

INTERNATIONAL COMPLICATIONS.

BY THE EDITOR.

AT the bottom of all the complications between two or more governments, such as the United States has had of late with the Japanese in California and with England on account of the tolls of the Panama Canal, there lies the great question of war, viz., the power to wage war, the financial ability and readiness to carry on a war and the courage to risk a war; and it seems desirable to clear up the situation once for all by showing that on this foundation ultimately rest all international relations, mutual respect, every consideration of rights, and the confidence in the ability to accomplish anything or to stand for something.

This life is a struggle and there are always clashing interests. There is no justice *in abstracto*, but justice is generally a compromise between two rights, or perhaps more correctly between two colliding claims. Wherever justice is so obvious that there is no doubt about it, it is a matter of course and need not be discussed, but such cases are exceptions—if they exist at all. The power to enforce a right, either by sheer strength or through the machinery of courts or other public institutions, is part of the fight itself, and weakness is tantamount to rightlessness.

There is no legal status between the lion and the lamb, but there is one between the lion and the shepherd. The shepherd owns the lamb; he has reared it and defends it, and the lion's right to it is based upon his power to take it away from the human owner. Lions and other animals of prey are outlaws, because they will persist in taking what they can find without being able to establish a truce, viz., a condition of peace, permanent or temporary. If the lion could make a contract with the shepherd to be satisfied with a definite share without continuing to wage war on human society, he would be entitled to the share accorded to him by treaty. However, since this is impossible there is a state of eternal warfare

which can terminate only in the extinction of one or the other party. In former ages whole territories had to be given up to beasts of prey; in our day the rule of man has been strengthened to such an extent that the extinction of the tiger and the wolf is near at hand.

There have been human robbers who, like predatory animals, have demanded their share from more civilized but weaker communities and in the beginning of history this frequently led to the establishment of monarchies. We see that David roamed the country and levied contributions on rich farmers on the plea that his men had never stolen the landowner's wealth or destroyed his property. Such was the case of Nabal, who refused to pay this tribute to David's men. The result was that Nabal died very conveniently and David took possession of both his estate and his widow. The Bible has preserved the further history of David, how from a kind of robber chief he developed into a responsible king. That is the old method of men of prey whose bellicose talents gradually adapted themselves to peaceful conditions by serving the interests of their former victims and giving them a much needed protection. As the result we have the development of kings "by the grace of God," and finally the modern constitutional monarchy, in which the king is recognized as the defender of the people, and as a rule is well paid for his job. Frederick the Great of Prussia was wise enough to understand the situation and called himself the first servant of his country.

We see that everywhere power is the basis of right, and even where republics have developed from monarchies the course of events has been through revolutions. The United States had to fight for its independence, and liberty is ultimately founded on the power to keep out usurpers and unwelcome intruders. Take away that power of the people and any republic will be in the situation of the lamb in the paws of the lion.

We cannot change the constitution of the world, and so long as the world stands the ultimate basis of all right will remain the power to enforce it. Let the sheep become ever so learned in law and demonstrate to the satisfaction of all the wise men gathered from all the most civilized countries of the world that it has a right not to be eaten by the lion, the lamb's right will surely meet merely with Platonic considerations and remain unheeded so long as it is unable to fight and defend itself.

Only a century ago, an adventurer from Corsica set himself up as emperor, and placed his yoke upon the necks of the legitimate

princes of the world. He could enforce his rule and so his empire became established for the time being and was recognized by the world, but all his claims would have been ridiculous had he not possessed the power to enforce his will.

In establishing a legal status by treaty on the basis of power the contracting parties must see to it that their rights can be maintained not only for the moment but also for time to come, and this is the element which is not power but wisdom, and wisdom is a consideration of other factors of power which if provoked or irritated will stir according to the laws of nature. If the lion were not only strong in muscle, in teeth and claws, but was possessed also of an insight into the nature of things, he would understand that he can not maintain himself against the slow but sure progress of civilization. He can rob but he can not build an empire.

