I should like to address a larger audience than my little native land can offer, I have resolved to present to English readers, not only the Supplement mentioned but also the Preface of my book, some pages of its programme, and a couple of short sections containing a few proposals for pacifist progress.

Self-appointed prophets are probably plentiful in Britain, pacifist literature perhaps also, but an appeal like the one contained in this Supplement has perhaps not been read before in Britain. British people will here find a fine illustration of what it is they are fighting against just now.

THE AUTHOR.

AARHUS, DENMARK, 1915.

INTRODUCTION

DR. NORDENTOFT has asked me to contribute a line or two of introduction to his very interesting book, and I am very glad to do anything I can to assist the consideration of so able and important a statement, even where it is the statement of a view not identical with mine. I doubt if there is any precise sense in which I can be called a Pacifist, except the sense in which every man is a Pacifist who is not a homicidal maniac. But in a world in which homicidal maniacs can apparently wield the power of empires and chancelleries, the exception is not insignificant. It is further open to my critics to say, with not a little plausibility, that if I were a Pacifist I should not be a Practical Pacifist. Nevertheless, a Practical Pacifist is a man well worth attending to; and Dr. Nordentoft really is a Practical Pacifist in the two or three most necessary and most neglected practical respects. I think his book very significant because it is not, like so many books of his school, merely a challenge to Militarists about why they have made war;

it is a challenge to Pacifists about the only human and tolerable conditions upon which they could even conceivably make peace.

The first practical point is that any serious Pacifist must be anti-Prussian. In this the author has a special claim to consideration merely as being a distinguished citizen of Denmark. The dismembered kingdom of Denmark remains as a more solid historical monument to the methods of the Prussians even than the ruins of Louvain or the damaged tower of Rheims. In this Danish tale is told, as simply as in the Danish tales of Hans Anderson, the true story of Prussia and the small nations. For there could not possibly be in the case of Denmark even those hasty and hypocritical palliations which were employed in the case of Belgium. No one could pretend that Denmark was invaded because it was the quickest road to France. No diplomatic ingenuity could connect the occupation of Schleswig with the mobilization of Russia. Nobody could represent that Holstein was a rampart separately seized in order to resist the onrush of a huge European alliance. The Danish provinces were seized in peaceful times—indeed, in far too peaceful times; for the sort of peace which the Great Powers preserved in the presence of such an outrage is the sort about which I for one cease to be a

Pacifist. They were seized upon an excuse which we may save ourselves the trouble of studying; for it was not adhered to, even by those who offered it. Even upon the German theory, the Prussian stole from Germans if he did not steal from Danes. If the Danish provinces belonged to anybody except the King of Denmark, it must have been the Prince of Augustenburg; and Bismarck ended by disregarding the Prince of Augustenburg as much as the King of Denmark. In its treason to friends and foes alike, but primarily in its naked and godless appeal to mere power, the thing was simply a working model of the history of Prussia. It is only one example, but a particularly clear example, of something which the Prussians not only perpetually did, but perpetually boasted that they did, until a rather singular thing happened unexpectedly in the plains of Northern Gaul, which we call the Battle of the Marne.

The next cogent point to which Dr. Nordentoft draws the attention of his own school is that if there is to be such a thing as practical Pacifism, it must dismiss nearly all the negative notions which go to make up the great part of theoretic Pacifism. It must not and cannot mean mere non-resistance. The final objection to what is called "peace at any price" is simply that we should pay the price

and not get the peace. What we should get would not be peace but one-sided war. It might lead logically to nothing except the perpetual shooting of unarmed people instead of armed people. No person of historical imagination can doubt that this is pretty much what would really happen under the uncontrolled power of the Prussian, as it has already happened in certain times and places under the uncontrolled power of the Turk. Dr. Nordentoft points out that the only peace for which free men can pray anywhere is a peace of law, and that law guaranteeing the rights of the smallest States as well as the greatest. Whether arrangements such as he would approve would establish this international ideal may be debated; but anything short of this cannot possibly be called an international ideal at all. Mere disarmament in face of armed bandits of the Bismarck type would not be an ideal at all, but an unprecedentedly unpleasant reality. And it would not even be international; for the very word "internationalism" implies the recognition of nations.

The important Supplement, in which subjects of Prussia in conquered territories describe the facts of that occupation, ought also to commend Dr. Nordentoft's book to any one who wishes to appreciate both the tragedy and the tenacity of the small peoples. The candour of Dr.

Nordentoft will itself be convincing, since he has embodied in the book criticisms, or at least somewhat plaintive protests, by a German to whom the Supplement has been submitted ; and I can appeal to the same candour in recording my own conviction here. Whether or no a civilized humanity can get rid of war, I entertain not the slightest doubt that it can get rid of Prussian war, and not the slightest hesitation in applauding its present efforts, however bitter and bloody, to do so. In the better times after that just consummation the small States will not only be, as Dr. Nordentoft desires, a part of international civilization : they will be more and more the very test of that civilization. A nation is judged by its peasant ; and Europe will be judged by its peasantries, but especially by its small peasantries. There will be no better test of whether Christendom can become Christian than the degree of dignity and independence that our international scheme can add to the thrift and the manhood and the merited prosperity of the Danes.

G. K. CHESTERTON.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	v
INTRODUCTION BY G. K. CHESTERTON	1
INTRODUCTION BY THE AUTHOR	9
CHAPTER	
I. ECONOMIC WARS	27
II. NATIONAL WARS	41
III. TO ILLUSTRATE THE IMPORTANCE OF THE RIGHTS OF PEACE—A SUPPLEMENT	56
IV. THE RIGHTS OF PEACE	158
V. REVIEW : ON THE POSSIBILITIES OF THE VICTORY OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT AND OF THE EFFECTS THEREOF	168
VI. EPILOGUE : PACIFIST PROPOSALS I AND II	191
CONCLUSION : THE PROGRAMME OF THE PACIFIST CAUSE	208

PRACTICAL PACIFISM AND ITS ADVERSARIES

INTRODUCTION

WHEN I, who am neither a diplomatist, a statesman, a representative of the people, a military expert, nor even a pacifist in the sense of being an active propagandist, consider the pacifist cause, then I feel (as probably do all specialists) an inclination to draw analogies and comparisons from my own special subject.

Medical science, my special subject, has for thousands of years tried to counteract and conquer one of the great plagues of mankind—Disease, just as the pacifist movement strives to counteract and conquer another of the great plagues of mankind—War. Perfect victory has not yet been gained in my subject. We have not succeeded quite in conquering and in doing away with disease. Sceptics may even maintain, perhaps, that no progress worth mentioning has been made, that man is hardly now any more than formerly master over diseases, the number and variety of which have not diminished to any visible extent, and that

Disease besides is a factor in nature which is necessary and to a certain degree useful.

Victory has still less fallen to the lot of the pacifist movement, and certain (not numerous) sceptics will even maintain that nothing has been done, and that nothing will be done worth mentioning, that the efforts of the pacifist movement are perfectly hopeless and useless, and that War, like Disease, is a factor in nature, which is necessary and to a certain degree useful.

As regards medical science such criticism is easily refuted. There is no doubt that disease in civilized countries has become noticeably limited in comparison with its prevalence in former days and in other parts of the earth lying beyond the reach of medical science. Medical science has thus prevailed in part, and in certain parts of the world, and—this is a point to which we shall return later—not over “disease” in general, but over certain special diseases, while it yet has no great influence over others.

A corresponding victory in part for the pacifist movement is perhaps less evident, and the cause will be found, according to the opinion of many pacifists, in the mere childhood of the movement at present. “Let it first reach the age of medical science, and we can expect similar results.”

This would be a long time to wait, as the history of medicine as an empirical science goes back over more than two thousand years. In this connection, however, we might suitably point out that it is in the course of the last fifty years that medical science has won victories more brilliant and more numerous than all those secured in all the former centuries put together. It is since 1860 that medical science, at any rate in civilized countries, has taken the sting out of almost all epidemic diseases and has sharpened the surgical knife into a keen and effective weapon.

But I believe too that it will be readily agreed that the pacifist movement is both far older than is usually supposed, and that it also has some partial victories to show. In fact, the pacifist movement, like medical science, has had a long history, although it is only now in our days that it has made its great stride forward, and, as medical science even in its dark ages had some isolated victories here and there to point to (the treatment with mercury of syphilis, vaccination, etc.), in the same way the pacifist movement has had victories of its own. It has not conquered all over the earth nor over "war" in general; but it has conquered over certain special kinds of war in certain parts of the civilized world—for instance, over religious wars, over the small feudal wars of the Middle

Ages, over the wars which the Vikings waged for war's sake or for the sake of private gain and piracy, partly perhaps even here in Europe over the "wars of conquest"; in other words certain relations have been deprived of their quality of being causes for war.

If, for example, we ask, "What has brought about the cessation in the civilized world of religious wars?" what else can we answer but "The pacifist movement"? Perhaps an unconscious pacifist movement, but still a pacifist movement, a recognition which has slowly convinced the minds of all that it is wrong to do violence to any one for the sake of his religion, and that every one must have a natural right, an immediate human right, to worship his God in peace in the way and under the forms which he prefers.

It can scarcely be denied, however, that medical science has better prospects than the pacifist movement has of winning greater and more numerous victories in the near future. If the prospects of the pacifist cause are less favourable, the reason, among others, might conceivably be its defects and mistakes, mistakes which explain why it has not made more progress, and which uncorrected will perhaps hinder it from attaining the full realization of its aims.

Fixing our eyes on the ways and means by

which medical science has won its victories, we note two things which I wish specially to emphasize.

In the first place it has not directed its efforts against disease in general, and has not sought victory—or it has at any rate ceased to do so—in a universal cure, a panacea like the philosophers' stone. No, it has directed its attention to single diseases—following the good old rule of combating its enemies one by one—and its means are manifold, as these are specialized from time to time in the medicine on the apothecary's shelves, in the knife in the surgeon's hand, down to the hygiene of buildings, water supplies, quarantine, and much else.

Secondly, medical science has reached its results in regard to a great many diseases, first and foremost through studying their causes, and it has used the knowledge gained not exclusively for healing purposes (knowing that a knowledge of the cause does not always enable us to effect a cure), but as a step to what is better, prevention by removing the cause, remembering the old maxim: *Cessante causa cessat effectus* ("With the cause the effect disappears").

But it seems to me in reading the pacifist literature and the daily press, and hearing about conferences and resolutions, that it is most frequently "war in general" which is the subject, also that the means recommended approach

the character of a panacea, as they are almost entirely contained in the two words "arbitration" and "disarmament." We hear less about the different special forms of war and about the causes of wars. And yet the different kinds of war must be prevented in different ways, and the preventive means themselves must be different and many. To conquer cholera it has been necessary to study buildings, water supply, scavenging, and food hygiene, communications and traffic, epidemiology, bacteriology, medical history, clinical and therapeutical treatment. In the same way the pacifist movement must, if it is to reach practical results, build on the study of economics and competition, the question of taxation and customs, the law of patents, commercial science, politics, expansion and colonization, immigration and emigration, naturalization and many other questions of international law in all their forms, the controversy regarding the use of languages, in the law-courts, the school, and the Church. It must take account of education in general, freedom of association and of the Press, rights of property, laws of exemption, religious questions, etc. It appears to me that the pacifist cause has hitherto somewhat neglected these tasks and has confined itself to the far smaller task of fixing rules, limits, and definitions of violations of right, for "war in general." It has en-

deavoured through international regulations to determine a number of things which must not be done in war ; but although this is most desirable, still for the furtherance of its aims it is of far more importance to fix and determine what must not be done in times of peace, and to remove in this way the causes of war. It has tried to settle this or that quarrel, preferably all quarrels, through arbitration. However desirable this may be, it should form only a very small part of the work which ought in time of peace to be directed much more towards the removal of the causes of strife, so that as little appeal as possible need be made to this arbitration, which so easily turns out to be too frail a weapon at the decisive moment.

By directing its efforts more towards the removal of the causes of war a better point of vantage is reached. For even the most glowing pacifist must recognize that there have been wars which have not only been righteous and necessary, but in which he would find himself not only at liberty but under obligation to take his part.¹

¹ An episode at the International Peace Conference in Stockholm in 1910 does not exactly endorse these words. Introducing a discussion on the question of "Justifiable Defence," Gaston Mock moved a resolution of which the following were the main points : (1) that armed defence was justified against assaults without preceding intimation, negotiations, or declaration of war ; (2) against a

To choose an example which cannot hurt any one we shall mention the Garibaldi campaign. If arms had not been resorted to and their decision called for, I wonder if the Austrians would not have remained in Venice till to-day and the Bourbons in Naples? Or take the fight for liberty of the Greeks, the Serbians, the Roumanians, and the Bulgarians. Or would the most enthusiastic pacifist wonder at the Poles making armed resistance against the division of Poland? War belongs to the greatest evils of humanity, but there are still greater ones. It is undoubtedly a greater evil

State which refuses to submit to arbitration in cases of dissension; or (3) which after arbitration refuses to respect it and commences hostilities in spite of it. But from a group of English and American delegates a declaration was made to the effect that as all war is contrary to the highest moral and religious principles, therefore wars of defence are also to be condemned. However firmly they adhered to this opinion, they would not try to force on friends and fellow-workers who might not share this view any resolution condemning wars of defence, as they knew well that such a resolution would be against their convictions. They only requested in return that the others should respect their conviction and should desist from carrying any resolution upholding what they considered to be untenable, and, in that way, should sanction what they regarded in principle as tending to the ruin of the whole peace movement. And their representations were successful, as a resolution was carried to the effect that the Conference did not wish to record a decision either for or against this question.

to be an oppressed, misgoverned nation under foreign rule, and under laws of exception, without a free national life, without equality in civil life, and subject to the oppressor's law. And this is the case, if only because those conditions are prolonged and perhaps permanent, while war is only a passing phase. If such a nation has the chance, the probability, or perhaps even the certainty of gaining an independent national existence through sanguinary armed insurrection, ought it not to choose war as the least evil?

Is it morally right to be content to demand peace at any price, so long as it is peace, regardless of how right and justice are faring? In these cases the peace movement appears to me to become illogical by directing its efforts against war in general and without exception. No, the proper point of attack is not war, but the injustice and oppression which lead to war.

Until the pacifist movement can procure for a conquered nation real equality with their rulers and the possibility for a free, unhampered national existence, with a national clergy, national teachers, judges, and magistrates, national universities, a national language, in churches, schools, and law-courts, etc., not till then can the pacifist justly say: "You must be patient and you can be patient. The borderline which separates you from your fellow-countrymen is practically done away with, and

you can live your national life together as if you were practically united in one State.”

There is a certain ingenuousness in this attempt to do away with wars, while leaving their causes unmolested, is there not? Is it not an insoluble task? As surely as the effect can disappear with its cause, so surely does it remain when the cause remains (*Persistente causa, persistit effectus*). Is it not like the attempt to do away with all prostitution without trying to remedy the social and moral cause of it?

It must be granted that the peace movement as a whole cannot fairly be described in the terms now used, and that its literature contains much that is valuable and intelligent in pointing out these things. But the matter is different at once when we look at the daily press, the public meetings, and the local pacifist societies, at any rate in my country. The pacifist movement is in a way divided into two sections, the more academic and literary, the more reasonable and less Utopian section, and the broad lay movement which often and in certain respects is less reasonable and more naïve, and which consists chiefly in inarticulate demands for disarmament and for compulsory arbitration.¹

¹ As regards pacifist societies and the lay movement it is perhaps not out of place to quote here the words of

But as two such movements are each by itself of little effect, while if united they would represent a force of no small power, it is necessary to lead the lay movement up to the level of reasoned discussion and to direct the combined agencies towards a better aim, or rather to mobilize them more directly against the causes of war than against war itself.

An objection will at once be put forward by many pacifists. But the pacifist cause will then become inextricably confused with home politics and international quarrels, with conflicts of nationality, commercial interests and customs, etc. It has always been one of its strictest rules to avoid at any cost every appearance of this, and it will spell certain ruin to the pacifist cause if it begins to put its hand into such a hornet's nest and to take sides in

Ernst Beckmann (the Interparliamentary Union, Stockholm, 1912): "The Interparliamentary Union can easily explain its origin. It has its root in the so-called pacifist societies. And this is a good parentage. The pacifist societies may have made many mistakes; they may, in more than one case, have deserved some of the contempt which at times has been lavished upon them. But show me the public movement which has never made any mistake. And who would dare to deny that these peace societies have done good work by keeping the banner of right and justice lifted high in dark times of blood and iron before the consciences of the nations, instead of allowing it to be dragged in the mud by a blind lust of war?"

the innumerable contentious questions which arise between the nations of the earth.

We shall return to this objection later on. In the meantime let it be enough to say that the pacifist cause both can and must be content with laying down principles and guiding rules and with seeking to instil these into the consciousness of mankind. But for all that it may quite well try to avoid mixing itself up with the quarrels of the moment, and allow each nation calmly to draw for itself practical applications from pacifist doctrines. And let us, then, once more repeat that if the pacifist movement chooses the attitude of demanding war to be abolished *sans phrase*, but leaving its causes unmolested and unnoticed, it will not only be pronouncing but also be executing its own death-warrant.

We certainly often find in pacifist literature vaguely voiced generalities which we are told ought to rule between nations in times of peace, so that "no conqueror or autocrat shall be able to violate those principles of right and justice on which rests the safety of States and the well-being of nations" (Ellen Key). Occasionally we even find specific judgments pronounced against "deeds of violence committed in this land and in that land," but in general the writers just forget in these vaguely voiced views to state precisely what those prin-

ciples of right and justice are in detail which should be observed in times of peace, and how their observance would prevent war, and what it is which makes the acts of a ruling nation here or there to be unjustifiable acts of violence.¹

Do not answer that this is superfluous because these principles are clearly evident to all, because no one could disagree about them. The case is far otherwise. The most deep-rooted disagreement exists, even among well-meaning and honest men who consider themselves unbiased, the most deep-seated disagreement about the most fundamental principles of the relation of nations to each other in time of peace, and disagreement not between a large majority on one side and a vanishing minority on the other, but a disagree-

¹ One of the first signs that the pacifist cause is beginning to open its eyes to this task was seen at the Scandinavian Peace Congress in Christiania, in July 1912, where the following resolution was carried :

“The seventh Scandinavian peace meeting in Christiania declares that the recognized right of nations to live their own free life according to ideas which for ages have held sway in the consciousness of their peoples is a fundamental principle of international law. It, therefore, requests that all pacifists should aim at securing that this principle be recognized by convention as a fixed national law. The meeting adds in accordance with this, that oppressed nations which consider themselves the object of violence ought to be given Home Rule.”

ment where there are millions on each side, where the majority and the leading men of large nations are on the opposite side to the pacifists.

Let us choose a single example of the broad "principles of right and justice on which rest the safety of States and the well-being of nations," the question of the right of nations to the use of their mother tongue. Do we not find at once two views sharply opposed to each other? And have they not both been carried out in practice and amply illustrated in real life?

The one holds that each nation must have an unlimited and distinct right to the use of its native tongue in church, in school, in the law-court, in the Press, and at public meetings, and an equally distinct right to educate its children in their native language by the help of pastors and teachers chosen from their own midst.

The other view is this, that such a distinct right does not exist, but that it is in any case limited by the interest of the State.¹ And when the interest of the State demands it, it is right, nay, it even becomes a national duty to deny and forbid a nation the use of its mother tongue in the school, the law-court, at public meetings, etc., even if this nation numbers millions, and it becomes a duty to educate the children

¹ E.g. Johannes Tiedje, in *die Christliche Welt*, 1909.

by force in a foreign language by foreign teachers.

To give another example. Some consider the right of property inviolable under all circumstances or, at any rate, equally inviolable for all. Others consider it justifiable, nay, even a national duty, when the interest of the State demands it, by laws of exception, to encroach on this right in the case of a certain class of people separated from the ruling State by religion or nationality (Jews in Russia and Roumania, Poles and Danes in Germany).

Similar difficulties appear in relation to questions of customs. One country considers that a system of customs walls and export premiums are right and justifiable, while another country considers this a violation of its economic interests, an unfriendly act, and a cause of war.

In questions of this kind it is seldom of any use to speak of moral rights, because to many people the question is not one of right but of might. In the following pages we shall quote authors who have written on these subjects, and who say openly that it is all the same to them on which side right or wrong is to be found. Or, as another author puts it, it is "a detail" where the right is. Such views are a good proof of the hopelessness of wishing to abolish war and to introduce disarmament.

ment before the causes of war have been dealt with. The arms of the pacifist cause, peaceful argument and earnest upholding of right and justice, must of a necessity fall to the ground without effect before a standpoint such as this. No, first of all a great and troublesome piece of work must be done to bring home to mankind the idea that right and justice must be the guiding principles for nations as well as for individuals in the treatment of each other, and that this right and justice must be equal for all. For, however elementary this principle may appear, still it is not generally acknowledged, and far less is it the foundation and guiding principle for the politics of States, nor will it become so for a long time yet.¹

¹ Arthur Christensen, "Politics and Mass Morals," Copenhagen, 1911, p. 94: "State morals are mummified ancient morals believing themselves in Olympic elevation above all development; they are the factor of inertia in the history of the masses; public opinion is the energy." Page 97: "The feeling of nationality rests on the absolute suspicion which animals, barbarians, and nations harbour against each other, and as regards nations the experience of the past thousands of years has fully justified this." Page 199: "To suppose that a State on some occasion or other had assisted a neighbouring State for nothing, from motives of pure human benevolence, would be to offend the politicians of the said State, while an insinuation that they had smartly cheated their neighbour in spite of indignant official dementis would more likely be regarded as a compliment to their intelligence."

It is only a short time ago that one of the most prominent statesmen of Europe before the tribunal of history took upon himself the responsibility for acts on the part of his Government which are in most flagrant opposition to this idea.¹

In dealing with the views of such persons we must be content to point out that right and justice, in virtue of an inviolable law of nature, are the most useful and most advantageous means, while transgressions of these principles on the other hand will always bring punishment for the transgressor—even more in the relations between nations than in those between individuals. It must thus be the next task of the pacifist cause to explain in detail what right and justice demand in questions of religion, nationality, economics, and politics. For it is just in these matters that millions of people, in perfect good faith and in the full conviction of being right, maintain ideas which from an objective standpoint are both unjust and wrong.

Before this is achieved it is hopeless to cry out against war. When it is achieved wars will perhaps disappear of themselves. If it is not achieved the work against war is hopeless; for as we have said before, *Persistente*

¹ Fürst von Bülow, in the German Reichstag, November 26, 1907.

causa, persistit effectus. Before we can hope to abolish war some agreement must be reached concerning peace, and the right and duties of the nations in time of peace. For war is like lightning, a final and unavoidable manifestation of an accumulation of force which has been steadily growing for some time—although it may also at times be a result of the stupidity of statesmen. As it is impossible to prevent lightning from flashing if the electric force is not divided, so it will be impossible to prevent war if one does not begin the work of clearing away its causes.

We shall now examine the practical causes of war and discuss the means of their prevention, and at the same time try to specify the “rights of peace”—in short, examine the past activity of the pacifist movement, its results, its means and methods, its prospects and possibilities, and from this construct its programme.

CHAPTER I

ECONOMIC WARS

HERE we are dealing with one of the central facts of the case, with that cause of war which, during the present generation, has been more prominent than any other, and which undoubtedly will become more and more so in the future, while the other causes of war will recede more and more into the background.

The great nations have carried on war and will continue to carry on war first and foremost for economic supremacy, for "a place in the sun," for material well-being. (We say the great nations—for on the whole the small nations do not any longer start wars. War history is at an end as regards the Scandinavian countries, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, etc. They may perhaps have to fight for their existence against the Great Powers or during a collision of the Great Powers, but none of them will any longer be able to cause or call forth a war. They all without exception understand that for them to start a

war would be to risk their whole existence in the most foolish manner. No danger of war will ever threaten from their side.)

This fight for "a place in the sun" is, however, by no means confined solely to times of war; it is being waged incessantly with the so-called arms of peace—that is, partly by the general competition between nations, especially in industry (e.g. the competition among German, Russian, and English merchants and seekers of concessions in China, Africa, Persia, etc., among German, Russian, and English banks in Constantinople, Mesopotamia, and Persia, among the engineers of the different nations, etc.), partly and chiefly by all the means that can be included under the name of "customs politics."

In reality every day, year after year, a stubborn and never ceasing war is going on among the nations with regard to economic supremacy. The weapons of this war are import duties, which exclude foreign goods; export duties, which bind the raw materials to the homeland and make them dearer to the competitors; export premiums, which are intended to give the home goods an advantage in the foreign market, or even in the market of the competitor himself (e.g. German sugar in England); commercial treaties, which buy one advantage by granting a favour in return; subventions for

shipping, railways, and banking concerns, and the State which is most astute and far-seeing, least conscientious and most unscrupulous in this fight will carry home the prize.

It in no way affects the validity of this principle that the side which wins may use its profits, and more than its profits, for an unproductive purpose, such as for military outlays which make the whole gain illusory. Such a nation has always the satisfaction of not having to pay for its military expenses by itself, but of making the competitor share them. An English Member of Parliament said recently that England, during the last generation, not only had had to bear the expense of her own Fleet, but that she had had to pay Germany as well, owing to an unfavourable commercial balance caused by a short-sighted customs policy.

Only when these weapons of peace do not suffice (as when the competitor knows how to use them himself) need the sword be resorted to, if one has confidence enough. Thus Japan broke down by force of arms the Russian customs walls around Manchuria with the claim for "the open door"—which door she was to close carefully behind her once she had got inside. Thus, perhaps, will England feel compelled to draw the sword to break the fiscal ring which German customs politics have forged

around her, to maintain the world's supremacy for the Anglo-Saxons, and to prevent the Germans from taking the lead instead.

Where do we here see prospects of the end of war? Human covetousness will never die out, and shall we ever see politicians among us who will not think that they are acting aright in gaining an advantage for their own country at the cost of another?¹ Failure to do so will certainly ruin their political career, and as certainly will they quickly disappear from the scene. As long as it is said, even in Gladstone's own country, "My country—right or wrong!" so long are peaceful, unresisting endurance of wrong and voluntary martyrdom unlikely to be represented in international politics.

Is there, then, nowhere a prospect of a breach in this *circulus vitiosus*, of a break in this screw without an end? Yes, there is a magic word which at one breath makes an end of it all and opens prospects of eternal peace, or, at any rate, of the removal of this powerful and predominating cause of war—*Free trade*.

The author of these lines confesses himself an enthusiastic adherent of Free trade, and he will try in the following pages to convince

¹ The world has seen such a politician, Gladstone, but this feature of his political outlook was ever the cause of his defeats as it was of his retirement into private life.

the reader of the blessings which Free trade would bring—that is, universal Free trade, holding sway over the whole planet. Now, I may as well make the remark at once, to the consternation of the unintelligent and superficial reader, but to the reassurance of the wise and unbiased, that at present in my own country I am an enthusiastic and convinced Protectionist.

Economic wars will disappear in that moment when it is generally recognized that the so-called peaceful weapons (import and export duties, export premiums, etc.) are at least as objectionable and preposterous, as hurtful and sanguinary, as wrong and destructive as the polished steel of the soldier ; that the loss of life, of comfort, and of happiness which an unsuccessful war inflicts on a nation is in no way greater than that caused by an unfortunate customs policy.

Only the method is different. War means shedding of blood, sundered limbs and bodies ; tariff defeat means children with rickets, atrophy, anæmic, worn-out women, hungry, overworked men, and, what is worse, men full of hatred and bitterness and discontent. (Their dissatisfaction and anger are increased by their ignorance, being so often directed against the wrong person, not against the foreign country which starves them out, and against the leaders and politicians who have brought about the

tariff defeat, but perhaps just against those very people who see the matter in its proper light.) Here, as elsewhere, it holds true that when the manger is empty the horses bite, and that an economic defeat, as well as a military one, is followed by internal party controversies.

For this reason no statesman should expose his nation to this kind of defeat any more than to military defeat. He should rather secure a fiscal victory. And his efforts in this direction—well, these must consist in this, that he on his side should for his own nation build up, if he can, still higher tariff walls, or at any rate a still more crafty system of customs, duties, bounties, subventions, etc. Thus is created the *circulus vitiosus*. For in the course of a couple of years, or at the expiration of existing commercial treaties, the competitor begins to alter his rules and his system. Hence those continual changes, those recurring debates on customs, and those eternal international discussions about commercial treaties which are never of long duration. In this way the nations, in their mutual intercourse, offer the spectacle of cattle-dealers or stock exchange speculators, who try continually to get the advantage over each other.

Therefore England perhaps now finds herself compelled in self-defence to abandon her old, honourable Free trade policy, and to begin

competing with the other nations by Protectionist laws—all to avoid being robbed by foreign nations and being taxed by them—that is, if she does not prefer to draw the sword to destroy this invisible yoke.

To all this Free trade would quickly put an end, supposing that it were carried into practice by all the nations of the earth. Every one who thinks out the matter thoroughly must come to the conclusion that all nations taken together would be happier with universal Free trade than with the present race for Protection. Free trade might perhaps, at the moment, bring loss to some nation or another on some point or another, and destroy some industry or another which does not grow out of its natural soil. But, in the long run, and in the general interest, the blessings of universal Free trade would assert themselves and would silence all opposition because they would prove so self-evident.

Protection is in the last analysis only a hindrance and a source of trouble in all the affairs of commerce and industry, and it is in itself a source of expense, demanding a large staff of officials, etc. It may enrich one nation at the expense of another, but it can never enrich the world as a whole. Energetic Protection may perhaps enrich the Germans or the Americans, but never humanity, as a whole,

and it can only enrich Germans and Americans at the expense of other nations, and, therefore, also only for a limited time. This is immediately self-evident so long as no one will get up and maintain that Protection in itself creates values, that it is in itself productive.¹ If this should be the case, from whence should the enrichment come to the nation which profits by Protection except at the expense of other nations? We prove thereby that Protection is a wrong done by one nation towards another, to which the reply is a new and preferably a greater wrong. This is implied in the idea of Protection itself. If all nations all over the world were to introduce a system of Protection which secured equal benefits for all so that the financial result would profit no one, and cause loss to no one, then Protection would become illusory, and its result would be only the cost and trouble which it brings.

But universal Free trade would give the same result, only without the trouble and the cost. Protection only gets meaning and purpose when it permits one nation to profit at the expense of another.² One thing would be procured through universal Free trade, namely, a fair

¹ Leaving customs officials out of the question.

² I do not, of course, mean that universal Free trade would be synonymous with equal wealth all over the earth. There will always be countries which are richly

opportunity for all. It would make it a matter of course that, just as in a football match, sun and wind are equally divided, and as a match is declared invalid if the one side has gained an unfair advantage at the expense of the other, such also ought to be the guiding principle in economic international competition. Why should it be more lawful for one nation to take advantage of the other than for one football team to take unfair advantage of another? In an individual nation it is always regarded as a matter of course that one merchant is placed on equal terms with another as regards all the conditions of commerce. Why does the matter alter at once when the two merchants belong to different nations?

At present when the question is asked, "Shall a German merchant not have permission to sell his goods in England, and an English

endowed and countries which are poor by the hand of Nature; although history on every page shows us that this element of Nature is by no means a decisive factor in the wealth of a nation. We daily see tropical peoples in greatest need though living in the midst of the most luxurious wealth of Nature, and *vice versa* we see people in poorly endowed districts, in rough, harsh climes, reach great wealth. For we shall always have able and useless nations, higher and lower races, wiser and less intellectual peoples. The equality of nations is also economically as much a Utopia as that of individual men. Finally, Protection, too, has its international results.

merchant his goods in Germany?" then we may expect the answer: "No, by Jove! he shall not. Let every nation look after its own—favour its own—and tax the others." As the world and mankind are, this is the only possible and therefore the only just arrangement. This is a possible answer, and represents a standpoint which can be discussed, attacked, and defended.

But if you are a pacifist you cannot say anything of the kind. The man who holds this view cannot at the same time call himself a friend of peace if there is any logic in him. For his standpoint is one of the most powerful causes of war. I shall, therefore, join the ranks of those Free trade theorists who look upon universal Free trade as a moral demand—a natural right. They put it forth as the only ethically defensible claim, and raise it up to rank among "human rights." On the other hand, they brand Protection as the war of all against all, as an infinite chain of the attempts of one to create an unfair advantage over the other.

But, if it is clear to us how small weight these arguments have in the world, to what a degree they are "imponderabilia," then we must undoubtedly rather seek to impress upon mankind that universal Free trade is also the most useful, the best, and the most profitable policy.

both for the whole of humanity, and for the individual nation, that the advantage which one nation occasionally can gain over others is in the first place always temporary, and, secondly, is often dearly bought and illusory, and, thirdly, often brings grim revenge later on when the opponent gets on the top. Thus the net result of Protection when we make up the account all along the line amounts only to the cost and trouble attached to its maintenance and demands, and the bitterness, anger, and hatred which it creates between and within nations.

A certain degree of recognition of these facts is no doubt to be found among peoples and Governments. For it must be to such a recognition that we owe the fact that it has actually been arranged by international agreement to make Free trade compulsory in certain territories which are administered under joint control. In no other way can we explain an agreement so remarkable as the Congo Act. When, in the year 1885, the Congo State was established and recognized at an International Conference in Berlin, at which all the Great Powers of Europe were represented along with the United States, the Scandinavian countries, Holland, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, and Turkey, those States also gave their sanction to the Congo Act. In this Act it is declared that in all the territories of the present Congo State

the commerce of "all nations shall enjoy perfect liberty," that the movements of shipping for coastal and inland traffic should be open to all nations, and that all unequal treatment as regards either ships or goods should be prohibited; that no trading monopolies or privileges whatsoever should be granted, and that foreigners should, without exception, enjoy the same rights and privileges as the native inhabitants in everything that concerned the protection of their persons and properties, the acquisition and transfer of their movable and immovable possessions, and the practice of their trade. Further, the Congo State was also declared to be neutral in times of war, even in the event of war in which its Sovereign or protecting State might be involved. And all the signatories bound themselves before a third party to render their good offices to secure that all territories of the Congo State should, while war lasted, be under the laws of neutrality, and be considered as if they did not belong to the belligerent State; consequently, also, that in time of war the shipping of all nations, whether neutral or belligerent, should be free to trade on the Congo, its branches, tributaries, and outlets, as well as on the shores lying opposite to these. Commerce should likewise remain free on the roads, railways, lakes, and canals mentioned in paragraphs 15-16.

There exists, then, a fortunate region of the world where all the ideas and demands of the peace movement have already been carried into practice, where they have absolute Free trade, where the "rights of peace are recognized" (see later), and where war is done away with—in fact, complete international agreement. (Unfortunately, this happy land lies in Africa—and Africa is unfortunately far away. But is it, then, quite Utopian to imagine that agreements like these might gradually be extended so as to hold good in other parts of the earth, and at last all over the world?) And it is sufficiently striking that the contracting Powers, in a clear knowledge of the economic conditions and of the overwhelming importance of the tariff question, placed in the forefront of all their pacifist decisions the demand for Free trade and for economic equality, for all nations.

If what we have said is right or even partly right, how is it possible that the peace movement should not give the question of Free trade *versus* Protection a very exceptional amount of attention? Must not every pacifist, in other words, become an apostle of Free trade, recognizing that even the smallest progress in the direction of Free trade has greater pacifist importance than many conferences and inter-parliamentary meetings?

The task of the Free trade movement is

difficult—but the same may be said of the whole peace movement. And if its chief aim (military disarmament) is not hopeless, then neither is this. It is at any rate easier to imagine economic than military disarmament as an accomplished fact. Apart from the former the latter is hopeless. Economic disarmament is the prime condition of military disarmament.

And, therefore, the pacifist must preach Free trade ; for Protection is War.

CHAPTER II

NATIONAL WARS

NATIONAL quarrels, even more than economic rivalry, are the predominant causes of war, and such quarrels have proved the cause of nearly every war in our time.

When we shall maintain in the following chapter as a moral principle, as the necessary foundation of the peace movement, that no nation has a right to rule over another, but that every one, even a small nation, has a Divine right to live its free national life, then we shall add at once that this principle in its unconditional force is valid only for self-conscious and developed nations. It cannot be applied, for instance, to the expansion policy of Russia in Asia, because this is chiefly concerned with undeveloped peoples which have not yet reached the stage of national self-consciousness. Even if Russia owes these every rightful consideration, still it is clear that other laws and a different moral valuation must hold in the relation of Russia to Finns and Poles than in their relation to Buretes, Samoyedes,

and Kalmucks—or in the relation of the white men to Kaffirs and Hottentots in Africa.

For, just as the principles of nationality and of popular self-government cannot be used as standards of valuation in the history of past epochs, where these ideas were not in existence, so also are they, inapplicable to undeveloped and nationally dormant peoples in whom these notions have not yet been awakened.

But as soon as we can come to our own time and to developed self-conscious nations, then the great principle must be adhered to in all its strength: the right of every nation (or part of a nation) to self-government and political independence (or connection with the mother nation); or at any rate—as the minimum demand—the equal right of the nations in relation to each other within the same State in respect of political status, religion, language, and economic freedom, and of equality before the law, regardless of nationality. This is a claim—a postulate, not a dogma or any universally recognized moral precept, but as stated, only a claim which certainly is acknowledged in many quarters, but which also meets with opposition and denial among other and influential authorities. It is not only put aside in practice, in daily life, in legislation, and in administration in many places in the face of millions of people, but it is also dis-

puted theoretically in the very midst of the Christian world by academic circles in outstanding "Kultur States." ¹

Let us in passing draw attention to the fact that this claim has always and without exception been acknowledged and advocated by all nations on their own behalf; opposition to it is always in respect of the other side only. There are in literature plenty of theoretical refutations of the justice of this claim in relation to other nations, but as far as I know none in regard to one's own country.

And it is strange to see the same nation energetically demanding that this claim should be enforced in its own interests, while at the same time it refuses to concede it to others; on the one hand feeling deeply wronged because the claim is refused—and yet wronging others by refusing it. Examples are found in the attitude of the Poles to the Ruthenians in Galicia on the one hand, and to Germans and Russians on the other; in the behaviour of Magyars to Germans and to Slavs; in that of the pan-Germans to foreign people under German rule, and to Germans in foreign States, etc.

Still, although this claim is not universally

¹ E.g. Herr Neue Bahnen, "Der Polenpolitik," Berlin, 1903; "Ceterum censeo," pamphlet, Leipzig, 1902, von Dr. Georg M. Metz; Dr. F. Winterstein, "Polnische Auferstehung," Lissa, 1907.

acknowledged, and has not won acceptance everywhere, it will at any rate not miss recognition in pacifist circles, or from people who on the whole are interested in the limitation or elimination of wars. It will be logically necessary for pacifists to recognize it because its victorious application would have most important results in promoting the causes of peace, while its surrender will naturally give rise to wars, and will continue to do so in spite of all imaginable peace efforts.

It will also become logically acceptable and recognizable by every one who accepts in private and individual relationships the moral axiom "Do not do to others what you do not wish that others should do to you." The world is, however, not governed by logic, but by interest. And it is indeed a fortunate fact that the claim indicated is so entirely in the interest of the peace movement that, so long as it is not respected, all peace efforts are utterly Utopian, foolish, and without meaning. And if the peace movement is to achieve anything and is to be taken seriously, it must direct its efforts towards the recognition and realization of this claim everywhere.¹

¹ One must be prepared to find that such a claim as this will meet, if not theoretical, at least practical opposition even from right-thinking and, indeed, from Christian people, because national idiosyncrasies more

Some men may love war, may welcome its recurrence, and may regard it as an indispensable factor in the life of nations, as certain authors tell us. In this case there can be no point in attempting to reconcile national idiosyncrasies. But if we want wars to cease, and especially national wars, then there cannot be any doubt that there are logically only two ways, two means, which can be considered of reaching this aim. Of these the first is the best, and must first be realized before the second can be carried out.

(a) The first means (the realization of which at the time of the publication of my book

than anything else blind people and prevent them from seeing clearly. It is true about many otherwise sensible and thoughtful people what a German author (Schovalter, cit. Ammundsen in *die Christliche Welt*, 1909) says about the Englishman: "He is entirely lacking in self-consciousness in questions which concern his politics, because he is convinced from the first that Providence has made his people the noblest of all the nations, and has given it charge of the education of the rest of humanity. It is quite impossible to convince him that his people can do wrong, because he at the outset is sure that such wrong does not exist. ('My country, right or wrong.')" But many Germans (Pan-Germans) have quite the same point of view regarding their nation, and maintain it in public (e.g. in their relation to the Poles, Czechs, etc.). Compare also Gruntvig's view of the Danish people as the people "after God's own heart."

Excellent examples of such blindness in Christian people are specially to be found in the polemic carried

might be considered very improbable, but which now perhaps can be the outcome of the World-War) is this, that the political borders everywhere must be brought into harmony with the national ones. When the people who feel bound together as a nation get permission to live together as a nation within the same State, then all national conflicts will cease.

At first sight this seems a very revolutionary thought, that the borders of States and their extent should be decided no longer by political, geographical, historical, military, and a thousand other reasons, but by the feeling of sympathy of individuals.

But on closer reflection it will appear that

on in *die Christliche Welt*, in 1909, between Professor V. Ammundsen, in Copenhagen, and the editor of the magazine, Professor Rade, and subsequently Johs. Tiedje, now Free Church pastor in Koenigsberg. I shall only repeat Professor Rade's remarks: "When the course of the world's history has brought about this condition [that Northern Sleswig is German] then no moral judgment in the world dare brand this fact as immoral"; and Tiedje's, that "Northern Sleswig has a life interest in the self-maintenance of Germany"—i.e. the Kiel Canal. "But this strategical reason is directly a moral and a Christian principle for a people who wish for an honourable peace." (One must remember here that the Kiel Canal is 55 kilometres south of Flensburg and 120 kilometres south of the Danish border.) The United States Canal zone at Panama is only 10 kilometres. See also the footnote in the supplement ("Against the Barbarians").

the presence of this feeling has at all times been the most powerful factor in the building up of a State, as its absence has been in its dissolution.

An example from our own country will illustrate this tendency, while showing at the same time how the feeling of mutual sympathy may exist between peoples of different nationalities, and may be absent between racially related nations even within the same nationality.

There was a time when this community of feeling was present among all the subjects of the Danish realm, not only among Danes but also among Norwegians and Germans. We find in history and in literature many striking proofs of the loyalty shown to the Danish King and to the Monarchy by his Holstein subjects right up to the time when the German movement towards unity reached them, and when for thirty years the separatist, "Sleswig-Holstein," movement received an artificial impetus—only to be crushed by the iron heel of Prussia in 1864. (We need only to be reminded of the German National Song: "Heil dir im Siegeskranz," frankly written by a Holsteiner to the Danish King.) And as long as a community of feeling existed the Monarchy was well protected and no danger threatened it.

When it disappeared the Monarchy went to

pieces, and along with it went by the board an old Danish territory, which now is thriving very badly indeed within the German realm, because it lacks every trace of communal sympathy with it. 'As surely as it is this sense of a common life which has created the unity of Germany and the unity of Italy, and which has secured the liberation of Greece and of the Balkan States, and continues to secure it, until the national and political borders somewhat correspond, so surely must the absence of communal sympathy sooner or later divide North Sleswig from the German Empire.

Vice versa, we have seen how the lack of this feeling has been sufficient to separate two nations which geographically, historically, linguistically, nationally, and politically were so closely bound together as Sweden and Norway, or Holland and Belgium, and how the existence of Switzerland depends on the fact that its German, French, and Italian inhabitants do not feel themselves to be connected with other Germans, Frenchmen, or Italians, but are bound together in the bonds of mutual sympathy.

This national consciousness is a powerful factor, having wide-reaching and practical effects. And if it is to be made a decisive factor in determining the borders and the extent of States, then we are adopting a principle

which is not quite new, but which is taken up anew again only because it was formerly applied, as the ideal in settling international conflicts, by the head of a great State, who in truth had considerable resources in making it effective, namely, Napoleon III.

His favourite idea of the plébiscite as the last court of appeal in questions of this kind was something more than a mere whim or clever tactics ; it really had its foundation in an understanding of where the last decision in these questions ought to lie, and in the long run really, does lie, namely, with the peoples themselves, and in an understanding as to who is best able to watch over the weal and woe of the peoples—again the peoples themselves.

(*b*) The second means of securing the cessation of wars is to allow the political borders to remain in the meantime as they are, however imperfect these may be, and however much injustice this may imply, and to ensure that the legal status of the individual and his personal and political position are such that even if it is not quite a matter of indifference to what State he belongs, at least this is much more the case than hitherto, so that the question of nationality becomes a mere side issue instead of being a matter of life and death. The people might perhaps wish for a change in their political relations, but they could also, with

some equanimity, put up with existing conditions, pretty much as in the United States, where it is not a question of deep interest or of vital importance to the individual whether he lives in one State or another.

That is to say, in other words, matters ought to be so arranged that the people of one nationality would be quite content to live their lives within the boundaries of a State of other nationality (in this way Germans, Scandinavians, Italians, Frenchmen, Irishmen, Poles, Russians, Jews, etc., live contentedly in the United States). Under these conditions they would be so contented that although an alteration of the territorial border lines might perhaps seem desirable, the people would never think of sacrificing life and property to secure it.

Can we reach this, and how?

If we want to please any one the first thing is to ask him if he has any complaints to make, and what these are.

So our first step in dealing with nations who are supposed to be wronged and oppressed, or rather with nations living under a foreign rule,¹ would be first to discover what grievances

¹ There are people living under foreign rule who on the whole do not complain, who really have no political or national grievances at all—e.g. Germans, Scandinavians, Italians, Poles, etc., in the United States. It might,

they have, next to judge of the rights and wrongs of these grievances, and finally to consider the means whereby an improvement may be brought about.

The only thing to be said against the application of this principle is that the process is

therefore, be reasonable to take their circumstances as typical, and say: "Give all nations under foreign rule the same conditions of life, then they will stop complaining, and the national differences will be smoothed out." The question is, however, not quite free from complications. We must first of all remember that people under foreign rule are of two kinds—(1) people who of their own free will have chosen foreign rule (that is, emigrants, not only in America, but also, for instance, French Huguenots in the European countries, although, of course, in a Lilliputian measure compared to the emigration to America); and (2) people whom the circumstances of war have brought against their will under foreign rule—that is to say, conquered people. It is evident that a man who of his own free will and without invitation travels to a foreign country of other nationality and settles there cannot make conditions, but must submit to the laws and regulations, circumstances and peculiarities of that country. If he does not like them and complains he may be told: "You could have stayed away. You knew, or you ought to have known, what you were doing; if you object, why did you come?"

On the other hand, a man who has been brought under foreign rule by force has much more claim (a moral claim which needs no support of the sword) to be treated according to his wishes. He can on his side say to his rulers: "I have never wished to belong to you; on the contrary, it is very much against my wish. But if you insist on

a slow one. There are many nations living under foreign rule, and their complaints differ so widely, that an examination and a study of them would fill—and as a matter of fact does fill—many large volumes. For practical reasons I shall therefore choose another method, and as a postulate which I assume

keeping me, whether I wish to remain or not, may I at least ask to be treated decently ? ”

This implies that the rights which the emigrant enjoys in a foreign land are to be looked upon also as the minimum claims for the man who lives under enforced foreign rule in his own country. Has he not the right to say to his ruler : “ You will surely not deny me the rights which you enjoy yourself the moment you cross the ocean ? ”

We must further assume that the man who of his own free will seeks foreign rule, i.e. the emigrant, is prepared to accept the fact, and has become reconciled to the thought that his children and grandchildren must give up their nationality even if he does not do so himself. A man with a specially strong feeling of nationality and national consciousness, who cannot bear this thought, must stay at home. The people of the new land could with some justification take national precautions to defend their nationality and their language from being debased through a large influx of immigrants. But the conquered must have a yet greater claim than the emigrant to have his nationality respected—again a moral claim not based on the sword. That such moral claims exist we see best in the peace treaties, where a nation, perhaps twenty times stronger, has dictated terms of peace to a nation twenty times weaker (e.g. in the Peace of Vienna between Denmark and Prussia and

to be self-evident, I will submit a statement of a series of general human rights, which all will probably accept in theory. As a guide and limitation to my argument let me say at the outset that I put forward no claim to any right which is not possessed by every immigrant in the United States, and which is not found in the party political programme of every nation under foreign rule.

There may be some who, despite this fact, decline to acknowledge these claims. In the first place there are those who on the whole do not recognize or acknowledge any moral claim in international relationships and in the mutual life of nations. They only acknowledge the claims which are put forward by the necessities of guns and munitions; in other words, they acknowledge no other right than the right of the sword, the right of the strongest.¹

Austria in 1864, which besides is an example of a legally formed claim not always being respected).

In the same way, too, in national questions especially, one might be justified in pointing out the rights which the immigrant enjoys in a foreign land as the minimum rights of a conquered people in their own country. Here, too, these could justly say to their conqueror: "Will you deny to me the benefits which you enjoy yourself, when you of your own free will settle in a foreign land?"

¹ Representatives in literature of this point of view are, e.g., Nietzsche, and among lesser lights Georg Kietz, Major v. Pfister, Alldeutscher Verbund, etc.

However, it is no use arguing with these people except with guns and munitions.

Secondly, there may be general disagreement among a number of people who never have thought deeply about these questions, but who from their birth have gradually come to regard themselves as belonging to the ruling nation, and who accept the conditions of the conquered nation as a matter of course. For these there is need of argument.

But as the argument would be too long, as I have said before, I have elected to dispense with it here, and let it follow in an independent Supplement written by quite another hand. I happen fortunately to have in my possession a document, a hitherto unprinted pamphlet, handed to me by a young man now dead. He belonged to a nation which is living under foreign rule, but he had emigrated some time ago to the United States, where he died recently, and I publish this with his consent. In my opinion it is at once a striking, valuable, and faithful representation of the complaints of suppressed nations in general, and at the same time it is an argument and an appeal. Thus my arguments for the programme of general human rights must be found in the following Supplement. I could hardly keep them within reasonable limits here. And the contents of the Supplement may perhaps scarcely be called

arguments, but rather a propaganda, an appeal. The somewhat passionate and excited form of the document will, I hope, be excused, and be put down to the extreme youth of the author and to his injured national feelings. With any one who after reading his short pamphlet still says, "He is wrong" I shall consider it a waste of time to argue.

CHAPTER III

TO ILLUSTRATE THE IMPORTANCE OF THE RIGHTS OF PEACE

A SUPPLEMENT

PREFACE

I HAVE been rather doubtful about using this Supplement here because it deals exclusively with the transgressions of a certain single nation against the rights of peace, and personal and unpleasant remarks against the said nation should preferably be avoided in a book like this. Besides, the expressions of the author are in many places strong, even at times violent, and for that reason he occasionally misses his point and says too much, as he himself acknowledges in later footnotes.

I have, however, decided to print it because I feel that an impartial academic representation of the general circumstances only, without any relation to the particular, i.e. to a certain nation and its conditions, would be quite valueless—would be colourless, in fact, and without feature. Being unable to speak to the heart, it would make no impression at all, and would

carry with it no conviction. The nation in question will, I hope, forgive me for using it here as a warning example, when I say, at the same time and acknowledge frankly that we might have equally well—perhaps even better—taken an example from somewhere else, for instance from the relation of the Russians to the Poles, to the Finns, the Ruthenians, or from the relation of the Magyars to the Slavs, the Croatians and the Rumanians, from that of the Japanese to the Koreans and the Chinese, etc. But my deceased author friend had not the necessary knowledge of these relations, and I have no connection through which I could secure such a document from these districts. On the other hand, I happen to have this present sketch, and I consider it a “find,” and as a *document humain* of the greatest interest and weight, and an excellent piece of propagandist literature, which will explain better than long-winded theories, to all who need it, the importance and the justice of the claims of peace, and also the all-important part which these claims play in the daily life of the people, and in their most precious and intimate relations.