Napoleon knew this pretty well when he established his empire of usurpation in Europe, and just as the robber chiefs changed into legitimate monarchs by adapting themselves to the natural laws of civilization, so Napoleon understood that as a ruler he had to serve certain needs, the natural interests of the people, in order to gain their support, furnishing his government with the tacit but indispensable consent of the governed. Without this support of a civilized people, no ruler can maintain himself by sheer military power, and this element in civilized countries has grown to such an extraordinary degree that people are inclined to believe that it is the only thing in the world which establishes right and order.

Napoleon was a factor for good in the stagnant world of Europe about the year 1800. There were so many entrenched rights, so many privileges by God's grace, so many antiquated medieval conditions which had become unbearable, that a good broom was needed to sweep them all out with relentless vigor. This was done by Napoleon, who in his egotistic and high-handed way so cleared out all the cobwebs of the Holy Roman Empire that the Germans ought to be grateful to him even now for having paved the way for a modern and more tolerable state of things. It is true he came as a usurper, but he came like Heracles cleaning the Augean stables of the accumulated deposits of medievalism by a wholesale inundation of his powerful decisions. He accomplished his reforms from very egotistical motives and not from love of modern ideals, but after all he performed the task and he did it by main force at the head of his armies. The representatives of privilege would have resented the new régime but they trembled and had to give up what would have cost the people a revolution to bring about. If

Napoleon had but possessed greater foresight, if he had not at the same time now and then trampled upon the common rights of man, if he had been fair towards adversaries, had not committed such crimes as assassinating a man like Palm, a simple bookdealer, in ruthless disregard of human life, he might have been the man to establish a modern Europe upon the new right of the Code Napoleon, more adapted to the needs of modern conditions. But there was too much of the lion in him and too little of the human, so he became only a link in progress and had to make room for less drastic successors, to build up more stable conditions upon the basis of the new social needs of mankind.

Considering the significance of wisdom, of foresight, of stability, of justice, a certain class of men have developed who believe that force is no longer needed for establishing right and suppressing wrong, but this notion is a fatal error, and a general peace on earth can only be established on the basis that the men of good will are the most powerful people on earth, and this state of things is bound to come about in the natural course of events. An assured condition of universal peace increases with the progress of the power of the civilized nations.

War is almost always a foolish transaction and both parties will suffer by it. The great Moltke, the greatest strategist on earth, used to say that "even a victorious war is a calamity," and certainly though Prussia was greatly benefited by her victories over Denmark, Austria and France, she had to pay dearly with certain evils that have developed, a transitory disastrous crisis of financial troubles and, what is worse, the rise of a narrow-minded reactionary jingoism. Nevertheless the wars of Germany were needed for the establishment of her status in the European concert, and woe to Germany if at the critical moment she had not been prepared to defend her rights with the sword. The power of self-defence is always the indispensable condition for peace, for an honorable peace, and peace has been kept among the European powers of to-day only because they have been fully armed and could have gone to war, and especially the present German emperor is to be highly commended for the establishment of peace. But he has accomplished this difficult task solely by the readiness of his armies.

There is a prejudice among the advocates of peace against the powers that are ready to wage war. They claim that readiness for war implies an eagerness for the glory of the battlefield, but such is not the case, as may be instanced in the German emperor who has certainly been more peaceful than his people. He maintained

peace even when the German nation clamored for war, and he was right in his policy.

The tendency in the world is more and more for peace, for almost all of the wars ever undertaken might have been adjusted by arbitration if only the defeated party, or mostly both parties, had been wiser and more discreet. As an instance we will take the War of Secession in America. Both parties were embittered. If the representatives on either side had had more patience they might have avoided the conflict by constant delays, and if they had known that the existence of slavery was due to the scarcity of labor, that slavery would have disappeared with the progress of economical conditions, the South would not have been so stubborn in defending the rights of the slave-holder, and the fanatics of the North would never have gained the influence they acquired. They would have known that as soon as free labor began to be cheaper than slavery, slavery would abolish itself, just as it disappeared in Europe with the progress of civilization.