My authority (the author of this work) some time ago sent the manuscript for perusal to a prominent man among his national antagonists—in fact, to a highly cultured German in Berlin, who is free from prejudice, and who

is known to be more than usually independent in his point of view with regard to suppressed nations. This gentleman has added footnotes to the manuscript (very incisive in their brevity), and he has made objections to several things in it. The author has recognized the justice of some of these notes, and he has acknowledged having made some errors in matters of fact. In respect of others he has made no such admissions, as appears from additional notes which he has added to those of the German.

I might have corrected the errors where my author owns to them, and taken no notice of the German's notes. But I have preferred to give the whole as it stood, to print his manuscript unchanged, and to add the notes of the German critic as footnotes in italics, and then again the answer to these notes from the author as supplementary footnotes, but in ordinary type.

In making my apology to the great German nation for placing it in the pillory, I ask it to be assured that I do so for want of a better example. And so I give place to my author. Certain crude and naïve expressions (e.g. on the title-page) will strike the reader's eye without any interpretation on my part. I ask him not to be alarmed at these; as he proceeds he will find his reward.

NOTE.

IN his book "The Barbarism of Berlin," which is translated into Danish and is widely known, Mr. G. K. Chesterton explains why the Teuton is the "positive" barbarian. This is stated briefly in two sentences on page 32: "His limited, but very severe, lunacy concentrates chiefly in a desire to destroy two ideas, the twin root ideas of rational society. The first is the idea of record and promise; the second is the idea of reciprocity."

A better illustration of these statements can hardly be wished for than the one contained in the following description at first hand of the rule of the Germans over conquered peoples. Nay, rather, a still better confirmation is to be found in the original footnotes written by a German—not by an average German, but by a German pastor who has held an appointment in one of the oppressed border districts, who evidently is an active Christian of strong convictions, and who has so much sense of justice that he has felt disgusted at the treatment meted out to his parishioners. He had so much courage that he spoke in public against it, and he is, in consequence, in the "black books" of the Government and is being persecuted by the thoroughgoing pan-Germans. He is thus quite an exception in the German nation. But even he cannot, as appears from his footnotes, get his eyes opened to "the idea of reciprocity."

AGAINST THE BARBARIANS!

AN ACCUSATION BEFORE THE COURT OF CIVILIZATION BY

ST. POPOLSKI, Merchant, Posen ;
 J. DANSK, Farm Proprietor, Als ;
 P. FRANÇOIS, Manufacturer, Mühlhausen.

TO ALL GERMAN CLERGYMEN AND TEACHERS AND
 TO THINKING GERMAN CHRISTIANS.

(*Quamquam sunt sub aqua, sub aqua.*)

TO THE PEOPLES OF EUROPE.

(To all civilized Nations!)¹

¹ Sir,—

I have read your manuscript with interest, and in its vehemence I have fully understood and appreciated a Dane's proudly patriotic heart and its thirst for justice. You have sent me the manuscript without reserve. I might acknowledge it in a few indifferent words. If, instead of doing so, I return your manuscript with footnotes (some of them very pointed) this is not done to annoy you. I merely wish to show you how careful one must be in dealing with such material. If your work were printed you would do harm to your cause through the errors which I have pointed out. And you wish to further it. Most pleased to give further answers, and with thanks for the confidence shown to me,

I remain, etc.

WE belong to some of the European nations, civilized nations with an old culture, nations which verily are not inferior to others, but nations of which a part is under foreign rule. And we should like to speak in the name of all those nations which are suppressed, ill-treated, and persecuted by foreign oppressors. Our intention is not to move Europe to pity—no one can thrive on pity,—but we intend to accuse our rulers, to show the whole of humanity by what barbarians we are ruled, and how they trample upon all human and Divine laws (to say nothing of their own) simply in order to torture us.

It is immaterial what nation we belong to ; it is immaterial whether we say that we come of a people who for centuries were the leaders in the culture of the Continent, and whose language was the international one of civilization, or whether we name ourselves sons of the people who for centuries were the outpost of Europe against Tartars and Turks, who before the gates of Vienna saved German culture from being suffocated in the Turkish embrace, and who in return for this, not a hundred years later, were deceived and butchered by the same Germans ; or whether we say that we belong to the small Scandinavian nation which first measured the velocity of light, first discovered electro-magnetism, first re-awakened

classical art in the present time, first loosened the bonds of the peasant, and which, perhaps, is foremost among European States in humane social laws.

Whether we belong to the one or to the other of these unfortunate oppressed groups is quite a matter of indifference. The treatment is the same, the complaints are the same. The brutal hand on the throat, the clenched fist before the face is the same for us all; it is the same foreign Barbarian who takes a gross pleasure in overpowering us (and then afterwards insulting us for our weakness), in robbing us of the conditions which make for progress in culture and in taunting us afterwards with our lower state of development, a Barbarian who every day lets us feel his brutal rule, and at the same time brags of his nobler nature and his own higher civilization.

The ground of complaint is the same with us all. Let us try, therefore, with one voice to speak for all, proclaim aloud to the civilized world what infamies are being committed every day in civilization's name. We shall disclose our oppressors as the disturbers of European peace, as the destroyers of civilization among our people, as the enemies of culture, as the rod of God's anger over us just as much as was once the case with Mongolians and Turks. "Nations of Europe! Protect your most holy

possessions!"—thus the warning words of an Emperor once sounded—"against the Yellow Peril!" But what if those most holy possessions have already been taken away from us? No, let us protect our most holy possessions from the peril of our rulers! It is the nearer peril, and the greater. Let us for once tell how life shapes itself for us under foreign rule, and Europe shall hear things which will fill her with horror and anger.

Many evil doings, many cruel charges will be recorded in this small book. But no untruthful word will be found, and every statement stands verified by the testimony of our rulers themselves. Every example given is related to distinct persons and actual occurrences. Any one can test them, if he will take the trouble, and go to the right place. And should doubt arise, our representatives can give him information.

Where shall we begin? With our economic circumstances, our legal conditions, our political rights, our difficulties with regard to our mother tongue, our laws of exemption, our religious ill-treatment? No, let us begin with that which is the most precious of all our possessions, with our children.

God be praised! during the first seven years of their lives, we can keep them, can teach them their mother tongue, teach them to love

us, our language, our people, and our memories. And this shall continue. As long as our language exists, as long as we are not all expropriated and driven from our homes and our land, so long shall all our strength and power be used in securing that during those seven peaceful years the child is so trained and developed that it becomes for all time a shoot of the parent stem, so that when it enters the foreign school it is already armed with a force which nothing can conquer, tied with the ties which nothing can break, the ties of home, the ties of love for parents, of love for the mother tongue and for its nationality. This we cannot be prevented from doing. Even our rulers have not sufficient police-officers to censor what the mother whispers into her child's ear and what songs she sings at its cradle. Be convinced, Herr Landrath, that the forbidden songs shall continue to sound in the sacred spot to all eternity, those old songs which our forefathers sang in a free country, but for the singing of which we now are cast into prison. At the child's cradle they shall never die!

But then the day of anguish dawns when our child is torn from us by force, and is put into a foreign school against our will, to be brought up in a foreign atmosphere, and to learn to despise us and what is ours, and

to learn to see everything great in *das grosse Vaterland*.

By force, I say, for it is so. To put our child in a private school, where it might be taught in its mother tongue, and be taught Christian doctrine in the language it can understand—that is forbidden. Forbidden! To think that we are forbidden to decide about the teaching of our children! Even if we propose that in a private school they should be taught the language, the history, and the literature of our rulers—even that is forbidden. No man or woman of our nation is allowed to conduct a private school. And if we wish to teach the child at home ourselves this also is forbidden. The examining Board before long pronounces that the child is insufficiently taught, and that it must be sent to a public school.

Thus the child meets the German teacher—and oh! he is so German—who too often is an obedient tool, and who, wishing to please the Government and his superiors, violates without shame the conscience and soul of the child, and sows broadcast in its mind doubt and hatred in his endeavour to create a gulf between me and my child! *Frisch daran! Nur gesinnungstüchtig!*

Thus, then, the child is taught: by a teacher

¹ *In general this is not true.*—Perhaps not, but in many, many places it is true!

who does not understand a word of its language, in German, which it does not yet understand. God be praised! We pride ourselves on the child going to school without understanding German. This does not favour successful teaching. It causes the child to suffer, but this suffering is necessary. It is a necessity to show from the very first day that it is our child and not a German child, and that what the school offers is something foreign and something which does not belong to it.

The teaching, then, is in German. It consists, in the meantime, mostly of religious instruction. At home we have already taught the child the Lord's prayer in our language, now it must learn it again in another tongue. Yes, and what is more—the teacher may insist that also at home the prayers must be said in German.¹

This the child does not do; we shall see to that. As diligently as the school teaches it the Lord's prayer in the foreign language, as diligently do we tell the child at home that it must pray, of course, in its mother tongue; and the child does it.

In the school the child learns to write beautifully and, perhaps, to spell rightly—that is, not its native language. No, *that* we parents

¹ *This is not true!*—Possibly only single cases have happened.

must laboriously sit and teach the children at home. And then we wish, if we can, to send it away for a finishing course across the border, when it is grown up, even if we thereby call down on our heads every form of worry and irritation which a zealous and aggressive official can invent for us. But in all those homes, of which there are many, where time and the gift for home teaching are wanting, the child on the whole does not learn to read or write its own language properly at all, and, we may say, not German either. And the child is taught history — German history, about the great victories of the Germans over us, over our poor nation, and about their enormous superiority over us in culture, history from German school books written specially for our use and bursting with chauvinism and containing glaring and evident mistakes and misrepresentations.¹

My child gets singing, too, at school! And what a joy the singing lesson might be! But to my child it is a plague and pestilence. Our songs, the songs of our forefathers, are not heard there, not even a hymn in our tongue.²

¹ *Nowadays this is done more judiciously.*—Perhaps a little.

² *Untrue.*—Not true everywhere, but still in many places. In a short review, January 1911, "Heimdal" states that in purely Danish school districts already 60

German songs, "Heil Dir im Siegeskranz" and "Wacht am Rhein," and whatever they call them—all these songs which we hate and detest because they are forced on us. Especially on the day of Sedan they have to sing in chorus: "Ich bin ein Preusze, will ein Preusze sein," and the teacher keeps a sharp and jealous look-out in case they sing instead: "Ich bin kein Preusze, will kein Preusze sein"; and if they sing this (and they do it often), they are punished. Many a caning has been given in German schools for this transgression.

There are intervals for play in the school, and there is a playground. Playground, forsooth! The child who in the playground speaks a single word in its mother tongue, in the language of its parents—is punished! To such service as executioners can men be bought! It is, of course, poor instruction which is given in the German school, and my child cannot be compared with children of such fortunate nations as are taught in their native tongue.

But it has this advantage, that the Prussian can point to us and say: "See how uncultured these people are. They need, indeed, to be

teachers have been appointed who cannot speak Danish. In 151 school areas the religious instruction was given in Danish to 7,620 children, in German to 5,317. And this last number will increase yearly at the expense of the other.

blest with the superior German Kultur!" This however, we accept as part of the bargain. Rather a less cultured child than a German child, than a child without root—with a divided mind, a renegade child, without nationality.¹ We accept this as a part of the bargain because it cannot be otherwise.

And, God be praised! we are the strongest. The child remains with us. Even if they finally put him into military uniform and send him away for two or three years to the other end of Germany, entirely among Germans, God be thanked and praised! he comes home again to us and is our child, child of our people—and not a German.

There is only one single thing which could bring victory to the other side—if they took the child from us and robbed it of our influence. And that is what they have done! Whether you will believe it or not, dear reader, they have done this incredible deed—this sacrilege they have really committed.

They have, by means of administration, robbed of their parental authority people who have shown activity in the national cause, and have transferred their authority to a "loyalist," to a (*gesinnungstüchtig*) guardian. But about this we shall speak later on.

Let us first, then, give the enemy his due.

¹ Good!

There are places and districts where the children get two hours' ¹ religious instruction weekly in their mother tongue in the lower classes, yet not always instead of the German instruction, but often as an addition to this outside the proper school hours.² These are the fragments which here and there are left of our language in the schools. Two hours' weekly religious instruction! But we despise them and count them as nothing. For it is 'as objectionable that a German teacher should teach our child in his language, which is strange to it, as it is that he should teach the child in our language which he himself has not mastered (but which in his mouth, through its difficulties, causes results which seem humorous to the children and to us blasphemous, a thing which he never clearly sees or suspects himself). No, such religious instruction is an offence only, a Judas piece of silver.³ It is no grief to us ⁴ that this instruction is gradually being discontinued in one parish after another, and soon will be but a saga in large parts of the country.

In the end my child leaves the school from its highest class—but in what a condition? It has not mastered German, which is only a school language to it. It has not mastered

¹ *Four hours and two hours, in German.*

² *Wrong.*—Is maintained.

³ *Very doubtful.*

its mother tongue either; the State purposely prevents it from learning to write it correctly in respect of spelling and construction of sentences. (How would an English child's mother tongue fare, I wonder, if it had never had an English reading lesson or had never written a piece of English composition, but had been taught exclusively in French?) And this cannot be altered. No energy, no perseverance can alter the fact that the child does not learn German thoroughly so long as the home keeps a jealous look-out to prevent German from slipping in and usurping the place of the mother tongue; while, on the other hand, the home cannot teach the child the mother tongue properly so long as the school does all it can to keep it out. The school cannot teach the child German without the home and in face of the home's opposition, and the home cannot teach the child Polish, French, or Danish without the school and in face of the school's opposition!

Accordingly the heart of the child is divided, torn and bitter. It is hurt and hindered by being the bone of contention between the home and the school, and by having to take sides with the one against the other, yes, of having to hate and despise his teacher, this Government tool, which it feels as a grievance and a hindrance.

Do you not believe me, dear reader? Oh, it is but too true. I do not say that it is equally bad in all schools in the conquered provinces, but it is so in most places. There may also be many a German teacher who finds that this state of affairs is too difficult, and cannot be called the spreading of *kultur*, and who, therefore, is lenient. But in that case he is not a "loyalist" (*gesinnungstüchtig*), and he is not a *persona grata* with the German Association, and his advancement, yes, perhaps even his tenure of office, is very insecure. For just for this purpose he is paid an additional salary—*die Ostmarkzulage*. This is, of course, blood and Judas money paid by the Government to him, not for being in the first place an educationist and the teacher of the children, the man in whom the parents are to place their trust, but for being the tool of the Government and the tyrant-apostle of Germany.

No, honest and good-hearted men are absolutely of no use as teachers to the German Association, only creatures who can be bought, who, for miserable gain's sake, and to please men, will sow evil seed in the hearts of the children, and wound the souls they ought to take care of.¹ Do you not believe this? Then you have not read your newspapers properly

¹ *Too strong!*—Perhaps in so far as many a man among them seeks a situation and receives his *Ostmarkzulage*

about the Polish school strike, or (this is most likely) your newspaper does not report this. Your newspaper will bring high-sounding reports of the Germanic spirit and its progress in Ostmark, Nordmark, and Westmark (untrue reports, for the Germanic spirit is not securing an ascendancy either in Ost, Nord, or Westmark, and it will never do so either, not in this way at least. It is naturally and necessarily losing ground because its procedure is morally wrong). But your newspaper does not tell you that it is by means such as these that progress is attempted—by offending the little ones of Jesus Christ. Do you not believe it? Hear then, what a German University teacher says about it. Professor Dr. jur. Walther Schückling speaks as follows in his pamphlet, “Das Nationalitätten problem” (Dresden, 1908, pp. 39-40):—

“On principle only teachers who do not understand one word of Polish are sent to teach Polish children, so that no word of Polish may be heard in the schools. And to these teachers, who do not understand the language of the children, the parents must surrender their dearest ones at the tender age of six. Picture the situation for a moment. What

without clearly knowing what he is entering upon or that he has really sold his soul. But how can any man remain once this has become clear to him?

would the German mothers have said if the Napoleonic conqueror had made such demands? Just picture the matter for a moment. How is the little Polish child to excuse itself to its teacher, when, for instance, it is late, when teacher and child do not understand one another? Perhaps before school hours the child has had to run a message for his parents to the doctor on account of a sudden case of illness. Every sensible teacher will in such a case excuse it, but he must in this, as in a thousand other dilemmas, understand the child. Is it not a travesty of all pedagogics, of all education, to let teacher and pupil speak in different tongues and give the elementary teaching (as Jeutsch has described it in 'Die Zukunft'), by means of a kind of deaf-and-dumb method! The *Frankfurter Zeitung* has recently even told us that teachers in the Polish districts who are able to master the Polish language are kept back from promotion for this reason! It is sheer madness, even if there is method in it [*'Ist es gleich Wahnsinn, hat es doch Methode'*]. We are in this respect far worse than the Magyars, who only quite recently have demanded that apart from the special teaching in the Hungarian language, the Saxon schools (*in Liebenbürgen*) shall allow *one* subject to be taught in Hungarian. We are also far worse than the Russians, who in

the Baltic Provinces lately, on principle again, have allowed the use of the mother tongue in the schools, and only demand that certain subjects shall be taught in Russian. With us it is, on the other hand, only exceptionally that Polish is tolerated in the teaching of religion. And even this is not permitted in all the classes of the public school. In many of the lowest classes the religious instruction only may be given in Polish. And even this, the last trench of the use of Polish in the schools, was in danger. For the school strike started in a place where a too zealous school-inspector had decreed that German must be spoken in giving religious instruction even in the primary schools. He has, we suppose, been disowned by the Government, but what if the school strike had not occurred?" "It is clear how the system of education must languish owing to the teaching of Polish children in German. . . . How miserable the results of the teaching are in the German-Polish school in the Eastmark may be seen from reports based on his own observations by the Editor of the *Christliche Welt* (1902, No. 45). The result of these sad revelations was not, of course, that the Government changed the system, but, according to what we are told, only that a circular was issued angrily forbidding teachers in future to admit any private

visitors into the schools." (See also Hugo Ganz, "Die preussische Polenpolitik," Frankfurt am Main, 1907.)

And if we want an example of the relation of the teaching profession to the population in one of the other German border countries, we have but to mention the following case. It has been publicly and legally proved before a German law-court and acknowledged and declared by German judges in giving judgment that a German teacher (Herr Bager, in Ketting, on the island of Als) in 1907 continually and habitually, during the hours of instruction, referred to the native population in coarse and offensive terms, such as "stupid Danes," "Jennies," "Danish dirt" (*dumme Dänen, Hannemann, danische Schweinigel*), etc. (You understand what it means for a successful legal proof of these facts to be established before a Prussian law-court!) The teacher is, of course, still in office in Ketting.

Then the child comes to the priest, in Protestant districts to the German priest, to prepare for Confirmation.

There are several German priests in the conquered provinces who are, first and foremost, politicians, and German agitators and priests only in the second place. They attend first to their political meetings, their Press

campaigns, and matters relating to colonization, etc. (Occasionally, they even engage in banking affairs, in shady company-promoting, and in criminal jobbery, as, for example, in the case of Herr Pastor Jacobsen,¹ the highly respected President of the German Association, "the chief president's right hand, the bulwark of Germanism in Scherrebeck.") And then after all this come the duties of the priesthood²—priests, indeed, of whom it might be said that it were better for them that a millstone were hanged round their necks, and that they were cast into the sea, than that they should offend our little ones. But there are also Prussian priests (fortunately several) who wish to give the child something really helpful, who feel how the national conflicts prevent this, and who would like to find a remedy. So a number of priests in the conquered territory send, in the simplicity of their hearts, a petition to the Prussian Government, proposing that the child in the school might be given, not only two hours' religious instruction weekly in the mother tongue, but also two hours' weekly instruction

¹ *One case only of fallen greatness.*—One too many, and one who for many weary years was an unspeakable offence to German sentiment, and against whom no one made a stand.

² *This is not true. It is an unpardonable generalization.*—Agreed. I ought to have said "in certain cases."

in the mother tongue itself, so that it might have the benefit of being prepared for Confirmation in the mother tongue. That is very kind of these priests, and proves that their *Gesinnings tüchtigkeit* has not entirely suffocated all their Christianity, and that their position as Apostles of Germany has not quite made them forget that they are also the Apostles of Christ. But their Superintendent sends up the petition with his disapproval!

Some Prussian Superintendents are first of all servants of the State, then servants of Christ (if time can be spared from the duties of the former office); they are first politicians, then clergymen — first prelates, then Christians — otherwise they would scarcely become Superintendents in a conquered province. The Government peremptorily refuses the petition. Then, for the first time, and for the second time, and for the third time, the priests consider the situation, and ultimately they decide to let the petition remain at home, and this is indeed also the wisest course.¹ They may

¹ Note by the author: It must be added that the petition was, however, brought forward year after year by the lay members of the Synod, and that at last in the year 1912 they succeeded in securing the votes of many of the priests and even of two of the superintendents, so that it was passed by the Synod. But no one must, on that account, believe that the Government will take any notice of that.

as well follow it. Two hours' teaching in the mother tongue from the German teacher who has not mastered the language himself, and who during all the other hours of the week zealously and servilely impresses upon the child the poverty and the low status of his language ! No, thanks !

The preparation for Confirmation comes to an end. Then follows the Communion, the first Communion of the child along with its parents. In German ! In German, in the hated foreign language we hear the words of Jesus to us about His Body and Blood which He gave for us for the remission of our sins.

The forgiveness of our sins He hath indeed bought for us, but not the use of our mother tongue in the midst of a "Christian" country with a national Church and a State-appointed priesthood.

Are these things actually true? Am I not exaggerating? Certainly, if I am a Roman Catholic, what has been said does not apply. Into the Roman Catholic Church the Prussian cannot enter with his German. But into the Prussian State Church !

Fortunate Catholics who escape this travesty of a "State Church" where the representative of foreign oppression stands in the pulpit, and at the altar, and speaks about "the great German God," and about the duty of obeying

the authorities, and of showing not only outward obedience to them but to bow the heart as well before them! False doctrine! Christ teaches us to show outward obedience, to give to Cæsar his due—but no more, not our heart. To our hearts he must remain as distant as the Roman Emperor to the disciples of Jesus, or as the Babylonian King to the exiled Jews.¹

There are some Protestant parishes (there will soon be only a few!) where there are still services in the mother tongue, if not every Sunday, still perhaps every second Sunday, and where the Communion is celebrated in the mother tongue. But there are actually parishes where the mother tongue is never heard in the church, and where we are baptized, con-

¹ *This is wrong. Jesus is never concerned merely with the outward, but He certainly on this point warns us to cultivate self-respect beside self-mastery. Further, Jesus spoke of the heathen.*—I cannot see that this is wrong. Surely Jesus would never ask that His disciples should show more than outward obedience towards the Roman authorities. He would never wish them to surrender their hearts—surely he would approve of their hearts remaining as cold and distant as the hearts of the exiled Jews to the Babylonian King. And that Jesus had to do with the heathen makes no difference in my eyes—except this, that the rule of oppression exercised over conquered nations may more readily be excused in the case of heathen people than in the case of a Christian nation. (Besides, neither Babylonians nor Jews nor Romans attacked the nationality or language of the Jews.)

firmed, offered Communion, are married and buried in German, and that even if we are far more numerous than all the immigrant Germans in the parish, the railway officials, the gate-keepers, and the postmen, and whatever else they all are.¹

And what are these church services, then, in the mother tongue? A stingily measured alms instead of our right! A contemptuous dole

¹ *This is almost maliciously inaccurate.*—It must be acknowledged that it is not often the case where there is a large Danish majority, but in many places where there is a large Danish minority. In many places a small German minority, by means of a petition to the Government, gains a church service in German first six times a year, then twelve times, then every third Sunday, at last every second Sunday, until perhaps they cease of themselves because no one comes to church.

In this connection I give a cutting from a newspaper. From the parish of Norre Logum we read in the Flensborg paper: "On New Year's Day the priest, after finishing his sermon, addressed the congregation from the pulpit as follows: 'I have a complaint and a request to make. Some years ago German services were introduced by request, and these have been held on fifteen occasions during the year, but no one attends. On the third Sunday in Advent, for instance, there was only one person present with the exception of a young girl from the priest's house. Not even those who asked for these services came to the church. It would have been better to have left things as they were. I now ask those who understand a German sermon to come. Otherwise it will be admitted that those who maintain that there is no desire for these services are right.'"

from the usurper to the rightful owner! And with this we are to be content and grateful!

It is a mean-spirited man who is content with the half of his rights!

These religious services conducted by a man, perhaps an honest enough man in his own way, but a man who does not know our language properly,² who is a stranger to us, who is a servant of the Government, but against us, who has to look after our souls, but who has also to Germanize us! Away with them! Let us have Free Churches! Should we not be able to pay for two kinds of priests—a priest whom we do not know and do not use, but who gets his ample official salary, and a priest who, perhaps, must be content with a smaller income or who must be willing to help in several parishes, but who belongs to us heart and soul, and whose word can in our own souls find an echo?

It is expensive, of course, to pay a salary to two priests instead of to one. But then, it

¹ *This is wrong. The congregation is responsible for this.*—I do not understand. That the congregation accepts and puts up with this state of things because it can have nothing better is a very different thing from not wanting anything better and from considering what it is getting—its half-rights.

² *N.B.*—This is the case with the majority of them. They believe themselves that they are fluent in our language, but this is a delusion.

is expensive to build churches which may remain unused for four years because the police officer discovers, on the opening day, a tiny crack in the plaster of the roof, and shuts the church on account of its "structural weakness"! And we should have to be buried in the State cemetery, and like suicides, without tolling of bells, as all petitions about the laying out of graveyards round the Free Churches are being refused. But in spite of all this we say: Let us have Free Churches! Our right, our sacred and imperishable right, is this: to have our language whole and full and free in the church as well as in the school. At Pentecost God's Spirit revealed Itself in many tongues, which now are defunct, and which certainly were not better than our tongue, in Cretan, in Pamphylian, and in Elamite, but the Prussian Government thinks that our language was not included in the Pentecostal miracle.¹ Into more than four hundred tongues has the Bible been translated, even into the meanest and poorest negro language. And when the missionary goes out to a savage people, what else is his first work but to learn the language of the people in order to preach to them in the mother tongue and to fulfil the Pentecostal miracle? And what is their next task but to educate and train native pastors and teachers to take

¹ *Good.*

the place of the missionary? Why, even the German Protestant Mission in the South Sea Islands goes to work in this way, but we are worse off than Polynesians, negroes, and bushmen!

In Berlin there is a French, an English, a Russian Church, etc., for the subjects of these various nations, to enable them to hear the Word of God in their own language, although in a foreign country. And the German Government sees that there are German churches in London, Paris, Copenhagen—yes, in Calcutta, and in Nagasaki, but in *our* churches a foreign language is spoken!

St. Paul was to the Jews a Jew, to the Greeks a Greek. Our priests do not seem to agree with him. It is a difficult and even painful position for an honest and good man to be a priest or a teacher in a conquered land. We recognize it, and we pity them, for there are really honest and good men among them. But I have a good piece of advice to give them when they feel the desperate difficulty of their position, and sigh because they are not able to be anything for the people who are feeding them.¹ I have a good piece of

¹ *They bear a good many vicarious sufferings for the oppressed.*—Must be admitted to a certain degree. See later. Such strong statements wrong these men. And yet why do they come among us? What they ought

advice to them. "Stay away!" I say. "Why do you come here? Go back again to *das grosse Vaterland*, and leave us in peace in our small native country."

No Christian priest can, with a good conscience, try to convert a foreign people¹ against their will and wishes, or preach the Word of God to them in a language which is not theirs, and which they do not wish to hear. For he usurps the place of one of their own people,

to say to the people they cannot, namely, that they are being unjustly oppressed, that they are suffering great wrongs which they must bear, however, patiently and obediently, and, like all other trials, let purification and spiritual growth be the outcome of their sufferings (after the manner of the Jewish people). This is what the congregation have a right to hear, because it is the only view which makes it possible for it to feel reconciled to the conditions and to see them in their proper light—the only way for a Christian person to regard them. But no German State preacher can say this. And yet it is only on this condition that a proper understanding and a proper relation can be established between him and his congregation. As circumstances are he will, in the eyes of the congregation, always "belong to the other side."

¹ *Most of the teachers and clergymen are natives of Northern Sleswig, sons of Danish peasants.*—Can a single Polish teacher be found in German Poland? And can a single openly Danish or Danish-minded teacher or clergyman be found in Northern Sleswig? Danish-speaking, perhaps, perhaps some of the children of "Home Germans," but openly Danish and really Danish-minded? No!

And no Christian teacher can, with a good conscience, seek a position among a foreign people, and against their will and wishes teach their children in a language which is not theirs, and which they do not wish to hear. For he usurps the place of one of their own people. Once Christianity really became the ruling power in their hearts, and once they really saw the situation clearly, as it is, then conscience would compel each of them, priest and teacher, if they were truly Christian, to throw up his place. Now, then, we warn them: We have not sent for you. We do not want you. We want priests and teachers of our own nation, the right that even Negroes, Eskimos, and Red Indians enjoy. Go away, and do not desecrate all that is most sacred to us by using it as a means of worldly service. Will you, a Christian man, let yourself be hired by any Government whatsoever to aid it in Germanizing, and use the Word of God and your priestly vocation for this purpose? All Germanizing by force is morally wrong, but doubly so for a priest or a teacher.

It is a natural human right, a sacred right belonging to every nation, to have priests and teachers from its own midst, of its own language, of its own mind. It is a sacred right belonging to every man to decide about the education of his own child, to have full

liberty to teach his child according to his own mind in his own language. If the laws encroach on these rights, then the laws are illegal and sinful, and transgress against the laws of God.¹ In such circumstances we cannot give unto Cæsar what belongs to Cæsar without withholding from God that which is His.

But if we are told, "Well, then, train your priests and teachers from among yourselves in your own language, and let them seek office among your people"—thanks! Does any one believe that one of our young people trained as a priest, or as a teacher or a lawyer, or anything else at a German University, would be able to get a post among us?² In Westphalia

¹ But what if the individual through inadvertence encroaches on the rights of the State? No family can live without the legal protection of the State. To this end the State educates its citizens, and a certain minimum of citizen education is enforced (knowledge of languages for the military, for the law-court, etc.). But as soon as the authorities become overbearing and refuse to tolerate the mother tongue side by side with this, then we are to blame.—Certainly, if the State will not go the whole way, and recognize that it has no right to rule over these people, but should liberate them and give them back to their own kith and kin. This should be the Christian duty of the State.

² Not as a lawyer, but priest or teacher, certainly.—Yes, on paper. But he cannot in reality, as he cannot accept the conditions which await him, or for a moment think of complying with the demands made upon him.

or in Brandenburg he might, perhaps, but not among us, where he just wants to be ; and he does not care to be in Westphalia or Brandenburg, and we do not wish to have him there as he is Danish and not German. No, that way is barred.

And it means a great deal to a people that the path of higher education is barred.¹ That is also one of the means by which the Prussians give us higher Kultur, by trying to prevent our young people from getting an academic training. That none of our people can become a gate-keeper, or a railway conductor, or a midwife, or a hospital doctor, or indeed an official of any kind in the service of the State or of the Commune, that doubtless may be a matter of merely economic significance for us ; it may hurt and vex us to see all these imported strangers whom we have to maintain. But that an academic career is barred to us (because an official career is barred to us in our own country), that is a matter of other and still greater importance to us because it diminishes our chances of culture.

But, thank God ! at the same time Prussia opens other sources of culture for us. There is an immense power in burning indignation, in the sense of being wronged, in suffering,

¹ *Not true!*—See below. Think of the Poles.

yes, also strength in hatred and in scorn,¹ strength which drives us to work with redoubled zeal for ourselves, seeing that the State bars to us its avenues to higher things, to delve more deeply into the culture of our own race so that we may not fall behind our oppressors in culture, but only in brutality.

It was in passionate indignation, in the sense of being wronged, in suffering, in hatred, and in scorn that Prussia found strength, in 1813, against the French conqueror. And it is exactly, from these same sources of power that we are drawing our strength against the Prussian conqueror, whose yoke is so much heavier, whose brutality is far greater than was ever that of Napoleon. All this is inevitable, until it dawns some day on humanity that to self-conscious and civilized nations the word "conqueror" is a term, not of honour but of shame; that God has made the nations, and that each one of them has a right to live its own life unmolested by others; that Germanizing by force, Prussianizing, Magyarizing, etc., ethically regarded, must be placed in the category of theft and murder.

So much with regard to the school and the Church. Need I mention the law-courts? Need I waste many words on the Prussian judges and police magistrates, who judge us, fine us

¹ *Good.*

and imprison us when we sing our old songs, when we paint our gates or doors with colours which accidentally happen to be in our old flag, who exile our children and our servants for offences which others have committed, who put our editors and parliamentary representatives in prison on paltry grounds, who forbid us to erect dwelling-houses on our own land, and force us to live in earthen caves and gipsy caravans, and who come and carry off our stove if we erect one there? ¹

Do you realize that it is a punishable offence to have a red-brown gate in a whitewashed wall? that if I paint the name of my property which it has held for a thousand years, on my wagon, the law comes down on me and threatens me with a fine if I do not erase it at once and put the new Prussian name of the farm on instead, a name which is manufactured and made up by the managers, and which often is only a senseless and silly perversion of the right one? ² (How would an English squire like to get Sandringham changed into Sonderhaven, or his old town with its ancient English name called Friederichshöhe

¹ ? ?—Will be proved later.

² ?—My statement cannot be questioned; here is an example. "Aabenraa" etymologically and from a scientific point of view makes very good sense, while "Apenrade" makes none; cf. "Graasten"—"Gravenstein," etc.

or Wilhelmsort?) I do not understand at all why I myself am allowed to keep my name, as it is absolutely, un-German in its sound!

But all these are but petty grievances in comparison with intolerable cases of tyranny in matters of far greater importance.

The most flagrant, if perhaps not the most important, example of such a pure breach of the law, and of their own promises and of their own enactments, is to be found in the treatment of the North Sleswig "Optionists"—that is, of the natives of Sleswig who, according to the right guaranteed to them in paragraph 19 of the Treaty of Vienna, had declared in favour of Denmark, and concerning whom it is decreed in the above-mentioned paragraph that they "must not on account of their choice be interfered with by either side regarding their persons or regarding their properties situated in the respective States," likewise that they also "retain their rights of nationality in the Kingdom of Denmark as well as in the Duchies."

My readers need not be afraid that I am going to weary them with a long explanation of the Optionist question.¹ It is sufficient to say here that Prussia has on every opportunity

¹ A statement of this can be found in a book by Franz von Jessen, "Manuel historique de la question de Slesvig," Copenhagen, 1906, the Gyldendal bookstore.

delighted in *exiling* these Optionists and their children (numbering tens of thousands), in spite of all promises, treaties, and later conventions, not when the Optionists themselves have been found guilty of pro - Danish agitation (an Optionist would take good care not to commit himself in that way), but when their brothers, or brothers-in-law, or cousins, or even persons who were only neighbours or friends of theirs from the same town or parish were directly concerned. If a Danish meeting has been held in a parish, or a social excursion has been conducted from a parish into Denmark, or if anything of that kind takes place, then the whole parish is punished by the exile of one or more of the Optionists, although they may not have had anything to do with the cause of offence. This is a recognized principle, and admitted as such publicly and in plain words by high Prussian officials.

I wish to tell Prussian officials clearly and distinctly, and in a manner perfectly intelligible, how we regard such acts (of course not in Sleswig only but, as we shall see later, also in Poland and Alsace-Lorraine). If one could imagine the impossible case of my being challenged to a duel by the Prussian Landrath in Sonderborg (I am not supposing so ridiculous a case in order to show my attitude to the duel question, but only cite a test that

will appeal specially to a Prussian), I should in that case turn my back on him with contempt and say: "I cannot consider you a satisfactory person to fight. You have in cold blood, and on your own responsibility, torn an orphan girl of eighteen from her old grandparents, and from her home, and have exiled her from her country, giving her only twenty-four hours' warning, and, mark well, not, as you yourself said, because she had given offence in any way, but because her grandfather was pro-Danish. Such conduct stains a man's honour, and will embitter, we hope, his dying hour."

[The young girl (Helene Reimers) is desperate, refuses to leave, is conducted by police over the border, returns next day, is arrested, imprisoned for a couple of days, and after this punishment she is again conducted over the border. Bravo, Herr Landrath!]

These banishments have happened by the thousand to people who have lived all their lives in the country—to grown-up people and to children, to men and women, to old and young, to sick and aged—yes, even to women lying in their beds in confinement.

Then just two more examples, mainly from the régime of Herr von Koller:—

A poor widow gets an order to quit within twenty-four hours, with her daughter, twelve years of age, who is dying from meningitis.

When she arrives at the Danish border station she must wait several hours before she is transported to a poorhouse, as the Danish authorities have not been warned of their arrival! Two days later the child dies.

A girl of sixteen, an Optionist child herself, but having two brothers who were naturalized, after serving their time in the Prussian Army, was told to leave the country within twenty-four hours. As a reason it was explained that she had gone from the kindness of her heart to help her neighbours, whose servants had been exiled.

A bedridden Optionist sixty-nine years of age, with a sick wife also sixty-nine years old, and a grown-up daughter, were deported. Even their German neighbours pleaded for them with the magistrate, but in vain. As a reason it was stated that their two grown-up naturalized sons had taken part in a Danish electioneering meeting.

Until 1898 sons of Optionists, born in Sleswig, were enrolled as soldiers and naturalized when they came up for their military training. Von Koller introduced the practice of cashiering them and exiling them. As a consequence we come across many instances of the eldest son having been a Prussian soldier while the younger one has been exiled, and has entered the Danish Army. In many

places the old parents are now living all alone on the farm which has been in the family for generations while all the children are exiled, all because, in 1864, the father, trusting the promises of the Prussian State, and relying on a Treaty drawn up in the name of the Trinity, exercised his option in favour of Denmark, and hoped thereby to escape the Prussian Conscription.

But the cup is not yet full. No, if they want to get rid of a man with Danish sympathies, and if he is not an Optionist, *they make him one*, should other means fail, by buying false witnesses. People who had never been Optionists were declared by Herr von Koller to be so, and their children had to quit. There are many examples of this having been done, even to persons who had taken part in the campaign of 1870-71 on the German side, and who had got the war medal. In these cases the authorities declared that the drafting of those men for military service was due to a misunderstanding! Nay, more, even if the father had been through the campaign and the son had later served his time in the German Army, still the authorities exiled the son as the child of an Optionist, so that there might be no one to take over the family property.

And to crown all, the officials of the Administration do not respect the law-courts, not even

the decisions of the German High Court. Do not imagine that a man can feel secure when he holds a German High Court decree declaring him to be a German citizen. The Landrath can, despite this, quite easily exile him as "an Optionist" (e.g. the case of Finnemann). In a few individual cases the order of exile has been successfully appealed against and nullified by the High Court. In those cases the authorities have lacked the courage to renew the order of exile, but they have shown their power and their ill-will by striking the names of the persons in question off the list of voters, and by depriving them of all rights as citizens. But, as a rule, it is impossible to get an order of exile repealed.¹

And in order to make an Optionist of a man they do not disdain the help of bribed witnesses. The Sheriff in Skaerback, Winther von Adlerslängel, wished to make a certain Herr Timmermann an Optionist, and stated in a letter, which fell into the wrong hands, that he would place the sum of 2,000 marks (from whose purse, we wonder!) at the disposal of a certain shoemaker if he, no matter whether

¹ Bank-manager Müller in Skaerback was exiled by the Administrative Council; therefore he was recognized by the ordinary law-court as a Prussian subject; but nevertheless he was deprived of his political rights and declared an exile. (Author's note.)

he “*quite* remembered the fact or not,” would declare on his oath that Timmermann had resided for a considerable time in Denmark, about thirty-eight years before!

Also in the Finnemann case it has been clearly proved that the authorities paid witnesses to give false evidence, and that it was through their instrumentality that they gained their end.

In both cases the truth might easily have been brought to light, and legal proof given before a German law-court. But all attempts stranded on the repeated refusal of the Courts to deal with the case. And in consequence of these acts of “justice,” farmer Finnemann has for years lived an exile across the border.

When this policy of the making and exiling of Optionists does not suffice, other resources are used. Listen to this:—

In order to compel Sleswig children who are attending secondary schools in Denmark to return, the first thing is to exile the Optionists in the affected parishes. If this does not suffice, the parents in question are deprived of their parental authority over their children, and guardians favourably disposed to Germany are appointed! But the children simply refuse to obey their new guardians and their orders to return. At last, however, a decree of this

kind has been reversed by the High Court of Leipzig, which declares, in opposition to the verdict of the Landrath, that it is not an "immoral" act to send a child to a Danish school.

To cite another case: A widow in the country with ten children gets her eldest boy apprenticed in a Danish newspaper office. On account of this she is deprived of her parental authority over all the other nine children, her worst personal enemy is appointed as their guardian, a "political" chimney-sweeper, who takes the boy away from his situation, and places him elsewhere in good German surroundings. Here, too, the case has to be carried right up to the High Court before the judgment is reversed, after a year and a day.

[It is superfluous to add that all Optionists are not treated like this, but that their political bias is the decisive factor. The former Chancellor, Fürst Bülow, is, for instance, the son of an Optionist, as his father after the war in 1867 decided for Denmark; but he has so far never been molested for that reason.]¹

This, then, is the German idea of right and culture. This is what is understood by Germanizing! And the men who lend themselves as creatures to do this dirty work are called *gesin-*

¹ *Good.*

nungstüchtige, and the champions of German culture in nord, east, or west-mark.¹

A special account has been given of the condition of the Danes in Sleswig and of the Optionist question, because these two things furnish particularly flagrant and amazing examples of Prussian policy. But do not suppose for a moment that you have heard the worst. Listen to what follows:—

In the first place, the evictions and exile are not confined to Sleswig. In Poland they even went so far, in November 1907, as to evict a boy of four years of age.²

Need I mention the pass-tyranny in Alsace-

¹ The author of this Supplement has not experienced personally the last phase in the North Sleswig fight for nationality, the persecution of the "homeless." Otherwise he would surely have directed attention also to this point: that among other things a premium is put upon illegitimacy in that the illegitimate child of a "homeless" man inherits its mother's Prussian rights as a German citizen and is secure from persecution, while the child is "homeless" like the father if the parents marry. Those two thousand to three thousand "homeless" persons in Sleswig, all born there, as children of Optionists, have nowhere any right as citizens, neither in Prussia nor in any other land. They can, therefore, only be exiled in general. They are fined for not obeying the order of exile, and are put in prison once, twice, thrice, four times, until they leave the country at last. (Note by the Editor.)

² ? ?

Lorraine? There, too, the police escort the sons and daughters over the border again when they try to rush home without a special permit to their parents' deathbed. Often, too, they are refused permission to be present, not only at the deathbed but also at the funeral.

There, too, the French language is proscribed, and its use forbidden even on tombstones.¹

In Berlin a hairdresser may call himself *Coiffeur*, but not so in Strassburg. There the police have carried their zeal so far as to confiscate handbills which intimated, in French, that such and such a Professor would lecture on the debt of culture to Richard Wagner.²

¹ *No, only political sentiments?*

² I need only remind you of the preliminaries to the demonstrations in January 1911. A couple of months beforehand the president of the Franco-National Sport Association intimated to the Metz police that they intended having a concert on the 8th of January. As he did not receive an answer he went to the police president, where he was requested to send in the programme of the concert. This was done at once. But the police now demanded a printed programme. Also this request was complied with. Some days later the president got word that the French text must be translated into German and then sent to the police president. And at last, on the 5th of January, three days before the concert, the president was sent for by the police president and was told that the police considered the concert a

But why labour these details? Examples from any one conquered province hold good for all. There is no difference of treatment; it is ever the brutal grip on the throat, the clenched fist before the face is ever the same.

If examples are wanted of the Germanizing campaign in other places, we need only mention that in the provinces of Posen, West Prussia, East Prussia, Silesia, and in the districts of

public demonstration and the list of members of the association must be handed in.

The president of the association found this rather stiff—first to have the matter dragged out by all kinds of pretexts, and then at the last moment to get such an unreasonable demand. But the police maintained their claim. The president now tried to apply to the police president's superior officer, who gave him a Solomon's answer to the effect that the society did not need police permission to hold a private concert, but that the police president had informed him that this was a public performance. It was clear that the society was the object of petty persecution by the police, that they did not dare to forbid the concert, but that they would as far as possible place insuperable difficulties in the way. The president and the other members of the committee maintained, however, that, according to the law, they had a right to hold the concert and that the police could not demand the list of members, and they, therefore, persisted in proceeding with the concert as advertised.

On the Sunday evening a couple of thousand people were gathered in the concert-hall. The orchestra had played an introductory march, and it was just going to start the real programme when a police officer appeared

Frankfurt-am-Oder, Stettin and Oöslin—that is, the Polish districts—it is necessary in every single case for the plans of buildings not only to be approved by the municipal authorities, but to be passed also by a State president, who must certify that the proposed building will not in any way contravene the German law regulating the construction of such buildings. For many years only Germans have been able to get this permission from the State

at the entrance and ordered the concert to be stopped at once. The chairman explained to him that this was not a public demonstration, and that only ticket-holders had been admitted; further, he asked all who were not members of the society to leave the hall, but no one stirred. The police officer stuck to his guns, but the audience demanded that the concert should proceed. The conductor made ready to begin, but he was stopped by the police, who seized hold of him and held him fast.

Of course this caused a great tumult in the crowded hall. At the request of the chairman the assembly dispersed, however, but the demonstrations were continued in the street. Several thousand people, with the banner of the society carried at the head of the procession, marched through the streets singing French and Italian songs. Stopping at the monument of Maréchal Neye, one of the members of the society leaped upon the pedestal of the monument and made a speech ending with a "*Vive la France!*" and singing the Marseillaise, they continued the march. In the meantime the police had called out the military, who met them with fixed bayonets. In the mêlée several people were wounded and a score of the demonstrators were arrested. (Note by the Editor.)

president. (Confirmation of this from the German side may be found, among other places, in a book by Professor Walther Schücking, Dr. Jurisp., "Das Nationalitäten problem.") It is, as a rule, impossible for a Pole to get permission to build a dwelling-house. He may build stables and barns, for these are not mentioned in the law, but not a dwelling-house. If, nevertheless, he does venture to do so, examples can be given of police officers carrying away windows and doors so as to make the house uninhabitable. At the beginning of this campaign people were at first allowed to build the dwelling-houses, and afterwards the proprietors were forbidden to use them. The house stands empty, and must not be entered, while the would-be inhabitants sleep in the barn or the stable. The temptation to steal into the dwelling-house at night is great, of course, but to do so involves a fine. And if the police suspect anything of this kind, they spread fine sand round the house in the evening so as to be able to find footprints next morning. (Report from the correspondent of *Gazeta Polska*, from the village Mielzyn in Posen, October 1903.)

A Pole, by the name of Drzymella, had bought a few acres of land near Posen, and had built a stable and a barn upon it; but it was quite impossible for him to get permission

to build a dwelling-house. At last he bought a closed gipsy caravan and lived in this with his family. It was remarkable that the police could not find any paragraph of the law forbidding this. After fighting the authorities for four years he at last got tired and left the country. His caravan is now in the Cracow National Museum. Occasionally the poor souls have to content themselves with living in caves dug in the ground, a form of dwelling which we shall therefore suppose must be considered less insanitary in the eyes of the Prussian authorities than houses.¹

The authorities do not seem to think they can forbid this, as there is no law against caves, so they let the matter pass because they do not wish to run the risk of having such cases brought before the law-courts.

However, to kill as far as possible the desire of the Polish inhabitants to parcel up the soil and to build houses on it, still finer methods have been invented. The moment the Pole, in such a caravan as we have mentioned, or in an earthen cave, puts in a stove, the sanitary inspector arrives at once and removes it, because a stove in such surroundings is dangerous to health! The Pole is thus compelled, for the sake of his health, to freeze in the Polish

¹ *Take care!*—Perhaps you do not know these conditions, but I have only said what I can prove.

winter ! That he might perhaps put up with for himself, and perhaps also for his wife, but it is sometimes hard to see the children freeze.

That he sometimes has difficulty in resigning himself to this may be seen from the following story :—

A peasant by the name of Chrosz, who lived in Silesia in such an earthen cave as has been mentioned, had placed in it a stove. The police ordered him to do away with it himself. As he did not obey, a police officer, accompanied by a mason, arrived in the absence of the proprietor and smashed the stove. While this was being done the man came home. Desperate and beside himself with rage, he seized his gun, fired on the police officer, and then shot himself.

Do not say, then, that the Prussian State does not take care of its subjects, and that it is not a State that pays due regard to law and culture !

[When, on the other hand, the State complains of the lower state of culture of the Poles, one is tempted to ask what the State is doing to advance Polish culture, and if Polish culture might not have been more advanced if the Poles had been allowed to enjoy political liberty as citizens, and the fundamental rights of human beings.]

But let us return to ordinary conditions of life among the people. Take, for example, freedom of association. How does this stand?

As we know, the German Empire has now (in 1908) secured a new Law of Association, granting a little more freedom from the interference of the German elements of society, but full of clauses of exceptions for the conquered people. As no one knows yet how this law will work, or be interpreted, we will first give a short sketch of the conditions under the old and specially Prussian Law of Association:—

“All assemblies at which public affairs are to be discussed must be reported in advance to the police, even if the gatherings are held in private houses, and if the discussions relate to agriculture, co-operation, questions of health insurance, or even the services in the Free Churches. Three persons are, according to Prussian law, enough to make an assembly.”

When two men come driving along in a closed carriage, and meet a friend, who takes a seat beside them, and they carry on a conversation about the high price of corn, “then,” as a famous German advocate has said, “they are punishable, according to Prussian law, as the meeting was not beforehand reported to the police.”

Gatherings in the open air require a special

permit from the police, a permit which has never been granted for a Polish, Danish, or French meeting.

Societies which "seek to influence public affairs" must submit their rules and lists of members to the police, and must notify within three days all changes in the membership. In 1899 about a hundred and fifty law actions, involving fines to the amount of twenty thousand marks, were brought against the North Sleswig Language Union in respect of deaths among members, during the preceding ten years, which had not been notified to the police within three days. When a man died in a distant country district the very first thing the family had to think of was to intimate the fact, as quickly as possible, to all the societies of which the deceased had been a member, so that the various committees might let the police know within three days, preferably in a registered letter, I think, so as to have for future occasions, perhaps ten years later, a receipt in proof of the intimation. *Each* member of the committee of an Agricultural Association was fined fifteen marks because the death of a member was intimated only on the 1st of May, while he had died on the evening of the 28th of April. The 29th was a Sunday, and on the Monday the Association held a general meeting for the election of committee

members. As a rule women may never be present at political meetings, nor yet at sociable gatherings held after them.

The police dissolved, for instance, some time ago, the Mantlemakers' Trade Union in Berlin because a woman speaker at a meeting had voiced a wish for the reduction of the tariff on thread. It had cost philanthropic people years of work and trouble to bring together and organize these worst-paid of outcasts among women workers. And then, with one stroke of a pen, the police director smashed and annihilated the whole organization.

Any meeting could be dissolved by the police if armed persons were found to be present, and in the conquered country districts such meetings have been dissolved because walking-sticks were found in the room.

Meetings have been stopped for many and various reasons. One speaker began his lecture with these words: "My theme . . ." Then the police officer rose and said shortly: "No one may speak of themes in this assembly. I declare the meeting closed!" Somewhere in one of the conquered districts a number of ladies were gathered at a tea-party, when the police pushed their way in and put an end to the gathering; certainly no speeches had been made, but, according to the ideas of the police, it was probable that public affairs might have

been discussed if the party had been allowed to go on. Ordinary non-political gatherings with lectures have been stopped "because a crack in the plaster ceiling showed that the club-house was shaky," or because "some children were ill with measles on a farm in the same parish," or because "the hall was lit with paraffin lamps, and it was quite possible that one of them might explode," or because the door was not marked "Exit" (*Ausgangsthür*), or because the police had not indicated how many persons the hall could hold. In Saxony the police have often forbidden meetings of a social-democratic character "because the drinking water of the town was not good," and in Silesia the police forbade a trade-union of masons to hold meetings "because foot-and-mouth disease had broken out among the cattle of the district."