It is well known that Christianity did not abolish slavery in the Roman empire. Even St. Paul sent back a run-away slave to his master and preached faithfulness of the slave towards his owner, and yet slavery disappeared. It disappeared without any law or any violence, without any expression of indignation against the state of servitude, simply for economical reasons, under conditions which made it inadvisable to own human beings on account of the troubles, expenses and responsibilities connected with slave-keeping. Slave-owners need guardians to watch the slaves and superintend their labor, they are responsible for their slaves' health in days of sickness, must provide for them in old age; and with all these duties imposed upon the slaveholders they had to make for every slave an investment of over a thousand dollars per head. In a word the free labor of responsible workers will with the progress of civilization necessarily become cheaper than to keep human beings in bondage.

The progress as to the abolition of war will come about in a similar way. It will no longer pay to wage war with its outrageous expenses for some little differences in international politics. The advantages to be gained would sometimes be less than the costs of a war, but wherever there are interests which are not of merely pecuniary value, representing the standing of a nation, the safety of its commercial and other interests, the constitution of its liberty, the sovereignty of its administration, and finally its honor and dignity, war will remain unavoidable, in spite of all that can be said

on either side by the quarrelling parties on theoretical notions of right and wrong.

The representatives of international peace follow a true instinct in their effort to establish peace on earth for all men of good will, but they frequently overlook the point that the basis of universal peace must always remain the power of the man of good will to enforce his right and his determination—if necessary to go to war for his ideals. War will gradually abolish itself, or rather it will be reduced to the most extreme cases of settling disputes about questions of independence and national honor, and this will come about in the natural progress of the times by the increase of the strength of civilized nations and by the unanimous kindness on which they will naturally unite in establishing peaceful conditions on earth.

We have before us a very interesting article on the present situation published by the American Association for International Conciliation, in which Prof. Paul S. Reinsch of the University of Wisconsin, recently appointed ambassador for the United States in China, discusses *American Love of Peace and European Skepticism*. He finds that in Europe diplomats and others are skeptical as to American love of peace, and claims that 'they [the Europeans] live crowded together in a small continent. They have the memory of antipathies of centuries to overcome. Their struggle for existence is grim, viewed from the swarming centers of European industry. Yet," continues Professor Reinsch, "when we make them realize that against their feeling of their own troubled situation we set not a vague sentimentalism but a deep conviction engendered by experience, they are willing to give more credit to the American point of view and even to look to it for a solution of their own difficulties."

The trouble with this conception is that by what Professor Reinsch calls "our experience," he means that we have had long stretches of peace, (from 1864-1898 and from 1898 until to-day), but this is really a lack of experience, and perhaps also a weakness of memory. We forget quickly and easily, and upon this lack of experience we base our confidence in the permanence of the present peaceful conditions of American politics upon which rests our "public opinion with proposals tending toward universal peace."

This our public opinion is based on sand, and indeed our present problems in Japan and England remind us of the possibilities of war, and war would become absolutely unavoidable if the United States were not ready to defend itself. Assume the condition that the United States navy did not exist, how would other nations regard our rights or claims? How quickly would any nation com-

pel us to submit to its conception of right, and being unable to defend our conception of right with sword in hand, others would condemn our views without even taking the trouble to investigate the legal basis upon which we have taken our stand.

Suppose mankind could have submitted all the prior quarrels that ever took place in former ages to a court of international arbitration, would it not be sure that in almost all the most important cases the judges would have decided against the course of development which history has taken? What chances would the Boston tea-party have had before an international tribunal? What rights would have been granted to the Saxons when they settled in Britain? What concessions might have been made to the Pilgrims when they ousted the Indians from Massachusetts? How would the Aryan conquerors of India have fared if their quarrels with the Indian aborigines had been laid before an impartial court to decide their differences according to any law of holding land, modern or ancient? What would have become of Alexander the Great, whose part in ancient history as a ferment for great new developments in the Orient is so significant?