At a certain place a Dedication Service was proposed to be held in a new Free Church. But in the place of the pastor the police officer appeared, in the chancel, in pointed helmet, and with sword in hand, and forbade the use of the church because a crack the size of a hair was visible in the plaster ceiling, and showed that the building was dangerous! A legal process followed, during which the church was kept closed for four years, then the closing order was reversed by the highest

court. But for those four years the congregation had in this way, been unable to make use of their church, and, of course, the right to hold open-air meetings had been refused.

[If only for completeness' sake, let me add that in the conquered districts the licences of hotel-keepers and innkeepers are held subject to the condition that they do not permit their houses to be used for Nationalist meetings, not even for Nationalist agricultural or Nationalist health insurance meetings.]

What surprises one is that any meeting at all is ever successfully arranged.

Whatever the circumstances, whatever the occasion, the question in the conquered districts is whether one's sympathies are Nationalist or pro-German, and if one is not pro-German one has no rights. If a farmer, owing to the busy harvest season, wishes to get an *exeat* from school for his herd boy, the granting of this favour all depends on whether he shows a "Nationalist tendency" or not. In the German Parliament on March 19, 1908, the representative for North Sleswig, Herr H. P. Hanssen, handed the Minister for Education a "private" note issued by the school inspector to the teachers, in which this procedure was strongly recommended. During the parliamentary discussions on March 16, 1908, a member of the House,

Herr Sudekum, showed that this principle is also accepted as the guiding rule in dealing with "grants in support of veterans." He produced a document in which Landrath Dolega von Koszierewski asked a county official to inform him how far some applicant fulfilled the conditions prescribed by the law; but, along with this, the official was asked to give in a separate letter, and for private information, his opinion as to how far an allowance granted could be supposed to promote loyalist tendencies in the case of the person in question, or if, on the contrary, he was pro-Danish. This was an attempt at corruption, for which it was impossible for the speaker to find parliamentary expression. He begged the House to record their disgust at this wretched Landrath's action (here he was called to order by the president).

[I make his words my own. First we are conquered, then we are forced to fight for the conqueror, and at last we are denied in our old age our pension as veterans, which all other veterans receive, on account of our nationality. As if our sympathies were within the power of our will!]

A community in which the inhabitants are mainly Polish decide to build a well at the school, and receive an offer from a local workman to do the work for four hundred marks. The community know that a neighbouring

district has got a Government grant towards the construction of their school well, and they seek the same help. This also is granted, but with this limitation : the grant is made to depend on the work being executed by a certain German firm. This firm want a thousand marks for the job, so that the community save a hundred marks by refusing the grant.

In the year 1908 the German people secured a new and more liberal Law of Assembly, which, however, can easily and zealously be used against us by Prussian skill in interpretation. But for the special benefit of the conquered districts, the new law contains in Section 12 this clause, that *at all public meetings*, political or non-political, even at ordinary lectures, and at Free Church services, only German and no other language may be spoken. This decree, however, is not to come into force for twenty years in all parishes where more than 60 per cent. of the population are of non-German nationality. But it comes into force at once in many purely Polish, Danish, and French districts, which have the sad fate of bordering on districts of German nationality, and of forming one half of a parish, the other half of which is mainly German ("geometry of choice").

In such places the mother tongue is silenced at once, even in the Free Churches ; in the

districts where it is spoken by over 60 per cent. of the population it will be silenced in twenty years' time. Wherever our countrymen gather in large numbers their mother tongue is forbidden, either now, at once, or in twenty years' time. The mother tongue *must* be silenced.

It is silenced in the church, in the school, in the law-court, in the clubs, in the theatres, in the agricultural associations, and in the health insurance unions. I know only one place where it will never die—in the home. From the home no persecution will ever drive it out; there at least it will reign to all eternity, and as long as it lives there it has always a chance of waking into life anew elsewhere as well.

And we shall not forget that the German Chancellor stood up in his place in Parliament and supported such a proposal as this (nay, a far more drastic proposal; for the law, as it exists, is a compromise between the Government proposal and the amendments secured by the Liberal parties), and that he has declared its acceptance to be necessary and self-evident. However refined and polite, however amiable he may, perhaps, be as a man, yet this policy of his brands him with a stigma which will accompany his name beyond death and the grave. We can accept no excuses to the effect

that these matters relate only to politics, and that here the question of morality does not arise ; for even in politics there is a something called elementary, personal honesty and uprightness, and there are limits to the contemptible slave labour for which a man of honour can be used. Is it necessary to add that the present Act is far from satisfactory from the point of view of the full-blown Pan-Germans and Nationalists? Let us remember that at the annual conference of the Hakatists a motion was submitted to the effect that all newspapers should be printed only in German.

In many places in the German Empire the Poles hold now (to the great indignation of ultra - loyalist Prussians) public meetings where no words are spoken, but the speakers write down their addresses in chalk on a large blackboard, in Polish. But the police will surely soon find a legal formula by which they can forbid this too.

Let us add that bills and notices in workshops, factories, and mines may be written in German only, even when the workmen, as in Westphalia and the Rhine province, are mostly Poles, who do not understand a word of German, and this practice has also been blamed for the recent mine disaster in Radbod.

It only remains to say that this stain on the honour of Prussia is but a small matter in

comparison with the infamous policy which is known as the Law of the Forcible Expropriation of Polish Land.¹ History has seen nothing like this since Assyrian kings drove away whole tribes of people from their homesteads.

¹ *It is only a case of latifundia, and the Polish Junkers are not better than the Prussian. Besides, the law does not mention Polish land, but it is directed generally against all excessive property in land. How the administration carried out the law—yes, my friend, that is quite another story.—Yes, it certainly is another story. The idea of general application is then quite illusory—we might say humorous. But the law in itself is not general either. Is it not limited so as to apply only to certain Government districts, and these just the conquered ones? And is it not officially endorsed as an effort to advance Germanism in these districts?*

That forcible expropriation is in practice carried out only in the case of excessive estates is one thing—that is natural—but that the law is not limited to these I believe to be certain, but I must make fresh inquiries. Ludwig Bernhard, "Die Polenfrage" (Leipzig, 1910, 2nd ed., p. 596), merely states that "the only properties entirely exempted from expropriation were the large possessions of the Church and charitable institutions in Posen and in West Prussia"; but he does not say a word about the law applying only for latifundia. See later quotations by the Counts Mirback and Schulenburg and von Haseler. And whatever the Polish Junkers may be like—even if they were mere brute beasts—still, they might claim the same constitutional rights as the Prussians (who are not any better). Even anarchists and moral outcasts enjoy those rights,

The right of possession is thus abolished in Prussia, as regards the Polish proprietor. We will assume for the moment that the State is in a position to annul the rights of private property (the matter is open to discussion), if it does so consistently and justly for all its citizens. But to do this in the case of a certain limited section!

Here, then, is a peasant proprietor on his farm,¹ which he has inherited from his father and intends to hand down to his son. If he is asked if he will sell the farm, he says no. But the Prussian Government takes him by the scruff of the neck and throws him out of his own gate, and gives him a sum, which it fixes to suit itself. Such a law we shall never recognize. This is not a case of *dura lex, sed lex*. No, this is not a case of law at all (as there is no equity), but only a brutal exercise of power.

The Prussian Landtag has passed this law, the Prussian Landtag which is elected by a small and carefully limited section of reactionary Prussia's most reactionary elements. But the Prussian Landtag has no right whatsoever to pass such a law, not a shadow of a right. Might is put in the place of right, and fundamental, natural, self-evident, and God-given

¹ *Estate. Small properties cannot be expropriated.*— Does this make matters any better?

justice is mocked and trampled upon. And whoever associates himself with such action is a criminal ; he sins against a law which is higher than all Prussian laws, which is above all imperial and royal authority. And the transgressor of this law shall, indeed, sooner or later, be duly punished.

Richard Witting mentions in one of his pamphlets that it is a matter of indifference on which side the right and the wrong lie in the struggle between Germans and Poles. Another of the Hakatist leaders, Councillor Wagner, has declared in public that it is a mere detail (*nebensache*) whether the Poles get their rights or not. And at the annual meeting of the Hakatists he has said: "Where Polish land is in the way, it must be cleared out of the way ; what becomes of the Poles does not concern us."

However, so far moral courage has been wanting to carry this law into force.¹ Is it

¹ The author of this pamphlet did not live to see this law enforced. The circumstances recently attending the first expropriations are highly dramatic and interesting. Up to the end of 1912 steps had been taken for the expropriation of four estates. One belonged to a widow whose husband, a German (*sanitatsrath*) Director of Hygiene, had fought in the campaign 1870-71. The commission of expropriation fixed as the sale price of this estate the same sum which her husband at some time or other had paid for it, and

possible to go further? Could one conceive any more drastic measures? Yes, indeed. Listen! A Prussian Government assessor has proposed that the Poles should simply be deprived of the right to possess any land whatsoever (*Neue Bahnen der Polenpolitik*, Berlin, 1903). And this proposal has been

made no allowance for the greatly increased value of the property. The other case was that of the estate of Koldrump, which the proprietor, Herr Trzycinski, had purchased recently from a Herr von Senptleben for the sum of 950,000 marks. (Herr von Senptleben had purchased the estate three years before for 600,000 marks; he had built a mansion-house at a cost of 80,000 marks; he had drained the ground, bought stock and machines, etc.—in short, he had improved the neglected property and sold it, as we have said, for 950,000 marks to Herr Trzycinski.) One fine day the proprietor receives a letter from the Commission of Expropriation inviting him to a discussion relating to the expropriation of his property. He takes no notice of this letter. He receives intimation that the Commission will arrive on a certain day to look over the estate. When they arrive the estate looks deserted, all doors are shut, so that the Commission have to make forcible entry. Only the parish priest turns up to protest against this violation and breach of the peace. The Commission inspect everything. Reporters who are present take photographs of them in the field, but police officers confiscate the films. When, in spite of this, a film which has escaped their vigilance is exhibited later on in a photographer's window in Posen, this photographer is fined 30 marks. The Commission now write to the owner that his property has been valued at 830,000 marks, 120,000 marks less than he has paid for it. He

heartily adopted by the German Board of Agriculture. We shall see.

The end has been reached. This, then, is Prussian rule, such is the Prussian Church and the Prussian school, such are its teachers and preachers, such are the Prussian law-courts and their officials in the conquered territories. This is Germanizing!

Let us recapitulate:—

In the conquered territories the Prussian clergy and the Prussian schoolmasters serve the Emperor and all that is German before they, serve God.¹ Besides being educators of

does not reply. A little later he again gets a letter from the Expropriation Commission saying that its president cannot accept the first valuation given, but finds it too high. According to his opinion Koldrump is worth 674,320 marks. The mansion-house, for example, would only be a burden to the Commission, and must therefore be deducted in the valuation. Besides, he draws the proprietor's attention to the fact that he must defray the cost of removal himself. A new valuation is, accordingly, fixed for December 13, 1912.

From the Press we notice that expropriated persons decline to accept the sums offered (which the Government then deposit in a bank in their names), also that they will not of their own will leave their properties. From the German side we hear that the Government, if necessary, will put them out by force, and accuse them of a breach of the peace. *Sic!*—NOTE BY THE EDITOR.

¹ *Untrue!*—Not consciously, perhaps. It may be untrue as a general indictment. Most of them believe themselves able to combine both—or perhaps even serve God

their children, and taking care of their souls, each of them is a Government tool, and as such he often hurts, ill-treats, and offends those souls which he ought to love, foster, and help forward. The Prussian official wrongs us in cold blood,¹ he exiles and worries innocent people for the "crimes" of others, and he admits this openly. He sometimes breaks the laws of his own country, to encompass our undoing, and cuts down the small measure of liberty which the laws of the conqueror have left to us. Occasionally he buys false witnesses, and exiles us on the strength of their perjuries. The Prussian law-courts often shut their eyes to this kind of thing.

Prussian law-giving may, from our point of view, be described thus: Towards the conquered nations the principles of equality, before the law and of the inviolability of the right of possession are dead letters.

In other words, the guiding principle is this: It is permissible to Germanize foreign nations, whatever the means may be; as with the Jesuits, the end justifies the means. To Germanize is by serving the Germanizing process. But this belief is mistaken. A German or German-minded man has no business to be there at all, taking up the place of one who is Danish and Danish-minded (Polish and Polish-minded, French and French-minded).

¹ *What do you mean by "us" ? Is the author by any chance a Sleswig man, or even a Pole ?*

the supreme end. All laws, human and Divine, all the rights of reason must give way to this. This is not just a wild statement. It is what was admitted in a characteristic manner by the German Chancellor, the Optionist's son, Fürst von Bülow, during the debate on the Expropriation Bill in the Prussian Landtag. For this, too, he was prepared to take full responsibility, before the tribunal of history. It was a law of necessity, a law necessary to secure the progress of Germanism in the Polish provinces. The whole question was whether those districts should be Polish or German.

And it does not enter his head that there is only one decent answer to this question—Polish. Polish they must remain, as they have always been.¹

This is the will of the Lord, for this is the country, which He has given to the Polish people.

“Necessary to secure the progress of Germanism!” But who says that Germanism *must*

¹ *The author forgets the advance of the Poles.*—The advance of the Poles! In the first place, all the country to the east of the Elbe is old Slavonic territory, which has been Germanized, partly with fire and sword (the German order of knighthood!). Secondly, it must be open to every nation to make peaceful conquests (with fair play and without deeds of violence). The author forgets, we think, the advance of Germanism in the north of Sleswig.

make progress in those conquered lands? If that be the case, it is a pity that ever since the division of Poland Germanism has made no progress in those conquered provinces and never will do so.

All the progress, as much progress as you like, that Germanism can gain by honest means in equal fight, in a peaceable manner, we shall not grudge. But when the advance of Germanism is to be procured by means of violence, trickery, and confiscation (to use the foreign word, through "expropriation"), then this so-called advance is not only a crime, but a failure.

And the most audacious part of the scheme is this, that Prussia, with a virtuous and scandalized air, represents it as a moral duty, that we should become Germans, pretending to consider it immoral and reprehensible that we cling to our nationality.¹

[See, for instance, the speeches by the Minister of the Interior, von der Recke, and by Dr. Friedberg in the Prussian Landtag, January 25, 1899. The former Minister of the Interior, Hammerstein, has expressed this claim pointedly: "We demand of the Poles that they shall have a German mind."² And Kurz von Strauz has in a supplement to the *Deutsches Tageszeitung*, aimed at the "new

¹ Good!

² Revolting!

Danish politics," formulated his opinions thus :—

"When the Government no longer has the weapons of exile at hand, the whole power of the State must be directed towards the extirpation of a Danish state of mind which is hostile to the State, which state of mind is nourished by the use of the Danish language."

[To think that the task of the State is to extirpate the mind !]

But, I confidently ask the whole civilized world, and every honest man in it who has regard for the truth, wherein lies our moral duty to become part of Germany? ¹ Are we given any other reason for this except "political necessity"? And can any one wonder,

¹ *Too ingenuous ! As the outpost of our fortifications ! In return we ought with redoubled generosity to prepare a cosy nest for the conquered people.*—The ingenuousness seems to be on the other side. Germany, then, has a moral claim to outpost fortifications on all sides within her neighbours' territories. But has France, then, not an equal right? (The kingdom of Westphalia, for example.) And certainly little Denmark must in a far greater measure feel the need of such a *glacis* in the direction of its mighty neighbour than Germany can towards the *quantité négligeable* called Denmark. Besides, there are fifty kilometres between the Kiel Canal and the Danish language border and 120 kilometres between it and the Danish State border. This is a broad *glacis* ! Other Germans make out that the whole of Denmark is required as a maritime *glacis*.

after reading the preceding description of the blessings of Prussian Government, that the oppressed nations are sighing and longing for the day when these blessings may cease? If it was morally right for Prussia, by force of arms, to compel us against our will to come under its rule, would it, then, be morally wrong if we, by force of arms, were to free ourselves from it? ¹

That such a thought is absurd and that no one thinks of realizing it is beside the point. I only ask whether Prussia's relation to any of the conquered peoples can be described otherwise than by the words "Might in place of Right"? How can there be, then, any moral grounds of indignation at our wishes for separation? If the right of the stronger holds, then it must hold for us too if the day should ever dawn when we become the stronger?

And what are all these efforts at Germanizing but a premium on immorality and hypocrisy? When the Landrath makes the pensions of veterans, hotel licences, exemption from exile for servants, admission to communal works, or whatever other material advantages may be in question, when he makes all these

¹ *A very bold assumption!*—Bold, perhaps, but perfectly logical. But why "bold," indeed? It is either true or untrue! The word "bold" is quite irrelevant. If it is true it cannot be too bold.

favours dependent on clear evidence of the possession of a "German mind," does he think that the person thus favoured, by changing his state of mind, rises to a higher level of morality? Our view is that he is guilty of an immoral act, which cannot be condemned too severely, as he is selling his national sympathies and his duty to his country for money or other gain—an infamy which is only surpassed by that of the man who buys him.

Certainly it is only a generation of hypocrites, of miserable renegades, of men striving for food without sense or spirit, that Prussia can buy at this price. And "what shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

But *we* will not be Germanized, and it shall never happen. For the thing is impossible in itself, and it is specially impossible if it depends upon these principles. In these principles of force and violence lie our guarantee that it shall never come to pass. As it was once put by a simple peasant: "I think that if it had been the Lord's intention that we should become Germans, He would have given them greater intelligence." Yes, indeed, the present method is not intelligent! It does not lead to the aim in view, but away from it. For Germanizing is (like all forcible denation-

alization), for Magyars, for Poles, for Russians, and for Danes, but one thing and one thing only.—a crime.

We are made by God in the same image as the German, and in His sight we are just as valuable as the German. The latter has absolutely no virtue in himself that we do not possess. Our civilization is equal to his. In the case of some of us it may be higher, in the case of others perhaps lower; but then, this is his fault, as it is only the natural result of German tyranny. Our culture is not to be judged by what it is, but by what it might have been if we had been allowed to live a free and independent life, or if our oppressors had fulfilled their duty to take care of our education, our development, and our language with the same zeal with which they care for their own. If we are found wanting in culture we put it quietly down to the account of our oppressors.

We are not German, and we will not ever become German.

Finally, a question and a comparison.

The Anglo-Saxon can Anglicize other nations without any complaint being heard of wrongs or oppression. America can absorb all who pour into her (including Germans), and Anglicize them under full liberty and absolute equality of rights. Nothing is heard there of

Polish, German, or other colonies for any length of time.

Where the Englishman goes an English country grows forth of itself. In America, in Africa, in Australia, both the natives and the immigrant settlers accommodate themselves easily to the English language, English thought, and English rule.

The German cannot bring this about either at home or abroad. Why?

We know why.

The Englishman has never wronged the other nations, he has never for a moment thought of the possibility of exceptional laws, and if any complaint over national wrong has been heard, then he has listened to it (Malta, South Africa, etc.) It is in his blood that first of all there must be "fair play."

The German does not make use of fair play. And that is why he is losing. That is why he cannot hold his own in his own country against the Poles, and why he cannot conquer even so small and so unfortunately placed a nation as the Danes.

For, in the long run, no one has ever yet been known to win by foul play. It is a law of Nature: the one who wrongs and tramples upon others must lose.

Many evil deeds are recorded in these pages, many serious accusations brought forward.

But no word has been written that is not true, and every accusation may easily be verified. Every one can examine these for himself if he will take the trouble to inquire in the right place. Every case cited refers to some particular persons and events.

What do we expect to gain by this little book? At first, I know, only meagre results. For, to convert our tormentors, and to get those who rule over us to adopt different points of view would, indeed, be too much to expect.

But there are other people in Germany than Prussians, and other Prussians than these hard-hearted and unjust men of whom we have spoken. There exists another Germany than the one we have been painting here in such dark colours, and which we hate and despise. There is another Germany which we love and admire.

But what has become of it? Will it share in the shame? Alas! this is one of the most tragic and depressing factors in the history of the world, that this better Germany has never been able to hold its own beside the other. This is a very depressing fact, since it is to this other Germany that we wish to speak, and through them to the whole of Europe, or rather to the whole civilized world.

We do this in order that all may work with redoubled zeal to bring nearer that great

aim and that distant time when wars and national controversies shall cease in old Europe, as they have already ceased in America, because there they *play fair*.

In conclusion we shall add some warning words written by prominent and warm-hearted Germans to their countrymen:—

“To rob any one of his mother tongue by violence is an unprecedented act of cruelty, but I would add that the cruelty and the harshness pass the bounds both of ethics and of morals when it is decided to rob parents, on account of their political sympathies, of their most sacred right—the right to educate their children.”¹

“The last evictions in Sleswig cry to heaven.”²

“When one comes in German history to the description of the Sleswig-Holstein war, and would fain depict the misdeeds committed by the Danes against their betrayed sister tribe, the voice fails, and the word dies on the tongue, for the painful truth reveals itself, and it is this: What the Danes did then, and what roused the moral indignation of the German

¹ Dr. Lenzmann in the German Reichstag, 1899.

² Professor Hans Delbrück in *Preussische Jahrbücher*.

people, was mere child's play, in comparison with the violence with which we now rule this district." ¹

"It is really strange to see what an enthusiastic interest our countrymen have taken in the Boers' fight for liberty, and how they here at home can commit 'crying wrongs towards their own fellow-citizens without caring in the least.'" ²

"Every subject of the State has the primary right to settle down wherever he likes if he is able to make for himself a living and to procure a house." ³

"According to existing laws of administration the communal president and the district commissary have power to grant building permits; instead of this that power has, as a matter of fact, been transferred to the Landrath. The communal president and the district commissary are required to lay all building applications before the Landrath; he sends them to the State president, and any one who wishes to build, and who has made the necessary application suddenly receives, instead of a decision, a reply from the State president, which he has not asked for at all, and which

¹ Professor Hans Delbrück in *Preussische Jahrbücher*.

² Professor Dr. W. Schüking, "Das Nationalitäten problem," p. 47, Dresden, 1908.

³ German Law, November 1, 1867, § 1.

is in the following terms: 'The plan of the building which you propose to build on such and such a piece of ground I hereby refuse to pass, as it is contrary to the law in furtherance of German settlements in West Prussia and in Posen.' That is the formula. The forms are printed; I have them by the hundred. Now it is necessary to apply again to the building authorities, only to receive in due course the reply that the application has been refused, because a permission to settle in the place must be obtained at the same time, and this is refused by the president of the Government."¹

"Gentlemen, what a cry of indignation would be heard among us if Russia were to treat the Baltic Germans to expropriation proposals! Do not forget the proverb, 'Do unto others as you would that others should do unto you.' On this ground I appeal to your calm consideration and to your sense of justice. In my opinion, frankly and honestly—I regret to have to say so—the man who conceived the idea of expropriation has rendered but poor service to the Prussian Government."²

"Every man who owns land will feel what

¹ The debates in the German Reichstag, 52nd meeting, March 28, 1906, p. 3836. The member Erzberger.

² Count von Mirbach in the Prussian Herrnhause, 5th meeting, February 26, 1908.

it means when that which he possesses to-day, that upon which he has spent the work of a lifetime, feeling that parents and grandparents had done the same before him—when that may to-morrow be taken from him.

“It has been said that just as thousands may be killed in war, so the State has a right, in the interests of its own safety, to expropriate. Gentlemen, these are totally different things. War is a fully justifiable way of settling conflicting interests: ‘Defence on the one side, offence on the other.’ But in expropriation one of the sides is defenceless.”¹

“When then, which God forbid! the conclusion will be drawn from this precedent,² when, perhaps, our successor will become expropriated and driven from the land of his fathers—then as he leaves he will point his finger at his father’s tomb and say, ‘He took the first fateful step on the unhappy road which has led to my destruction, and is responsible for it.’³ Gentlemen, I wish to safeguard my tomb against this!”⁴

“Gentlemen, do not attack the mother

¹ General Field-Marshal Count von Häesler. Same place as above.

² A social-democratic expropriation of the wealthy classes.

³ By voting for the expropriation law.

⁴ Count von Schulenburg. Same place as above.

tongue. In doing so you touch the most sensitive nerve of all. The heart of the people clings to its language: the poetries of all nations make us recognize this; the poets have given their best, their deepest and highest, when they praised the mother tongue. The man who interferes here makes a great mistake. The result will be, not reconciliation but indignation.”¹

“On every occasion on which I have spoken in public on the Polish language problem I have advocated, not only that all religious instruction in all divisions of the school should be given in Polish, but also that the public schools should give instruction in the Polish language; and for two reasons: in the first place, so that the children after having learned the Polish language may also receive religious instruction in Polish; and, secondly, because I have the conviction that every human being has an inborn right to his mother tongue, and that when the Government forces the children to go to Government schools it must do justice to these inborn rights in the school curriculum. I am of the opinion that for the welfare of the people as well as for the sake of the Government, it is greatly to be recommended that those officials

¹ Dr. Pachnicke in the German Reichstag, 70th gathering, December 10th.

who are in immediate touch with the people, as well as the judges, should have some knowledge of the language of the people so that they do not need interpreters to make themselves understood" (the President of the German Reichstag, Count Ballestrem, in a declaration read at a meeting of the electors of the Central party, in Beuthen at the end of June 1908). As a commentary on this Dr. Georg M. Kietz writes in his book "Ceterum Censeo" the following lines, which we give to show how completely a simple question of this kind may be abused and perverted:—

"Instead of a language making for unity in the State to please my lords the Poles, Babylonian confusion of languages is advocated. *Sancta simplicitas*. The Government know now what to consider in connection with school legislation in the future. First it must introduce Hebrew into all schools wherever the Jews all over the Empire demand this so that their inborn right to their mother tongue may not be overlooked.¹ Further, Danish, Lithuanian, Wendish, French, Dutch, Masurian, Kassubish, Mährish, etc., must be taught. . . . To what strange views and con-

¹ As if Hebrew was the mother tongue of the German Jews! Why, however, should the Jews be forbidden in their own schools to teach their children Hebrew if they wish it, which most Jews do not at all?

cessions even wise men like the President of the German Reichstag may be led for the sake of his *threatened mandate!*"

"Above all, be hard! Sense cannot be got into Czeckish heads, but to blows they are sensitive. Be hard!"¹

"The task of conquered nations! To pay taxes, to give military service, and to hold their tongues."²

"In the Cape Parliament the Dutch language is on an equal footing with English. Likewise also in the Transvaal and in the Orange Free State, where the recently conquered Boers now form the Government.

"On the island of Jersey belonging to England the French language was, up till February 8, 1911, the only language in the Parliament Hall. Since then the use of the English language has also been permitted."

¹ Professor Theodor Mommsen: "To Germans in Austria," *Neue Freie Presse*, October 31, 1897.

² Dr. Theol. Letzius at a Hakatist gathering in Greifswalde in August, 1900 (from *Prneglad Wzeck-polska*, August 9, 1900).

These are the words of the deceased author.¹ I shall let them speak for themselves without attaching any commentary and without criticizing him for possible inaccuracies in detail. The chief impression is clear enough, and as a first-hand testimony of the feelings and thoughts of oppressed nations it is in my eyes a valuable document, an *argumentum ad hominem*. Its object may perhaps be regarded less as argumentation than as agitation. But it serves my purpose, which is to try, by its aid to convince pacifists and those friendly to the cause of peace, as well as neutrals, of the importance of the realization and establishment of the "rights of peace" and of a conscious and energetic effort to convince the world of this; also of the fact that the "rights of peace" are an ethical irrevocable claim, a self-evident and universal right of humanity. How could peace exist in a national society shaken by such violent passions and by such explosive feelings?

In order that one nation only may not be placed in the pillory and to prevent any one from saying that this sort of thing can only happen in this one place in the world, and does

¹ When he gave me the manuscript he expressly stipulated that his name should not appear—presumably out of consideration for relatives still residing in his native land,

not play a part as a universal factor, I shall add a short sketch from another source—a sketch in which the cause is pleaded of, among others, the ill-treated and oppressed Germans against *their* rulers. It appeared as a newspaper article by Björnstjerne Björnson in *Politiken* of January, 28, 1910.

“THE MAGYAR OPPRESSION

BY BJÖRNSTJERNE BJÖRNSON.

“Of this I have written in foreign magazines and newspapers.

“The present article which I am contributing to the *Neue Freie Presse* I wish also to publish in Scandinavia on account of the information which it gives.

“TO THE EDITOR. SIR,—

“It is with surprise that I have read the threats of the myrmidons of the great Magyar race against the *Neue Freie Presse* because this paper had dared to publish my letters. It had long been the case that no other account of what takes place in Hungary may be heard in Europe except that supplied by the Pan-Magyars themselves. This tyranny has now been broken; so now their aim is to prevent any other views from the outside world from

penetrating into Hungary. A paper of world-wide circulation like the *Neue Freie Presse*, which also has numerous readers in Hungary, must either hold its tongue about everything which does not please the Magyars, or death and the devil are invoked from Czernova.

“The leaders of the Pan-Magyar clique which governs Hungary have clearly defined their aim in public lectures: to crush all intellectual leadership in the other Hungarian parties. Where this has been done they think the people will soon succumb. Hence their gymnasiums and museums are shut up; higher education can only be acquired through the medium of the Magyar language. All history is arranged for the glorification of the Magyars. All who, armed with talent and courage, try to defend the language and the rights of their people are persecuted. As deputies, as authors, as orators, priests, teachers, and editors, they are interfered with by every means in the power of their rulers—and of these there are many in Hungary!

“To give you some idea of the spirit by which these persecutors are inspired I will reprint what a Government paper recently wrote about the Slovak Hlinka, a man who by his talent and his faithfulness towards his people would be an ornament to any nation. ‘He ought,’ so it said, ‘to be flayed. He ought to be flayed

alive and then have boiling fat poured on his trembling flesh ! ’

“The press of the different nationalities is deprived of all freedom of speech through an endless number of prosecutions, imprisonments, and fines, with the result that paper after paper goes under. A list has been sent to me containing the number of those who during the last few years have been found guilty of crimes against the hegemony of the Magyars. My correspondent says that the lists are far from complete. In spite of this they show that the very humble journalists of a small Slovak paper have during recent years been made to pay together in fines about five thousand Austrian crowns, and have together been imprisoned for about four years. Since the present Government came into power (April 8, 1906), the spokesmen of nationalities, especially the journalists, have, taken together, been in prison for about eighteen years and they have paid over eighteen thousand Austrian crowns in fines. And please remember that the lists are not complete. If any one helps them to pay the fines and this becomes known, those persons are punished. If any one, man or woman, goes to meet the martyr when he comes out of prison, he is punished.

“If this wretched people raise a monument over a dead martyr, the act is regarded as an

insurrection. A military cordon is placed round the cemetery to hinder the unveiling of the monument.

“We must, when we read this, always remember that the language of these nationalities brings them into constant touch with peoples of a kindred race in surrounding districts. To drive them into Magyarism is like tying them up in a sack.

“A certain Slovak wrote in his will that three hundred Austrian crowns were to be given to help Slovak school-children (you will soon hear why). The authorities refused to allow the money to be paid, on the pretence that Slovak school-children were not a society or an institution—and the will was declared invalid. The law-courts sided with the authorities. Again, a Russian bequeathed 160,000 Austrian crowns to promote the educational interests of the Slovak people, and appointed executors. The authorities got hold of a drunken brother of the testator, who was told to claim the inheritance. But he would not allow himself to be made use of. The authorities then tried to declare that he was insane and to put him under trustees in order to get hold of the money in this way. This attempt also was unsuccessful, and during the course of further proceedings the man died. Then more distant relations were hunted up and made to claim the money.

The process is still going on. The plan is that as the law-courts, in any case, make the estate of the testator pay the costs, the Slovaks will lose a great part of the inherited fortune.

“The Pan-Magyars tried to get hold of as many Slovak children as possible. They made a law according to which orphan children or those who had lost one of their parents, or in any other way were not sure of being provided for, were sent into the Magyar country proper and were educated there. The children suffered enormously. Many died, many ran away, and their cries became so loud that they were heard in Russia and in Bohemia and the law had to be allowed to fall to some extent into abeyance. But Magyar Kindergartens were then invented and the Slovak children were forced into these. The parents are now being fined if they do not send their children there from the age of three. When the fines—the hungry Magyar’s universal remedy—are not forthcoming, a writ of execution follows, and revolting scenes take place.

“But nothing of what I have hitherto described is in its origin or in its results so damning to the ruling Magyar coterie as my next example.

“I come of a free and self-governing people, and neither in this or in any other Scandinavian nation is there such a thing as falsification of election returns. To falsify the election

returns of a people would in our eyes be as bad as poisoning the nation's water supply.

" Falsified election returns ! What kind of a legislation assembly would result ? What kind of laws would such an assembly enact ? But what we should consider the very worst disgrace conceivable in our political life, with the Pan-Magyars is a normal state of affairs.

" I cannot give a short sketch of Hungarian election laws ; the rules are far too hopelessly confused. I venture to say, openly that the Hungarian election laws of 1848, partly revised in 1874, were framed by, dishonest men for a dishonest purpose. If any one should think that this is speaking too harshly, he can pass over from the law and study the conditions of elections, which are based on it. These are drawn up in such a way, that in Hungarian Rumania 5,161 electors may be apportioned to twelve districts so as to return twelve Magyar representatives, while 5,275 electors may be jerrymandered into one single district so as to return only one Rumanian representative !¹

" As if this dishonest arrangement were not enough to secure the end in view, the law contains a clause whereby, a man may be proposed by, ten electors and be elected by acclamation before the electors have had time to come to the polling stations. This is accom-

¹ These figures are taken from the elections of 1892.

plished as follows : The polling station is fixed in a place as inaccessible to the Rumanians as possible, a long journey being necessary to reach the spot. But it is easily accessible for the Magyars. The election begins at nine in the morning and during the first half-hour it can happen that a man is proposed and elected by acclamation. There are other equally monstrous and scandalous conditions. But I will pass them by. I shall only mention that the Magyars themselves decide whether the election is valid or not !

“ And now about the elections themselves—i.e. in those districts where the Pan-Magyars are afraid of not having a majority. I have before me here a description of an election where the large majority were Germans. The result of the election—a Magyar ! The people dared not show themselves ; they barred their doors ! and it was most necessary. Even the pupils—all young girls—in an ancient public institution were in danger.

“ I shall write about Hungary’s election laws ; election conditions, and election rights in a great English paper. There it will have effect. But here—and not there—I shall make the following remark :—

“ We do not know how many Germans there are in Hungary. The Magyar statistics, which make every one a Magyar, are not of any

use. Some say that there are two million Germans, others that there are two and a half millions. I ask now: If two and a half million Englishmen were being ill-treated and scoffed at as are those two or two and a half million Germans in Hungary, at present, what would be the result? Or would the Pan-Magyar party, on the whole have dared to do as they are doing now?

“The Hungarian King has now promised to introduce a Bill in favour of universal suffrage. Does any one who knows the Pan-Magyar party believe that he will be allowed to keep his royal word?

“There is no freedom of intercourse in Hungary. The public meetings which were advertised among the Nationalists to discuss this royal promise were almost all prohibited. It does not augur well. It is only a year since one of the chief leaders of the party, now in the Government, publicly lauded the existing election laws and the election conditions. As a psychologist I shall vouch for it that such leaders are unable to introduce a suffrage Bill which is straightforward and honest in all its details.

“All can understand that the present state of affairs is equally harmful to the oppressors and to the oppressed. Nor can any one seriously believe that a happy Fatherland is

built up upon falsehood, to which naturally the response is faithlessness ; upon arrogance, to which the response is hypocrisy ; upon wrongs, to which the response is hatred. Where is to be found the young Magyar noble enough to break the ranks of tradition and shout to his brethren : ' We shall obey God rather than man ' ?

“ How many do not think with me at present ? If the Magyars in 1867 had allowed the world language, German, to become the general language which, as a matter of fact, it was in a fair way to become, while all the other languages had retained their full liberty, would Hungary not be happier to-day ? Would not all her people be more united, more enlightened, and, therefore, more endowed with material success ? Would the conditions of election not have been changed long ago, the elections have become natural, the laws honest ? Would not greater freedom, greater loyalty have been secured, all the processes of government have become more simple, administration cheaper, finance sounder ?

“ Then would the Magyar craving for expansion, which testifies to a crude, undisciplined force, have had a nobler aim and a healthier ambition than to convert, by force, all fellow-citizens into Magyars, and all surrounding peoples into enemies.”

So far Björnstjerne Björnson! Further we add (from Arthur Christensen's "Politics and Mass Morals," Copenhagen, 1911, p. 142) the following description of Hungarian elections:—

"In Hungary the non-Magyar nationalities had before the elections of 1910 only 23 representatives. This number was reduced at the last elections to 7, while the Magyars, who form the smaller half of the population (45½ per cent.), got 347 candidates returned. In spite of the special peculiarities of Hungarian election laws, this result caused general surprise. *The Times* published the following Vienna telegram, dated June 10th: 'The Hungarian Prime Minister, Count Khuen-Hedervary, declared to-day, in the *Budapesti Hirlap*, that all reports about the use of troops in favour of Government candidates at the recent elections are absolutely unfounded, and that the troops did nothing but maintain order and protect life and property. On the other hand, the *Reichspost* and the *Neue Freie Presse* published a signed statement by the well-known Scotsman Mr. Seton Watson, who was present on the day of the election in Scakolega in the *Nyitra Komitat*; it tends to show that the whole town was surrounded by troops, and that none except those who supported the Government candidate were allowed to pass.

And four thousand Slovaks, among them many hundred electors, were confined in a dusty open space outside the town for many hours. Several hundred Slovak electors who at last gained admission to the town, and who stood waiting in the sun for two hours between rows of soldiers, were in the end driven back by police-officers without having had an opportunity of voting. In view of the fury which arose over this, the Slovak candidate withdrew finally, to avoid bloodshed. Professor Jorga, in his pamphlet mentioned above, 'Les derniers elections en Hongrie et les Roumains,' records episodes of the same kind, and gives details every bit as scandalous from districts where Roumanian candidates stood for election. In *The Times* of August 23, 1910, we find the following report from their correspondent in Budapest: 'The tales of violence, bribery, intimidation, and intrigues employed during the elections in May by the Government, as well as by the Opposition, are in the main true. V——, one of the most brilliant members of the National Labour Party, acknowledged frankly under debate that all kinds of abuses had taken place, but added: 'Let us not forget that we are Magyars, and that election trickery is an old habit in our history.' . . . For centuries all Magyar parties have sinned in this respect.'

Is not this a fine illustration of the importance of the realization of the "rights of peace," and of the absolute necessity for the victory of the peace movement? For how could a lasting peace be possible in countries where such conditions prevail, or between nations who face each other in such a manner? ¹

So much for the conditions and the sentiments of the conquered people. With those who are still independent, especially among small nations, the great obsession is the fear of being conquered. The thought of when their turn is coming is like a nightmare. This thought is very strongly expressed in the following plea from the Danish lady artist, Fru Agnes Slott-Möller, published in the form of

"AN OPEN LETTER

TO THE DANISH WOMEN'S UNION FOR DEFENCE.

"MADAM,—

"I see in the *National Tidene* that the Danish Women's Union for [National] Defence has received gifts towards the Defence Fund in other forms than in ready money. It has struck me that my husband and I, who would like with all our hearts to help as much as

¹ See also Arthur Christensen, "Politics and Mass Morals," pp. 81-4 (sketch of the Denshawai affair).

possible, might give you one of our pictures, as we cannot afford to give a large sum of money. The Union for the Defence might then be able to convert it and other gifts into cash by some means—for instance, by raffling or auction sale.

[A request to other artists to make similar contributions follows.]

“Undoubtedly the bearers of culture, and among these the artists of the country, as surely as *noblesse oblige*, ought to be ready to guard in every way the culture for which their whole lives stand. And they ought to be among the first to understand that if our country lost its independence, all independent Danish art and culture would be threatened. Not only would these be pushed aside and not appreciated, but when the stranger became master in the land, they would simply be forbidden, suppressed, maimed, and, if possible, crushed out of existence.

“It is strange how little we in Denmark learn from what is going on every day under our very eyes in South Jutland, although we can see very clearly what life would be like in Denmark if our whole country were made a part of the German Empire. We live here as a rich people, who do not know what poverty means, and who yet may be exposed any day to the direst misery. What we consider as

quite matter-of-fact necessities of life, and what really also is the foundation of all work and existence, that we possess a language of our own, an independent country, whose history and monuments, consciously or unconsciously, are part of our dearest spiritual possessions, that the work of every one in the end has one common aim, the upholding of the national individuality, its skill, and its right to exist—these are all boons of which a people are robbed when they fall under foreign domination. It would mean in the first place that the University would be closed; or if it were not quite closed (so that young Danes wishing to study would have to go to German Universities), only German scientists—and Germany is rich in scientists—would be appointed teachers in all subjects. Danish as a scientific subject would, of course, be dropped from the programme of this German University, and the study of the Danish language, and therewith of the Danish consciousness, would be left to private initiative. The study of Danish history would be of no value in the eyes of those in power so far as it did not serve German interests, and did not serve to prove that the Danes, properly speaking, always had been German.

“And the treasures of our national Museum, which, gathered as they are now, thanks to

distinguished Danish scientists, show us, as in a mirror, the development from ancient times of the culture of our own country.—what would become of them? Would not such a museum be considered as a dangerous institution, too strengthening to national self-respect to be allowed to remain in the former capital of the country?

“When a South Jutland peasant nowadays finds, when ploughing his field, if not a horn of gold, yet old stone axes—ancient weapons, utensils, or ornaments, everything as Danish as it is old—the Landrath of the place will quickly appear and will demand that the objects be handed over to the museum in Kiel, so that they may belong to German scientists—that is, if the peasant does not prefer to cover these ancient treasures up again with the earth till better days shall come.

“In the museum in Kiel may be seen to-day all that excavation has brought to the light of day at Dannevirke; nor has the Sigtrygstone itself, a gigantic runic stone which stood near the Haldredshill at Hedeby, with Danish runic inscription, telling of Danish history, been allowed to remain in its place where it had stood from distant ages, “when Kamper rode round Hedeby,” but it also has been carried off to Kiel.

“And in the German Museum of Antiquities

in Flensburg, Danish tourists can find, among old Saxon, Dutch, and Friesian objects, baptismal fonts from Danish churches, which had been in use from the time when Knud Lavard held court in Sleswig, and ruled the land as "the Duke of all Denmark"; altar chests, which were the ornaments of churches in Flensburg at the time of Queen Margrethe, old guild banners, and the trades guild emblems from bygone centuries; furniture of Danish citizens of all kinds, bearing Danish inscriptions, yes, even entire Danish peasant rooms, as they have stood and stand to-day, one from Romø, one from Gjenner (between Aabenraa and Haderslev), etc. At the conquest of South Jutland in the last war all these things fell into the hands of the Germans. How, I wonder, would they dispose of Rosenborg or Frederiksborg if, after the fall of Copenhagen, they had the power to deal with those castles? The Historical Inventory can easily be made part of the Kunstgewerbe Museum in Berlin, like the lion from the Flensburg Cemetery, which was dragged to Berlin, and is now the ornament of some military school there.

"And things which cannot be dragged away they would alter, and put their stamp on so that it would be more bitter than death to see them apparently still existing; how would Kronborg look with the Prussian eagle over

its main gate above Kingo's inscription, "Step in if thou art worthy ; my vault to thee I open" ? Or with what feelings should we see the German flag flying from the flag-battery at the entrance to the Sound with Kronborg as a German background ?

"And all the living human beings in the country—what would their fate be, generation after generation ?

"With the accession of a Prussian Government all the country's own officials would be deposed immediately, and German officials put in their place. If any one has not got imagination enough to picture what it means to a people to lose its own royal house, let him read in old Herr P. Skau's Memoirs the description of that day in Kolding, in 1864, when the South Jutlanders came forward to say good-bye to their rightful King, a born South Jutland man himself, King Christian IX. No Dane can read this without tears.

"In every branch of administration German would take the place of Danish officials, and these would all—no matter how high their qualifications or position—be deprived of the means of a livelihood.

"The Church would become German ; into all our Danish parsonages, with their rose-beds, and with their storks' nests on the roofs, German priests would move in as the Danish

priests left, as happened everywhere in Sleswig, only with this exception, that after '64 the South Jutland priests got appointed to parishes in Denmark, while now they would be without any kind of appointment anywhere.

“ In Sleswig there are now really no means of living open to Danes other than to become merchants or farmers ; wealthy and intellectual peasant boys have no inducement to study, for they will never get a public post anyhow or any official position if they maintain their Danish sympathies, however obedient they may be to the law as German subjects. And in the same way all the Danes in our kingdom would as quickly as possible be deprived of all employment which has anything to do with the weal and woe of their native land. That the schools, too, would as quickly as possible be made German is perfectly self-evident, when we recall how all the Danish schools in Sleswig have not only been closed, but how all private teaching in the homes by a Danish teacher, male or female, has been forbidden.

“ And our High Schools ! How the Prussians would revel in striking a blow at them in revenge for all the harm done by them in teaching Danish to South Jutlanders and by strengthening the Danish people in their nationality and religion and in their fight against invading Germanism.

“And “the fine Arts”—of what use would they be in a land conquered by the enemy? Rightly art, to its honour be it said, is considered one of the most dangerous opponents a State can have which is aiming at crushing the individuality of a people. A people who are to be crushed must not see the beauties of their country in pictures which will make them love still more deeply its green islands and its blue waves; they must not hear the airs or sing the songs in which the mother tongue voices her love for her native land.

“With what fanatical zeal is not all Danish scenic art forbidden by the Prussian State in Sleswig! Even public readings of the works of Danish poets are forbidden, so much is the power of art feared, working as it does with twofold power through the words of the poet and the art of the actor.

“And what would our actors, petted and spoilt, say if the National Theatre were closed and all Danish plays were forbidden all over the land, and if they were all condemned to dumb silence and poverty? To forbid the painter to paint pictures or the sculptor to make busts would be less practicable, but in proportion to the value and importance which their national stamp gives them in our eyes would be the diminution of

their recognition in the eyes of the foreign conqueror.

“The Academy would share the same fate as the University; if it were kept open at all it would be in the hands of German directors, with German professors in official positions as teachers in all branches.

“Danish architects would have to look on quietly while German architects ‘restored’—that is, destroyed—our old churches and other public buildings, as they are at present destroying the cathedral in Sleswig by ‘restoring’ it in their *altdeutsch* fashion (while its sister church, the Cathedral of Aarhus, has at the very same time been brought back to its original style and may now be seen in its perfect beauty, thanks be to the careful, skilful knowledge and sure and perfect taste of a Danish artist).

“Here, in Sleswig, you so often hear people say, in despair, when things go wrong, ‘It would indeed be much better to become Germans!’

“No more idiotic words could be uttered. No greater, no more far-reaching misfortune can happen to an ancient, highly developed nationality than to come under foreign rule.”

This is indeed a sad perspective. Why should men be so wicked in their relations

with one another? Is it not worth while to join in the crusade to prevent men from being worried by such a nightmare, to free them from the fear of such misfortune—*that is to say, to join in the crusade* for the recognition of “the rights of peace”? That is the first and at the same time the most powerful factor for the promotion of the victory of the cause of peace, for the abolition of wars, and for the establishment in its place of a peaceful, legal, and just settlement.

IV.

THE RIGHTS OF PEACE

AFTER this description of a state of affairs where natural human rights are trampled under foot, we may pass on to set down a list of those general human rights which are the acknowledged possession of every human being without exception, even of those who live within the borders of another nation. If some of these rights should appear to the reader to be so self-evident that it is superfluous to emphasize them, then I must maintain that there is not one of them that has not been sinned against in this twentieth century, by the nations most advanced in culture.

I put forward, then, the following theses:—

1. The parental right is inviolable as long as the most elementary duties of the parents are fulfilled. The State cannot deprive the parents of their parental right on account of their national feelings.

2. The parents must have liberty to decide freely about the school language of the child. The State ought not to force any father to let

his child be taught in any other tongue than its mother tongue, but may, at the most, demand that the school shall give the child a knowledge of the official language of the State as well.

3. The State ought not to have power to forbid private teaching or private schools which fulfil the minimum demands of the official school inspection.

4. When in a school district half of the inhabitants (perhaps even less than half) belong to a foreign nationality (especially if it is a conquered nationality) then these inhabitants, in countries where there is compulsory education, have a right to claim *that the State shall teach their children in their native language*—that the native tongue shall be the language of instruction and be used in all subjects. This demand is easily justified, as the same right is granted to negro tribes and to Eskimos and is presupposed as a matter of course in all mission work.¹

5. Where a population of, say, at least 100,000 individuals of foreign nationality are living together (especially if it is a conquered

¹ First of all it is, of course, an irrefutable claim that religious instruction by the State school must be given in the mother tongue. But a real instruction in religion in the mother tongue presupposes lessons on the mother tongue as well.

nationality), there these people have an undeniable right to have teachers (and priests) from among themselves and of their own nationality, who can teach their children in the State school. This right, too, is easily justified by pointing to the mission-field, where it is accepted as a matter of course. What is granted to negroes and to Eskimos should not be denied to civilized people in Europe.

6. Where the majority of the population (or even less than the majority) belong to a foreign nationality (especially if a conquered nationality) there their own language should be heard in the churches, not only every second, third, or fourth Sunday, but every Sunday (compare the mission-field).

7. Where there is a State church, the priest in charge must be able to speak the language of the congregation, or rather he must himself be of the nationality of the congregation. If the congregation be bi-lingual, then the service may be held in both languages but by two different persons.

8. No one ought to be forced to pay taxes in support of a State Church. It should be freely permitted to foreign nationalities to form Free Churches of their own, and thereby to be exempted from all contributions to the State Church. The church building itself ought, especially if it originally belonged to the con-

quered nation, to be available for the Free Church members.

9. Where half, or perhaps even less than half, of the population belongs to a foreign nationality (especially a conquered one) it has the right to claim that its language shall be heard in the law-courts. In districts, e.g., where 100,000 people dwell, so that they form the majority of the population, there they have the right to demand that judges and police officials shall be taken from their own nationality and speak their own language.

10. The conception of the freedom of the press carries with it as a matter of course the assumption that printed writings and newspapers everywhere in the world may be published in any language whatsoever.

11. The principle of freedom of association and of union carries with it as a matter of course the corollary that in assemblies and public meetings everywhere in the world any language whatsoever may be used (Chinese and German in New York, Welsh in London, etc.)—at any rate, when this is the mother tongue of those assembled.

12. All citizens ought, apart from nationality, or social or political position, to enjoy equal rights under the law and its administrators (the police). Nowhere in the world must it be

possible to enact laws regarding general affairs, regarding language, church, or school, or regarding freedom of association and of the press, which only hold for certain citizens in the country and not for others, or for certain provinces (*veiled*) or parts of the country and not for others.

13. The rights of property ought, as long as the present order of society exists, to be inviolable, and the State must not be able to transgress the private rights of possession unless this is really necessary in the public interest and unless such action will benefit all citizens alike and without regard to their nationality or faith. (As a rule such action should only be taken in matters of economic interest and never on any account when religious, national, or political interests are concerned.)

14. All citizens ought to have full *liberty* of earning a livelihood. As regards conquered nations it ought to be a question of honour with the ruling nation to see that limitations in respect of the liberty of earning a livelihood, privileges, concessions, and licences, *jus practi-candi*, etc., shall depend entirely on qualifications, training, and examinations, never on religious, national, or political considerations. The same should hold good with regard to the right to possess land, to keep a hotel, to

compete at examinations, and to engage in university study, etc.