Wherever we look into history we find that the ultimate basis of all right lies in power, while the continuance of it becomes possible only through the wisdom of foreseeing the results of breeding discontent among the subjected elements, who by combination and establishment of a counter-movement will gradually acquire sufficient strength to upset the order established by violence.

If we neglect to comprehend the significance which power plays in international politics we shall be apt to make the gravest blunders, and instinctively all nations act upon the principle that their voice in any international council or in the general respect of mankind counts only so far as they can enforce their will, and gain recognition for their conception of right and their peculiar kind of civilization. It is true that representatives of a policy of peace-at-any-price are more numerous in America than in Europe, but this happens to be simply for the reason that Europeans have more experience. As a rule they see the necessity of maintaining their national honor at the point of the sword.

Germany, a nation which is most centrally located in Europe, has tried the policy of peace for centuries with the result that all nations preyed on Germany, and bore off province after province. Alsace-Lorraine was lost to France, the Netherlands in the north, and Switzerland in the south became alienated from the empire; Pomerania was lost to Sweden, Schleswig-Holstein fell to Denmark,

the Baltic duchies were never affiliated with the empire and fell to Russia, and the interior conditions became most chaotic. A regeneration in Germany could only come about through a reassertion of the national spirit in a movement that would not shrink from abetting German interests with a ready army, and Prussia was the only state in Germany competent to do exactly that, and for this reason Prussia grew to be the center and mainstay of a new united Germany.

Energy, power, force and the will to use it—that is the backbone of every decided stand in life; and wherever we cancel power, there ideals sink down into mere sentimentalism. If the Europeans misunderstand American ideals, e. g., the love of peace at any price, the reason is exactly this: Europeans know very well that when a real clash with American interests comes, America will stand up for her rights just as much as any other power in the world, and all our declamations and assertions of our good will and love of peace will be set aside for the sake of national honor, national independence, and the defense of national ideals.

We must bear in mind that the ideals of a nation are exactly the issues on which international quarrels originate. So for instance in 1870 Napoleonic France had one ideal of international right and justice while Germany had another conception of it. The clash came mainly on account of the difference between their ideals, and the question was which of the two should predominate.

Similar conflicts will come about in the further development of mankind, whether European, German, English or French ideals shall mould the future of mankind, or American ideals; and if the question is not decided by war it will certainly be decided by power. If in a contest any one of the contending parties is so overwhelmingly strong that the outcome of a war can be easily foreseen, the problem will be decided by treaty, or simply by submission. The stronger power may make concessions to the weaker one, but on the main point it will prevail, and in this way many wars will be avoided in the future, but the condition of such a peaceful settlement of problems will always be based upon a prognostication of the powers displayed on either side of the contending rivals.

Among the rights and wrongs which a nation commits there are many things beyond the litigation of international tribunals, and American declarations of their international good will and love of justice have often become an object of incredulous smiles in Europe because the actual policy of the United States has rarely been in accord with their idealistic pretensions.

According to Professor Reinsch, Secretary Hay's statement at the time of the Chinese imbroglio is well known "that American foreign policy has only two principles, the 'golden rule' and the 'open door.'" But how about the American high tariff? We prescribe the open door to China, where the commercial interests of other nations are stronger than ours, but at home we have been building a Chinese wall around our own country. We declare war on Spain with the highest motives of abolishing the evil policy of Spain; we declare that we do not want to annex Cuba, but when peace is concluded we take Cuba under our protectorate and annex all the rest of Spain's American and Asiatic possessions. The protectorate of course is as good or at any rate as serviceable as ownership.

I do not blame the United States for doing it, but I point out the reason why Europeans distrust American idealism. It seems to me quite natural for Europeans to think that Americans are hypocrites who make loud protestations of international good will, and when the time comes take full advantage of their opportunities.