15. A population of foreign nationality, (especially a conquered one) have the right to claim proportional admission to offices of trust and emolument, nay, even to exclusive admission to such offices within their own district. Such a population have a right to claim that in the district they inhabit the railway, postal, telegraph, and customs officials, the teachers, priests, lawyers, and doctors, etc., are selected from among their own nationality, and not from among the ruling nationality—as well for economic reasons as in the interests of education. This claim is easily justified, like the previous ones, by showing how, as far as circumstances allow it, this is realized among Hindus, Egyptians, etc.

16. It is the duty of the State to work for the *furtherance of education* among *all* its citizens—including, that is, those of foreign nationality, and even for the furtherance of a national system of education among these latter. The State ought thus, not only not to hinder, far less to forbid, the opening of higher schools and universities and other educational institutions which take their character from and use the language of the foreign nationality, but it is in duty bound to see that these exist. The right to this concession has been gained by

its foreign subjects, partly through the fact of conquest, partly by their payment of taxes and their subordination to the law and order of the country. The claim is easily justified by the fact that this is recognized and carried out among many foreign tribes.

17. Of course it must first and foremost be recognized by the ruling nation as a primary obligation of honour (if that nation desires to retain any moral prestige in the world) that those rights which are granted in peace treaties to the conquered are adhered to in the most minute detail.

This does not pretend to be in any way an exhaustive and complete enumeration of the rights and duties of the individual in relation to the State—but only of those which are of interest in connection with the question at hand, namely, the cause of peace.

Much of what has been said here will to many seem self-evident. If an American citizen reads it, he will say to himself: "But that is how things are! No one would for a moment dream of anything else." The reading of the Supplement will probably cause him to change his mind. And a ruling nation, one of those ruling over foreign subjects, will perhaps take refuge in a sophism and say: "Dear me! All these claims are fulfilled at once even for foreigners, yes, actually fulfilled the

moment they cease to feel as foreigners, when they give up their nationality and adopt our language, our culture, and our mind.”

But that is a condition which no one has any right whatsoever to propose, because such a condition wars against—against what?

Where is the peculiar fundamental principle of national equality to be found? It is to be found, of course, at the same source as the principle of legal equality between individuals, at the same source as the principle of ethics generally. Either there is no such thing as an ethical basis in the affairs of men, or, if there is, it must involve the equality of nations as well as that of individuals.¹ If the principle

¹ From many quarters the hope and the belief is voiced that this war may be the last in Europe. And among pacifist nations there had already been discussed before the outbreak of the war the thought of a coalition of States which not only would not go to war themselves, but which would not allow other States to do so. Let us finally in this connection remark that, however mighty the victorious coalition, it would be enabled to dictate peace to the world without dictating justice at the same time. If a pacifist, fear-inspiring coalition undertakes to dictate peace to the world, then it undertakes at the same time the obligation of establishing justice universally among the nations. If it deprives the oppressed and the ill-treated of the possibility and of the right (should occasion offer) of buying their liberty by the help of the sword, then it must secure this liberty for them in another way; that is, it must take upon itself the responsibility for establishing and maintaining the rights of peace.

“ Do not do to others what you would not that they should do to you ” holds for each man separately, then this must hold for nations also.

Once this has been brought about the conditions for the victory of the peace movement will be manifest. All objections raised by questions of honour, independence, and integrity, and by questions of life or death (the life-or-death struggle will and must continue to be the necessary and only arbitration), will be met with the answer that *these questions would not arise among nations if the nations themselves would set their face against them.*

Between two friendly nations determined to be at peace with each other and ready to treat each other according to the accepted axiom, such questions cannot arise at all. And if a cause of strife should occur, and if loud cries arose that this was a question of honour, or of sovereign rights, and of existence—a question of life or death—then must all real Pacifists cry still more loudly that this is not the case, that the question has not got this enormous weight and importance, and that through calm deliberation and discussion a solution may be found acceptable to both parties.

Questions of life or death cannot, as a rule, arise among nations, except as the outcome of rude violations and transgressions of justice on

the part of one nation against another or against a third party. These would be eliminated by the establishment of the defined rights of peace, and even now they might always be avoided if the nations really wanted to avoid them.¹

Let the Pacifist movement, therefore, work with might and main for the creation of international agreements and instruments. But let it not forget that these are secondary matters, and that the primary condition under which international law shall succeed in embracing all the nations—that is, in securing real and full acceptance—is through the carrying into practice of the rights of peace. Towards this end the Pacifist movement must in the first place direct all its forces. This is new work, but it is work of the first importance. The Pacifist movement must necessarily, if it is to make headway, regard the fight for Free trade and for the rights of peace as a fundamental plank in its platform. For peace must be the outcome of justice, and without justice it is a chimera, and does not exist.

¹ That is, the arising of new questions. Those already existing (e.g. the Polish question) might, through the realization of the rights of peace, lose a great deal of their poignancy, though they will probably never be definitely solved.

CHAPTER V

REVIEW

ON THE POSSIBILITIES OF THE VICTORY OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT, AND OF THE EFFECTS THEREOF

Is there any reasonable probability of further progress in the peace movement, and of securing far-reaching practical results, in a not too distant future? That is the question which now finally forces itself upon us after we have considered the different aspects of the problem. Is it all futurist music, dreams and fancies of a millennium which, perhaps, will never dawn?

It must be acknowledged that although what has been achieved up to the present is encouraging and perhaps even surprising, the real practical results in the meantime do not amount to much, that a great deal remains unsatisfactory, and that many of the aims and means discussed here have in view a distant future, which need not perhaps interest us very greatly.

Is it really necessary, if we wish to see

practical results, to wait for universal Free trade, and the recognition and realization of the rights of peace everywhere? Or can we believe and hope that practical results will to some extent appear gradually as links in a chain of development, before these conditions are themselves present, or at least fully present? Can we hope that the results will appear *pari passu* with the conditions, so that conditions and results may develop side by side?

Or is there even a third possibility—a possibility of a sudden surprising victory for the peace movement, of such a nature that some fine day the whole purpose of the peace movement may be attained, a victory surprising, overwhelming, and captivating in its glory and splendour?

Alas! how could this come about? And yet let us exhaust all possibilities and all points of view and consider this last question, as it is not quite outside all reason and all earthly possibilities.

That a sudden, surprising, and overwhelming victory for the peace movement will dawn in consequence of an instant or quickened moral improvement of the human race, a great world awakening, and a return to the spiritual condition of the first Christian congregation—that I, at any rate, am not sufficiently optimistic to believe.

But what about the victory of the peace movement through war, through that *contradictio in adjecto* where the peace movement, sword in hand, might force a victory and establish all that we have wished for in the preceding pages?

Can we not imagine a sufficiently great and mighty nation or group of nations (e.g. the Anglo-Saxon nations, cf. Sir Edward Grey's speech previously quoted) making themselves champions of the peace movement, demanding its fulfilment by other nations, compelling the small nations through fear and the great nations through force, striking down all opposition, sword in hand if necessary, and then once for all establishing universal peace? The United States of the Earth, compulsory arbitration in all imaginable cases before one and the same permanent court of judgment, an international, permanent Congress or Parliament with an adequate executive force, universal Free trade, the fulfilment of the rights of peace, admission for all to the Central Court with their complaints, etc., and all this in such a way that this nation, or group of nations, of its own accord, freely and generously laid down the sceptre and placed itself in the same position as the other States of the Union, and under the same conditions as these, without demanding any prerogative or advantage for itself beyond

the glory of the gratitude, the respect, and the admiration which would crown its head—is such a thought quite senseless and unreasonable?

I am able to show that it is not, because we have actually seen this come to pass, because history shows us an example of it in sufficiently large dimensions.

The example is an Anglo-Saxon one. I am thinking of England and of the United States of South Africa. Victorious Britain has, by force of arms, laid the South African States at her feet, has made them dependent on the mercy of the conqueror. She has then used her victory for the realization on South African territory of the victory of the cause of peace, for the establishment of South Africa's United States, their common, permanent Congress and Court of Arbitration, with an executive force as the only existing force in arms, with a common tariff inside the whole territory, with the unrestricted, unquestioned administration of the rights of peace, with equal rights and equal opportunities for the different nations, without any preference or advantage for herself.

Now, in the above sentence, let us exchange the name of England for that of some imaginary Power, or for a coalition of several Powers, and that of South Africa for Europe. The sentence will then read like this:—

A victorious Power has, by force of arms, laid the European States at its feet, has made them dependent on the mercy of the conqueror, and it has used its victory as a means of realizing on European soil the victory of the peace movement, of establishing the United States of Europe, their common, permanent Congress and Court of Arbitration with an executive force as the sole existing force in arms, with common tariffs within the whole territory, with the unrestricted, unquestioned administration of the rights of peace, with equal rights and equal opportunities for the different nations, without any preference or advantage for itself.

These two sentences are identical except for the exchange of two words. Those two words make this difference, that while the one event has happened, has actually been realized, the other is considered a hopeless, impossible, and childish phantasy.

Why? Is it impossible or unreasonable to imagine a world-fire—a general European war? Certainly not, for such a war has taken place time after time in the past, and its recurrence is considered probable by many sensible and thoughtful men. Is it impossible or unreasonable to suppose that a single Power or one or more allied Powers might come out of such a struggle strong enough to be able to dictate

their wishes to Europe? Again, certainly not, if we have already seen this or something exceedingly like it. In the year 1807-8 the supposition we are imagining might almost in truth have been attributed to Napoleon. Is it, then, unreasonable or impossible to imagine a conqueror using his victory in the manner we have indicated? Surely not, since history shows us an example of it: England's action in South Africa.

We might make a slight editorial change, and instead of a Power, a victorious Power, we might substitute a Man. For it is often just as much on a Man as on a State that everything depends. A new Napoleon, who, unlike the old one, would not use his victory for self-glorification and self-aggrandizement, who would not, like the old one, repulse the hearts of men and waste his victory and his might by founding his rule on false and unstable principles (on arms, on fear, on admiration, on war-glory, in the last instance on himself, instead of on justice, equality, liberty, on love and veneration for the ideal he serves—in short, on the ideal instead of on himself), an altruistic and idealistic Napoleon instead of an egoistic and materialistic one, a Gladstone-Napoleon, if we can place these two names side by side.

What a stretch of imagination to think of

Napoleon doing, in 1808, what the British did in 1908! (And what an anachronism!)

Unfortunately, it is difficult to become a Napoleon and a world ruler when one is an altruist and an idealist; far easier, and perhaps only when one is an egoist and a materialist. And, at any rate, altruistic Napoleons cannot be produced to order, nor can we in any way contribute to their appearance.

But, further, even if there were no such precedent, and if no single Power or individual had attained to unquestioned supremacy, some such ideal as has been referred to might be imagined, might perhaps be even more easily imagined (and the thought of it might be even more acceptable). It is an ideal which has been conceived and put forward repeatedly by people whose words are listened to, and who have a certain claim to be heard.

At the National Arbitration and Peace Conference in New York, in 1907, Mr. Andrew Carnegie proposed that the Powers friendly to peace should lay moral, economic, and, if necessary, military pressure on every State which intended to break the peace. The neutral States should form a fear-inspiring coalition against the disturbers of the peace. "But before using force, it will be best to begin by proclaiming the cessation of all relations with the peace-breaking State. No exchange

of products, no loans, no importations of a military or naval kind, no postal service—these precautions should serve as a solemn warning and would probably prove effective.”

Precisely the same idea was promulgated three months later by ex-President Roosevelt in his Christiania speech:—

“Finally, it would be a master stroke if those Great Powers that wish honestly for peace would form a peace league, not only to maintain mutual peace, but also to prevent, if necessary by force, a breach of the peace on the part of other States. The greatest difficulty in the further development of the peace movement at The Hague lies in the complete want of an executive or police force which can carry out the verdicts of the court.”

Further, we have seen the same thought advanced in the House of Commons by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Sir Edward Grey, in discussing the Taft Arbitration Treaty between Britain and the United States. In the English Press it was also declared, in this connection, that “war will become an impossibility when the English-speaking peoples all over the world are against war.” This is expressing in other words the idea of an Anglo-Saxon peace league, which should mean, not only unconditional peace among all Anglo-Saxons, but also that the Anglo-Saxon sword

should be put in the balance in favour of peace against every breaker of peace. The Anglo-Saxons would say to the world, "We will have peace, and we do not allow any one to break it."

If only this could be so! How all the small States, whose lives are hanging by a thread, must greet such a thought as a gospel, welcome it with tears in their voices, and, as far as their weak strength goes, give it all the assistance in their power!

It is assumed, of course, that the Anglo-Saxons want, not only peace but a just peace! It is assumed that such a coalition is not to be a "pot in which to boil small States" but a protection and guard for them. For peace is worth nothing without the rights of peace, and the coalition must not regard its task done by securing peace, but must add to this the duty of securing respect for the rights of peace—that is, for economic, national, religious, political, and civic liberty within the nations and between the nations.

I see no reason to doubt the possibility and the realization of this. It is not nearly so much a question of power as of will. When this movement will attain its full development and begin to bear fruit is another matter. This depends upon the amount of the intervening spade-work and upon the energy and enthusiasm of the propaganda of the pacifists.

And let us add that it is desirable that the movement should not emanate solely from the Anglo-Saxons—who cannot carry it to a successful issue by themselves, and who ought not to have the monopoly of the Pacifist movement and of working for its success. But there is no reason to fear that this will be the case. It is not unreasonable to suppose that the Pacifist movement has taken equally firm root in other nations (e.g. in Russia), not only in Government circles, at any rate in certain Government circles, including that from which the conception of the Hague Conference emanated, but also within the wide confines of the great Russian nation as a whole. It is by no means certain that the Anglo-Saxons may not find competitors—or, let us rather say, co-operators—in this work.

But whoever the members of this coalition are, it is in any case desirable and morally essential that the coalition shall not act on its own initiative and responsibility for longer than is absolutely necessary, but that it shall as quickly as possible receive the sanction of the court of nations, so that its activities may be regulated by fixed legal procedure which will preclude any kind of suspicion of personal aims. For such a league of peace could only be called a “master piece” if its aims were in the interest of the people

as a whole, and if it kept itself free from all taint of personal ambition, and provided that it did not act in such a way, as to receive, or even show a desire to receive, any special advantage for its members or any favours for any individual nation. And further, such a league of peace would be expected and required to be organized on as wide as possible a basis so as to provide for the admission of every State which was willing to enter it. The greater and stronger the coalition became the more easily could it carry out its programme.

If these conditions were fulfilled a way would be prepared for a solution of the pacifist question—a way which would be practicable and which we should welcome with all our hearts. For the moment interest in this question has waned somewhat. But it is bound to come to the front again. When a question of this kind has once been raised, it claims attention again and again until it has been solved. And it is not to be expected that it should be solved at its first appearance.

In the meantime we can only point to the conditions of its solution, to the factors which the solution must contain if it is to be of lasting value. And as that which is presented in the form of an object-lesson impresses itself more firmly on the mind of the reader, we cannot

resist the temptation to submit a draft of this ideal treaty, which should form the basis of the proposed League of Peace. The scheme may seem far-fetched and Utopian, and to many readers somewhat simple and ingenuous. However, here it is:—

THE LEAGUE OF PEACE TREATY

WHEREAS His Majesty, the King of Great Britain and Ireland and Emperor of India, the President of the United States, the President of the French Republic, His Majesty, the King of Belgium, Her Majesty, the Queen of Holland, the Regents of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, Switzerland, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Peru, Siam, etc., have the intention in the spirit of mutual goodwill and understanding to maintain the most favourable conditions for securing peace among their peoples and as far as possible all over the whole world; and WHEREAS they recognize that peace can only be founded on justice and that its basis must be economic, national, and educational equality and liberty, and respect for each person and each nation, as natural rights due to them, THEREFORE they have, in agreement with the Royal and Imperial British Government and with the Government of the United States, resolved

to convene a Conference at The Hague, and they, have nominated as their representatives the following: * * * *

who, being provided with plenary powers in good and proper form, have considered and passed the following resolutions:—

§ 1. The States which have signed this agreement shall enjoy absolute Free trade in relation to each other. Not only can none of the States mentioned levy an import duty on goods from other competing States without at the same time levying the same tax on the same goods produced within the country, but neither shall their own goods be favoured through export bounties, shipping subventions, reduction of freights, or the like. The contracting States undertake before the end of the year * * * to carry out the necessary legislative changes to secure this.

§ 2. Within the boundaries of each of the contracting States, all subjects, without regard to nationality, or faith, shall be equal and shall enjoy in the fullest measure free and unrestricted use of their mother tongue in the school, the church, and the law-courts, at public meetings and in the press, perfect freedom of association and of the press, so that each council or community, in town or country, shall have preachers, teachers, judges, and officials of the nationality to which

the majority of the population belongs, private schools and Free Churches shall enjoy perfect liberty, the rights of property shall be inviolable, the avenues to emolument, possession, and settlement shall be the same for all and not be obstructed by the decisions of officials, and laws of exception, open and secret, shall not be tolerated.

§ 3. The contracting States shall at every opportunity use their influence to establish the validity of the principles stated in § 1 and § 2. The Powers which have not signed the present general treaty may be admitted to its deliberations by a special Act as explained in § 4 following. The admission of each new Power shall be brought to the knowledge of the International Congress through diplomatic means and by the Congress again to the knowledge of all the States who have signed this general treaty or who have later come under it. This admission involves the full and complete acceptance of all the responsibilities and the enjoyment of all the privileges which are specified in the present general Act.

§ 4. The contracting Powers shall establish in common an International Congress to which they will send delegates chosen by the Crown in proportion to the number of their inhabitants (including those of their colonies and dependencies), yet in such a way that

each sovereign State elects first one representative and then one more for every three million inhabitants which it through an official census can be proved to possess, while the colonies and dependencies shall be represented by one representative for every three million inhabitants of white race and by one representative for every five million of other races, excluding illiterates however. The order of business of the Conference and its powers shall be fixed by a special Act. It shall meet at least every second year on March 1st and at The Hague, and shall remain in session until by a simple majority it decides to dissolve. Proposals may be submitted to the Conference for approval provided these are supported by at least twenty members representing at least three States. The Congress shall have power to pass resolutions affecting either the contracting States or outside States and their home or foreign circumstances and relations (e.g. complaints regarding the non-realization of the principles formulated in § 1 and § 2, proposals for the changing of frontiers, etc.), subject to the provision that such resolutions are supported by three-fourths of the votes recorded, representing at least two-thirds of the contracting Powers at any given time.

§ 5. The contracting Powers shall mutually hold themselves bound to take action against

any breach of the peace, even by or between the outside Powers, and to prevent or suppress this by every means in their power, in the last resort by force of arms. The contracting parties shall bind themselves to enforce by every means in their power, in the last resort by force of arms, the resolutions passed by a legal majority in the international Congress.

§ 6. The armed force required for this purpose shall be placed at the disposal of the Congress by the contracting Powers as explained in § 4. The Congress shall fix in each individual case the contribution of each individual State in military personnel, material, or money, and shall fill the posts of command in the international executive force thus established, appoint its Field-Marshal and give him his orders. All arrangements relative to these matters shall be determined by a special Act before the end of the first session of Congress.

§ 7. There shall further be placed at the disposal of the Congress a standing executive power in instant readiness, and the expense of maintaining this force shall be met in the following manner :—

All the contracting Powers shall agree that any contracting State which desires to do so may adopt total demobilization within its own borders, provided that it pays each year to the Congress a sum fixed

each year by the Congress, which sum shall, as nearly as possible, be equal to the half of the amount considered adequate in respect of its military expenses by the Congress at the time, and shall not exceed the half of the amount per individual expended by any of the contracting Powers which have not been demobilized.

If the amount raised in this way is found to be insufficient, the Congress shall by a qualified majority of three-fourths of the votes recorded, representing at least two-thirds of the contracting Powers, raise the necessary funds by taxing the contracting States according to their population. On the other hand, all the contracting parties shall mutually guarantee the integrity and sovereign independence of the demobilized States and shall undertake to provide instant armed assistance if they should be attacked by any other Power. The council, composition, command, etc., of this executive Power shall be decided by a special Act before the end of the first session of the Congress.

All this must be assumed as a foundation, and it will serve no useful purpose to begin with much less than this if progress is to be made. Pessimists may perhaps object that at that rate a beginning will never be made

at all. But as we are trying to be optimists we shall not listen to them. We will maintain that this "ideal treaty"—although for the present and for an incalculable future (incalculably remote or incalculably near) it may quite possibly be described as Utopian—has nevertheless a claim on the consciences of the nations, and that, accordingly, it will force its way to recognition with the same might as the religious appeal as soon as it is put clearly before men's eyes. If we believe in the future of that appeal and in its power to break a way for itself in the form of practical results, then we must exercise this belief also in relation to this claim. If we have no faith of that kind, then we must agree that everything will remain as of old, or rather, if we are logical and consistent, we must come to the conclusion that the development of the world will go backwards and lead us into greater and greater barbarism, and make the fight of all against all the ruling law in human life as it is in a measure in Nature! Forwards or backwards! The one or the other! There is no standing still.

Let us, then, in conclusion endeavour—even if we perhaps cannot be said to stand on the summit of Mount Pisgah—to cast a glance

into the Promised Land, and see how the effects of the victory of the pacifist cause would manifest themselves, what the significance and the consequences of this would be, especially for us Europeans.

First and foremost there would be a vast and overwhelming sense of relief and of deliverance, as a multitude of burdens would fall from the over-taxed and over-burdened back of old Europe.

Consider, first, the burden of national wars and of national hatreds. Think what it would mean to bring about a cessation of the furious hatred and of the raging anger, of the pent-up explosive indignation which now rule within the minds of millions of the people of Europe against other European people. I am not sure that those of the ruling classes, those who are at the top, fully understand the nature, the extent, and the strength of this hatred, this bitterness and anger. If they did they would tremble. To understand it quite, it is necessary, perhaps, to belong one's self to one of the oppressed nations or to a nation which has compatriots under foreign rule. Only then does one quite feel the sting of the following questions: What right have those strangers to rule over us? By what right have their political agents become our school-teachers,

their national agitators our priests, their chauvinistic incendiaries and propagandists our judges and magistrates, their gendarmes and policemen our uninvited guests at our meetings and assemblies, even at our weddings and festivities? But it appears to me that the ruling classes also (even if they will not admit that there is no possible shadow of justification for this kind of treatment) must be able to see what an enormous advantage, for example, the United States of America or of South Africa have over Europe in this respect, and how this advantage helps to place those new countries in a much more favourable position in the world, and how much strength Europe is wasting to no purpose in this ruinous inner process of mutual antagonism.

Secondly, there is the economic burden of military armaments. As we have said before, it can be borne, seeing that it is borne; it is not intolerable, as it is tolerated and that even voluntarily. But it would be folly to deny that it is heavy, and that the expenditure of a thousand millions annually for a nation of half a hundred million people is an exceedingly noticeable outlay, and that such a sum released, entirely or partially, for peaceful educational purposes would produce very noticeable effects, as it would also if

applied to the solution of social questions. How many social reforms of glorious promise are deferred or abandoned in every country, wherever you look around you, for want of money—money which would be forthcoming in plenty the moment the pacifist movement became victorious.

It will have appeared clearly from the views indicated above that I do not sympathize with those who, in season and out of season, run down military expenditure. I belong to those in my own country who at present wish this expenditure increased, and I have advocated this in public. But, just as one can be in principle an enthusiastic adherent of universal Free trade, and yet be a zealous Protectionist at home in one's own land, under present circumstances, because of sad necessity, so can one be a zealous advocate of Home Defence at home in one's own land, because one sees the sad necessity for it, and yet heave a silent sigh for the time when all that gold which is now being swallowed up by military expenditure shall flow out as a fertilizing stream over all other departments of human life. This, before all others, is the first step which can bring Europe—the Old World—on to an equal footing with the New.

Thirdly, the victory of the Pacifist movement would be felt as a vast relief and libera-

tion in all that pertains to education—for many nations at any rate. Think only how much energy would be released, which is now wasted in Nationalist conflicts, not only by the oppressed nation, but also by the ruling one. What an enormous hindrance national antagonisms and national hatreds inflict on the national school by means of these controversies!

With the victory of the Pacifist cause the millennium would not have come. There will still be plenty of evil and misfortune left in the world. As long as human passions exist there will be hatred, cheating, murder, and immorality, drunkenness, poverty, etc., on earth. All this is eternal, and not to be done away with so long as perfection has not been reached. But all moral efforts must aim at limiting these evils, at restraining them and keeping them in subjection.

In these efforts the labour for the cause of peace is a link, and a most important link, because the effects of its victory would be manifold, and because it is a practical aim which differs from many other practical moral aims in this, that according to our belief it can be fully realized.

Hatred between men will never quite disappear, but we believe that hatred between nations can disappear, because we have seen this happen in South Africa, in North America,

and also in Europe. The condition is only that every one should get his natural rights. Murder and killing will never quite disappear, but we believe that war for all that may quite well disappear, at any rate among civilized States. The economic battle between individuals will, perhaps, never cease, but for all that it may quite well cease between States.

And the victory of the Pacifist cause would for the individuals, too, be a step towards the victory of good over evil. It would have blessed effects upon poverty, it would make neighbourly love to increase, and it would repress hatred among men. The blessings of culture, national, economic, and social, would follow in its footsteps.

CHAPTER VI

EPILOGUE

PACIFIST PROPOSALS. I

As an explanation of § 7 in the preceding League of Peace Treaty, I venture to lay before an English public the proposals regarding it which are contained in my book. I am quite aware that these can only be of real interest to the circle of pacifists proper, and that by many they will be considered phantasies.