And verily we ought to do so, nay we must. The truth is that if we had left the Philippines free, some other strong nation of a more decisive and a more aggressive character would take them under their protection, either Germany or Japan, and we would have missed an opportunity of educating a territory helpless against aggressors, in our ways of thinking, in adopting our principles of government and our institutions.

European critics of American ideals are in my opinion very much mistaken in judging American utterances. So far as I know Americans, American idealists and American statesmen, I freely grant that American idealists are honest. There has been no hypocrisy in our dealings with Spain. Sometimes the idealists are different persons than the actual statesmen, sometimes idealist statesmen change their opinion when the hour of decision arrives and they follow instinctively the right path in spite of their ideal misconceptions.

When Louisiana was annexed through a bargain with France, President Jefferson who happened to belong to the party that would have denounced the annexation of any territory without special permission of its inhabitants, unhesitatingly annexed Louisiana with instinctive foresight without asking permission of its inhabitants, on the plea that he acted like a guardian for a minor. He broke with his democratic principle when the blunder into which it was

leading him was too obvious, but we can not denounce his inconsistency as hypocrisy.

The democratic principle so strong in our traditions since the beginning of American politics declares that we should mind our own business and not mix up with the world's politics. That sounds very fair and wise but it is wrong. We have to take our stand in the world. We have to struggle for our ideals. We have to make our influence felt wherever it may be, and our sphere of interest is not limited to the patch of ground on which our homestead is built. The life of this little world of ours, called the earth, is so interwoven that we can not help being mixed up with the universal development of all other nations, and if we meekly limit ourselves to the soil which we till we shall soon find ourselves nonplussed, disrespected and shoved aside.

It is our duty to be ourselves and to struggle for the expansion of our own life and our ideals. This does not mean that we should be greedy and grasping and take possession of the world wherever there is an opportunity, but it means that wherever American interests are at stake we should not be afraid to stand up for them. I agree with Senator Hoar when he says, as quoted by Professor Reinsch, "May I never prefer my country's interests to my country's honor," but I believe the honor of the country demands an expanse of the country's interest and its sphere of influence. Our country's true interests are always solidary with our country's honor, while on the other hand temporary advantages which are dishonorable will in the long run prove a curse and ought to be rigorously discarded.

Mankind develops international institutions out of purely national conditions; yea, they exist now, and their significance is growing year by year. Finally there will be one mankind in which the world-interests, the interests of all, will be so predominant as to insure peace on earth, but this state of affairs lies still in the distant future, and here we agree verbatim with Professor Reinsch when he says, "Much further thought and effort must be expended before we can arrive at a clear and adequate conception of the form international legislative action is to take." Before the development of such interests common to all, there is no use to entertain the thought of a fulfilment of our peace ideals.

An intermediate step in the development of universal peace in case of war would be a demand of the neutral nations not to have their trade and traffic interfered with and to make the belligerents responsible for the damage done. Think only of the destruction of

ships by floating mines which by carelessness have been allowed to drift after every modern war. Think further of the harm done to peaceful neutrals who under present conditions suffer without receiving any indemnity. If the neutral powers would act as the great European powers and the financial institutions sometimes act and as they ought to act now with the Balkan states, if they would exercise a pacifying influence upon the heated ambition of the belligerents, many a war might be avoided in the future. Think only of the millions and millions of dollars lost in European financial circles merely through the depression during the time of the war scare, and consider that half the amount would have sufficed to send combined detachments of troupes to the theater of war and restore peace. Would not in the future such measures be more frequently resorted to for the protection of neutral rights?

The realization of the ideal of peace on earth is not impossible, but it will come about by a development according to natural law in the way of a slow growth of civilization. Peace among the states in the United States is based on the common interests of all the inhabitants, upon common civic ideals and a common language, and these interests are overwhelmingly stronger than separate demands of a local or temporary nature. In the same way, as soon as all mankind will speak the same language, adopt the same principles, have the same interests in common, peace on earth will surely become a firmly established condition among the nations on earth.