If this¹ be regarded as a solution of the problem of an Executive Power on which the Great Powers especially should be represented, and which might possibly be thought of as a thing that could be called into being in the near future, there follows next the solution from the point of view of the small States, a kind of solution or preparation for a solution which is perhaps capable of being even more easily realized, and realized also within a future even less remote. It has the advantage, besides, of not only representing the beginnings of an Executive Power under peaceful but perfectly effective conditions, but also of providing a kind

¹ The preceding pages which are not given here.

of a solution of the question of disarmament, and of making a real disarmament possible for those who want it; and these are in the meantime and in the main probably the small States only.¹

This is the matter to which we referred on p. 183). The proposal was this, that the small States should apply to the Hague Conference for an *international consent to their disarmament*, and for an assurance that the rest of the States represented at the Hague Conference would in common guarantee *their existence and their neutrality*, while they on their part should bind themselves to refer for settlement all questions in dispute to international arbitration, and *to contribute annually a proportionate sum* for the maintenance of an international executive Power, or in the meantime for some other international purpose (which we shall detail below).

This contribution should, of course, be withheld the moment any State used armed force against a State which had disarmed, and when this had not been prevented by the other Powers. And it should not be renewed until

¹ We should remember that in certain small States there has for many years been a rather strong and, in my view, a foolish and childish movement in favour of disarmament based on the conviction of the total hopelessness of military defence.

a *status quo* had been re-established. To this might perhaps be added a neutralization under collective guarantee by all the other Powers of the disarmed State or States. Only under such a guarantee would neutralization become effective enough to permit of disarmament, and reassuring enough to afford security.¹

At first sight this might appear too simple and Utopian a proposal; but I believe that further consideration of it will secure more favourable acceptance. The amount of the contribution should, for a certain number of years, be fixed by the Hague Conference or by the International Congress that is to be, and the other united Powers should bind themselves never under any circumstances to use armed

¹ The thought of neutralization is discussed by Hilty ("Polit. Jahrbuch d. Schweiz. Eidgenossenschaften," book 8, p. 245). He proposes to augment the number of neutral States, and to bring about an alliance between them. Bajer proposes the same thing in "Neutralité foederative" in *Revue de droit International*, 1902, p. 127. Nippold (*l.c.* p. 596) finds the suggestion worthy of note, and thinks that therein would undoubtedly lie a further guarantee for the application of international legal procedure. According to Schliep (*l.c.* p. 132) a development of this international law-court, in terms of which the existence of each State should be guaranteed by the Great Powers, appears to be quite practicable: "The position of the neutral States in relation to the international law-court might be regarded as a rough sketch outlining what the European State system might become."

force against the disarmed States, but to refer all possible cases of dissension for decision to the Hague Court of Arbitration.

The other States which had not disarmed could not refuse their assent to this proposal on the plea that certain causes of strife were "vital," inasmuch as they affected their sovereign rights, their integrity or their national honour, since a disarmed State could hardly be found guilty of such offences against an armed State.

I hasten to add that as I consider the proposal to establish an Executive to be impracticable at present, as unanimity for that purpose could not yet be secured at a Hague Conference, the sums contributed should in the meantime be applied, according to the direction of the Hague Conference, to one or other of the international purposes which are now being carried out by contributions from a number of interested Powers—for instance, for international hydrographic research, for the expenses of the Hague Conference, or eventually for international lighthouses or telegraphs, for international North or South Pole expeditions, etc.

If it could be arranged that the contributions were to be used for the purposes of an international Executive Power, its influence would perhaps gradually increase as more and more States disarmed, and it would, it might

be hoped, quickly, become so powerful that every disturber of the peace would have to reckon with it as an opponent in addition to his original antagonist.

It is, however, not sufficient for an idea to be merely beautiful. It must also be practicable, it must be rooted in reality and not in the dreams of Utopia. Let us not be content to become enamoured of its attractive appearance, but let us examine it closely from all sides, and see what objections can be raised against it, and how to refute them.

From the side of the small States the question may first of all be raised whether such an international guarantee would have any value and importance, and if it really could be considered as affording sufficient protection for their existence and their independence. It is generally recognized, for example, that the guaranteed neutrality of Switzerland does not permit Switzerland to disarm, but that that country, in spite of its neutrality, has to bear the same military burdens as others, and must be prepared to defend its existence and its neutrality, just as if its neutrality had never been guaranteed, evil tongues might add.¹ (Pessimists might further point to the free

¹ Wrongly, as the guaranteed neutrality is, nevertheless, of value to Switzerland—how much or how little we shall not here discuss.

State of Cracow; its existence and integrity, were guaranteed by three Great Powers, but some sixteen years later it was, in spite of this, annexed by one of the guarantors, without intervention from any of the other Powers.)

To this might be replied that there would probably be much better protection and far greater security in a guarantee under the above conditions. In the first place these conditions include a formal consent to disarmament from the other Powers, and a formal obligation under no circumstances whatsoever to use arms against a disarmed State. Secondly, something is contributed by the disarmed State in return for the peace guarantee; and, thirdly and mainly, a transgression would immediately bring the disturber of the peace into difficulties and diplomatic trouble with all the Powers on account of the cessation of the money contribution.

But some may perhaps object that even if the existence of the disarmed State might be regarded as secure, still its independence would suffer. It would not be able to maintain its free right of self-determination in foreign affairs. Its sovereignty would perhaps be recognized, but in reality it would be dependent on its great neighbour, and it would sink into the position of an annexed and vassal

State, and its inner national life, its self-consciousness, its culture would suffer. This has been clearly pointed out by Harald Nielsen on page 148 of his pamphlet.

Personally I do not hold this view. The large State would be practically powerless under such circumstances. It would have no means of exercising pressure, for every dispute would at once be referred by the small State to the Hague Conference, and any aggression on the part of the large State would at once cause international complications, both political and economic, as attacks on the independence of a small State would involve the cessation of its contribution to the international fund, and an illegal loss of income for all the other States. If, for instance, we supposed that the fund were used in the meantime for the support of international hydrographic research (whereby the contributions paid at present by certain States would have ceased), then an attack on such a disarmed State would carry with it the very noticeable practical result that Russian, English, French, and American research in this field would have to cease its operations owing to the cessation of its subsidy. And the tendency to such aggression would undoubtedly find a check in the fact that it would necessarily be followed by a long series of protests from other States, and would give each of these

a formal right to intervene, and to set the Hague Arbitration Court at once in motion.

I believe, therefore, that disarmament under the above outlined conditions would afford, not only a far better protection than disarmament undertaken by each State singly, without the approval of the other Powers, and without any return being made, but perhaps an even better security than that of a purely military nature. This would, at any rate, be the case with certain small States whose military powers of defence are but small, and whose position is exposed, such as my native land, Norway and Sweden,¹ and perhaps Holland and Belgium also,² and, later, the Balkan States.³ I am inclined to consider such an arrangement better than the

¹ For I consider the position of these States to be very weak in the event of an advance towards the Atlantic by Russia, for instance.

² Would not Holland and Belgium after such a disarmament be in fully as secure possession of their colonies, and of the Congo States respectively, as they are now when they are dependent on an eventual military defence of these?

³ Later, because the Balkan States naturally must await a definitive delimitation of territories in the Balkans, especially the division of Macedonia. Bulgaria, for instance, would not think of disarmament in the manner sketched above before her border had been pushed forward to the Ægean Sea.

Later note.—The Balkan war just ended has affirmed these words and made them superfluous.

status quo for such States, because it would afford them greater security. Some small economic advantage—a slightly decreased expenditure—ought also reasonably to be attached to it, partly as a small premium and an encouragement, partly because all the money would go out of the country, while military expenditure to a great extent is spent in the country. And, finally, it would give the nations in question a fine sense of contributing in a very high degree to the progress and the development of the cause of peace.

There would, at any rate, be a very big difference between a disarmament of this kind, carried out with the approval and under the guarantee of Europe, and subject to the payment of a corresponding contribution in money, and a disarmament undertaken at one's own risk, by one's own hand, and to the surprise and indignation of Europe (and to her envy, also on account of the economic advantages it might bring). In the first case, the disarming Power would act as a pioneer and as a shining example in a great movement of civilization, encouraged by the sympathy of serious and right-thinking people in all countries; in the second case, it would be despised and hated, regarded as an international disturber of peace and an anarchist, unlawfully securing profit for itself as against

the other States, a menace to the peace of Europe as it had stepped outside the bounds of civilized State society. But the objection may be raised, in looking at the matter from the other side—from the side of the Great Powers—that the necessary consent would never be granted because this would be contrary to the interests of certain Powers. There are Powers in Europe which, so long as an eternal peace has not been secured, and so long as war is still within the range of possibilities, must necessarily reserve for themselves the possibility of violating the neutrality of their neighbours. There are others which look forward to territorial expansion at the cost of a neighbouring State as a condition of life, a prospect of so great an importance to them that they would not for a moment consider the possibility of depriving themselves of it.

The answer to this depends on whether Nippold is right in saying that “the earnest will of the States to secure under reservation of their sovereignty the practical validity of legal arbitration cannot be doubted”—or, as Deschamps expresses it: “No civilized State exists which does not recognize that the relations among the nations must rest on right and in cases of disagreement must be regulated according to the demands of justice.”

In conclusion I will merely add that the disarmament of small States is, in my argument, dependent solely on the fulfilment of the conditions stated. The idea is, of course, that the small States must begin, but that the great nations would eventually follow suit as the Executive Power gradually developed.

PACIFIST PROPOSALS. II

It would greatly tend to strengthen the Pacifist movement, and especially to increase the importance of the pacifist centre at The Hague, and it would perhaps augur well for a periodical international Conference, if the diplomatic discussion between States were to take place, if not at or before the Hague conferences, then as far as possible at a place common to all, where representatives from all Powers might be gathered (or, in the meantime, from as many Powers as possible, or even from some of these)—and preferably on the spot where the Hague Conferences are held at The Hague.

Carried to its logical conclusion, this thought (clearly Utopian at present) would imply that all States should have one or more permanent Ambassadors at The Hague, but nowhere else, and that all diplomatic discussions should be carried on there, and not in the capitals of the

Powers concerned. Commercial treaties, for instance, between France and the United States should be ratified at The Hague. Every one will at once object that this is impracticable and impossible—and rightly so in the meantime. (Yet it is not as impracticable and impossible as it seems at first glance. At present the discussions take place in this way. For example, the American Ambassador in Paris receives telegraphic or written instructions from Washington, and brings them to the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, who sends his answer and his instructions to the French Ambassador in Washington, who then carries the communication to the American Minister for Foreign Affairs. It would be equally simple if the discussions were carried on between an American and French Ambassador at The Hague who each separately received instructions from their respective Governments.)

Much will have happened before all the embassies in all the capitals of the world are done away with, and diplomatic discussions carried on at The Hague only. But *something* in that direction could not only be realized without great difficulty but would prove of great practical advantage.

All States—and especially the smaller States—are not represented by an Ambassador in every country. Thus Denmark has no Ambas-

sador in Constantinople, in Bulgaria, in Greece, Serbia, Roumania, Portugal, Egypt, Morocco, China, Japan, Persia, nor in any South or Central American State, just as none of the States mentioned are represented in Copenhagen. In Spain and Belgium, Denmark has no special Ambassador either, but the Ambassadors in Paris and at The Hague act as Ambassadors in Madrid and in Brussels, in the same way, as several States have one Ambassador in common representing them in the three Scandinavian countries. The same is the case with other small States. But nothing would seem more practical than that all these Powers should each have an Ambassador at The Hague, where discussions between Denmark and China, between the Argentine and Greece, between Chile and Japan, could take place at any time instead of waiting for the appointment of extraordinary Ambassadors or instead of requesting the Ambassadors of foreign Powers to look after one's interests, or of having the discussions carried on by persons of lower status—for example, by Consuls, who, perhaps, are not suited in the least for duties of this kind.

An arrangement of this kind, then, could be easily realized without raising objections from any quarter, and for a small State

it would have the advantage of keeping it in diplomatic contact with all the other States, while the expense would be *nil*, or at any rate infinitesimal. For the cost of maintaining an Embassy at The Hague would be amply covered by the abolition of several other embassies. Denmark could quite well recall, not only her Ambassador to Holland and Belgium, but also her Ambassador in Italy and Austria-Hungary, and she would only need to retain her Embassies in Germany, Russia, Norway, Sweden, and America, possibly also in France and England—and even among these Powers there would probably be several who would welcome the idea of eventually carrying on their discussions with Denmark at The Hague. South and Central American Powers would then only need to have one common European Ambassador at The Hague, etc.

If a small State could gradually withdraw all her Embassies and have all her diplomatic discussions carried on at The Hague, this would presumably be a great benefit for her. She would be in a position of greater freedom and security during her conversations with a Great Power, as it would not be so much a case of a man to man duel, since all the other Ambassadors would be within reach and her own Ambassador would feel

that he had a freer hand at The Hague than he would have in the capital of his opponent.

But, besides this advantage, such an arrangement would afford an indirect support to the Hague Conference and would form the beginning of an International Statutory Congress—a beginning of the United States of Europe.

An institution of this kind, in its fully developed form, is at present impracticable and lies in a far distant future. But a beginning might be made at any time, even if only two small States led the way in the hope of several others following by and by. The beginning might be made by Denmark and Norway agreeing to withdraw their respective Ambassadors in Christiania and Copenhagen, and to permit all their future diplomatic discussions to be carried on through their present Ambassadors at The Hague. Denmark and Norway would next intimate to all the Powers where they are not represented that definitive conversations might be conducted through their Ambassadors at The Hague. In this way, the Embassies at The Hague would at once gain somewhat in influence and authority and they would gradually attain real importance in the event of other States following the examples set them, and this

would lead to Ambassadors being sent to The Hague by Powers which are not represented there at present.

The next step for Denmark and Norway would be to endeavour to enter into a similar arrangement with one or more of the other Powers—e.g. with France, then with England, Russia, Austria, Germany, until at last they all had only one Embassy at The Hague—and no more.

It must be remembered that to make the arrangement satisfactory, Denmark and Norway would not only require to secure the friendly consent of the Powers to withdraw their Ambassadors in London, Paris, Berlin, etc., but they must also request the Powers to withdraw their Embassies from Copenhagen and Christiania, and to agree to discuss their relations only at The Hague. For an arrangement under which Denmark, for example, had no Ambassador in Petrograd, while Russia had one in Copenhagen, would be worse than that existing at present. Final conversations might then easily be carried on secretly in Copenhagen between the Russian Ambassador and the Danish Minister of Foreign Affairs.

It may be objected that the Great Powers could not dispense with their local embassies, for the Ambassador must be *mediis in rebus*.

He is not only the middleman and the spokesman in questions of international dispute, but he is also the political agent of his State, who studies circumstances in the foreign State, and reports on its political, military, and economic conditions. Some of these duties might be performed even now by a Consul - General, others by the military attachés (who with the further development of the peace movement would become superfluous, as military trials of strength would become more and more obsolete in proportion as international economic co-operation and reciprocity gained the day.) But even if it is undeniable that a long time will pass before such an arrangement is carried into effect for all States, this holds true about every reform, and a beginning has its own value.

The economic saving caused by the arrangement we have sketched would be the least of its advantages. Far more valuable for the small States would be the greater moral freedom, and the more assured position which such an embassy would enjoy in the centre of Europe, within reach of all the other nations of Europe, *coram Europa*, and the greater prospects of a peaceful issue as the result of definitive conversations regarding international affairs.

CONCLUSION.

THE PROGRAMME OF THE PACIFIST CAUSE

WORDS by themselves are of no value ; theories are useless if they have no practical results.

Let us from the long—perhaps too long—arguments and inquiries of this book try to pick out the practical results, however meagre these may perhaps appear.

Its purpose is not only to represent how things ought to be, not only to point out the rights and the truth of the Pacifist movement, and to describe the beneficent consequences of its victory—even if this also has its value—but, more than this, to show the way to victory and give practical direction regarding the work to that end.

Many questions have been raised in the book (and these may also have their value). Not many answers have been given. This I regret, but *ultra posse nemo obligatur*. Let us, then, finally endeavour to collect these answers together in the “Programme of the Pacifist Cause,” not, it should be noted, the eschatological programme of the Pacifist cause, which

is briefly expressed in these few words: arbitration, disarmament, an international central authority,—words which, unfortunately, to many of the naïve enthusiasts concerned, exhaust all thoughts and ideas about the programme of the Pacifist cause—but the programme for to-day. Where should the work of the Pacifist movement lie at present? How should it be conducted? Towards what preliminary and immediately attainable end should it be directed? The work must, then, first of all, as has been said so often before, tend to create a broad basis for the development, growth, and extension of the Pacifist cause, to bring about conditions for the victory of the cause, namely, *the recognition of the rights of peace* and international liberty and equality, in other words *universal Free trade*.

Thus the task of the Pacifist movement becomes, in the first instance, an energetic and indefatigable agitation to secure, firstly, that all citizens, regardless of nationality or creed, are placed on a footing of equality within each State. That every people, including those under foreign rule, and more especially if they are a conquered people, shall receive full recognition of their rightful claim to a free and unrestricted use of their own language in the school, the church, and the law-courts, at public meetings and in the Press; of their claim to

have priests, teachers, judges, and magistrates from among their own midst; of their claim for economic liberty and equality, and for the inviolability of the rights of property; and of their claim for educational liberty and for the support of the State for their national culture; and, secondly, that international economic freedom and equality shall prevail—that is, that customs barriers shall gradually disappear and Free trade be introduced everywhere.

On this basis, and on this basis alone, the further work of the peace movement may proceed with prospects of success. And this further work should be conducted in some such way as this:—

International research commissions, mediation, and arbitration should be further developed in the manner indicated. Especially, should *mediation be made compulsory* everywhere where the parties do not at once agree, or where they are bound to arbitration by treaty, and the mediation should be undertaken by the standing Council of Administration before the Peace Bureau at The Hague, which is armed internationally with the duty of initiative. Further, treaties of arbitration should be drawn up in as many cases as possible and should be as all-embracing as possible, and, as far as possible, the clauses regarding circumstances, honour, and independence should be

omitted. The good offices of the permanent Court of Justice of the Hague Conference (perhaps modified in the manner indicated) should always be sought, compulsory arbitration should be internationally agreed upon between wider and wider areas, thus gradually rendering arbitration treaties superfluous, while in preparation therefor the above-mentioned proposal should be brought into operation, that the International Bureau at The Hague keep an authorized list of the States which are willing to enter into compulsory arbitration, and of the questions which each of them is willing to have decided in that way.

Further, the Court of Justice at The Hague, its International Bureau, and its standing Council of Arbitration should be fostered and developed by more and more functions being delegated to them, and the Hague Conferences become statutory and periodical. Further, their business procedure should be simplified and made more effective, and the principle of unanimity be abolished, at least in respect of certain matters as a beginning.

Further, the supreme prize-court should be established as quickly as possible, and the Declaration of London ratified by its contracting parties, and afterwards adopted by all States at the next Hague Conference.

Further, it should be made clear to all that

the progress of arbitration alone is insufficient to solve the peace problem ; that this cannot be secured in a general sense within the framework of national and political institutions as these exist at present, but that the creation of new instruments which go beyond these is required, especially the creation of a real international central authority, through a federation either of all the States of the earth or, as a transition stage, of a larger or smaller number of these.

To promote the development of the Hague Conference, and to enable it to become a real international central authority, it is further proposed that the Pacifist movement should work more and more towards securing that diplomatic negotiations between individual States (and in the meantime between States which are not mutually represented in each other's lands) should be carried on at The Hague, where ultimately all States, without exception, should have permanent embassies, while the local embassies should be gradually withdrawn.

Finally, it is proposed that all States that wish it, after applying to the Hague Conference, should obtain international consent for their disarmament, with the guarantee of all the other States for their integrity and independence. They on their part should agree to submit all questions in dispute to the decision of the Hague

Conference in return for the yearly payment of a sum fixed by the Hague Conference towards one or more specified purposes.

This is the positive side of the programme. Is it necessary to say that it has also a negative side—*non nocere*: not to injure the Pacifist movement by immature, naïve, and Utopian proposals, and by immediate and unpractical demands, but to remember before all else the fundamental truth that peace without justice is worth nothing, that without justice peace is a fiction, and does not really exist, that a just decision through war is to be preferred to an unjust decision through peace—that, in other words, the necessary foundation of peace must be the rights of peace.

Principles of Social Reconstruction

Demy 8vo. BY BERTRAND RUSSELL, F.R.S. *6s. net.*

The purpose of this book is to suggest directions of social and political reform, on the basis of a political psychology suggested by recent scientific research and experience derived from the war. Men's important actions are more governed by impulse than by calculation; but impulse is largely moulded by circumstances. The impulses that mould politics and social life may be broadly divided into those that are possessive and those that are creative. Property, war, and the State are embodiments of possessiveness; such institutions as education, marriage, and religion are capable of embodying creativeness, though at present they do so very imperfectly. Possessiveness is the source of fear, oppression, and strife; creativeness is the source of hope and of constructive pacifism. Institutions largely determine how large a part possessiveness and creativeness respectively play in men's lives. This book endeavours to show how the part played by creativeness might be indefinitely increased.

Authority, Liberty and Function in the Light of the War

A Critique of Authority and Liberty as the
Foundations of the Modern State and an
Attempt to Base Societies on the
Principle of Function

Crown 8vo. BY RAMIRO DE MAEZTU *4s. 6d. net.*

This book is born of the war; but it sees the war as the outcome of something wrong that has prevailed in the European mind from the Renaissance onwards. It sees in the war a conflict of two principles—Authority, based on force, and Liberty arising from the ideal of happiness. Both are, from the author's point of view, equally false. He can see in Liberty nothing else but the individual longing to satisfy our lust and our pride. He sees in Authority only the consciousness of power, and he denies altogether its pretensions to a moral right. The two first parts are a critical analysis of Authority and Liberty as the foundations of the modern State. But while he cannot see in Liberty a practical principle of association, because Liberty and Association are a contradiction in terms, and because the very first thing even liberal countries do in times of crisis is to suspend individual liberty, he sees in Authority a principle of possible practical triumph, a mischievous fact. To supersede both he needs to find a principle which at the same time binds men in society and yet is not authoritative. He finds it in the function and in the ideal of maintaining and increasing social values.

Poland's Case for Independence

Demy 8vo.

7s. 6d. net.

This notable book is a reprint of certain remarkable pamphlets illustrating the vitality of Polish nationality, and written mostly by representative Poles. Introductions have been furnished to the pamphlets by Lord Bryce, Lord Weardale, Mr. G. P. Gooch, Mr. Sidney Webb, Dr. Seton Watson, etc.

Poland Past and Present

Crown 8vo.

By J. H. HARLEY

4s. 6d. net.

Some new and vital details of the recent history of this unfortunate country are conveyed to British readers in Mr. J. H. Harley's vividly interesting volume. It will be preceded by a preface from the pen of Mr. Ladislas Mickiewicz—the son of the great Polish poet—which will state the attitude of the Polish people to Germany, and reveal how deeply their sympathies are enlisted in the cause of the Allies. A notable feature of the book will be a record of the attempts made by the Germans in Poland during the last few months to seduce Poland from her confidence in the justice of the Western Powers.

After-War Problems

EDITED BY WILLIAM HARBUTT DAWSON

Demy 8vo.

7s. 6d. net.

This important volume, which has been edited by Mr. William Harbutt Dawson, is intended to state some of the more urgent national problems which will need to be faced after the War, and to offer a practicable Programme of Reconstruction.

The chapters have all been written by specialists deeply concerned in the subjects with which they deal, as will be seen from the following synopsis:—1. Imperial Federation, Lord Cromer. 2. The State and the Citizen, Bishop Welldon. 3. The Cultivation of Patriotism, The Earl of Meath. 4. The Alien Question, Sir H. H. Johnston. 5. National Education, Viscount Haldane. 6. The State and Industry, D. W. Garnett. 7. The Organization of the National Resources, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Compton-Rickett, M.P. 8. The State and Labour, Professor S. J. Chapman. 9 & 10. The Relations between Capital and Labour (two chapters by a representative Employer and a representative Labour Leader respectively), Sir Benjamin Browne and Mr. G. H. Roberts, M.P. 11. The Position of Women in Economic Life, Mrs. Fawcett. 12. The Land Question, Mr. C. Bathurst, M.P. 13. The Rehabilitation of Rural Life, the Bishop of Exeter. 14. The Housing Question, Mr. H. R. Aldridge. 15. National Health, Dr. James Kerr. 16. The Care of Child Life, Miss M. Macmillan. 17. Unsolved Problems of the Poor Law, Sir W. Chance. 18. National Thrift, Dr. A. Sherwell, M.P. 19 & 20. National Taxation after the War, Professor Alfred Marshall. The Editor will contribute a General Introduction.

Battles and Bivouacs

A French Soldier's Note-book

BY JACQUES ROUJON

TRANSLATED BY FRED ROTHWELL

Large Crown 8vo.

5s. net.

"Battles and Bivouacs," by Jacques Roujon, is a vivid recital of the first six months of warfare. The language is direct and unaffected, soul-stirring, and free from exaggeration; every page, nay, every line, compels attention and evokes the most sympathetic interest. The book is alike authentic and restrained in tone, but what most strikes the reader is its extraordinary *sincerity*. No war book has yet appeared that gives so strong an impression of reality, or which, on its own sheer merits, is more worthy to survive the rage and tumult of battle.

The Diary of a French Private

1914—1915

BY GASTON RIOU

TRANSLATED BY E. AND C. PAUL

Crown 8vo, Cloth.

5s. net.

"M. Riou is rather more than a simple soldier. He is a writer of great gifts—narrative power, humour, tenderness, and philosophical insight. Moreover, his exceptional knowledge of Germany gives special value to his account of his experiences as a prisoner of war."—*Literary Supplement of The Times*.

My Experiences on Three Fronts

BY SISTER MARTIN-NICHOLSON

Crown 8vo.

4s. 6d. net.

A vivid account of the author's experiences in Belgium and Russia and afterwards with the French and English troops.

War and Civilization

BY THE RT. HON. J. M. ROBERTSON, M.P.

Crown 8vo.

2s. 6d. net. Postage 4d.

"A spirited piece of international polemic. It is always acute, moderate and well informed."—*Manchester Guardian*.

"Is a sufficiently shattering piece of argument. We hope his book will be widely circulated."—*Daily News*.

LONDON: GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LIMITED

DATE DUE

MAR 11 1941

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 001 041 842 4

