

UNIVERSAL PEACE
CONGRESS,
LONDON, 1890.



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

INTERNET ARCHIVE

Digitized for Microsoft Corporation
by the Internet Archive in 2008.

From University of California Libraries.

May be used for non-commercial, personal, research,
or educational purposes, or any fair use.

May not be indexed in a commercial service.

INTERNET ARCHIVE



1
21

$$\frac{20}{63}$$



HON. DAVID DUDLEY FIELD.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
UNIVERSAL PEACE
CONGRESS,

HELD IN

THE WESTMINSTER TOWN HALL,
LONDON,

From 14th to 19th JULY, 1890.

Published at the Office of the Congress,

No. 47, NEW BROAD STREET, LONDON, E.C. :

and may also be obtained, on application, through the several
Peace Societies in Europe and America.

ONE SHILLING.



JX
1930
v.
U58
1890

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

The Committee appointed to make arrangements for the Universal Peace Congress held in July, 1890, have great satisfaction in presenting the following Report. It is a faithful record of the written and spoken words of able and earnest men of many nations, who met for the purpose of conferring together on the best means of obtaining for mankind the blessings of PEACE.

Both papers and speeches, now collected and carefully edited, constitute a body of valuable material which will be of great service to all who work for the sacred cause in coming years. Indeed, without such a publication, the practical outcome and permanent influence of a Conference must be inadequate to the sacrifices and efforts made on its behalf.

The Committee feel much gratification in knowing that this Report will obtain a much wider circulation than would otherwise have been the case, because its contents appear in the two languages which were used during the week's proceedings. This fact should ensure many readers; and the Committee desire to express their earnest hope that all friends of international concord will make every effort to bring this volume before a large number of persons. It will be observed that the price is almost nominal; and the Committee desire to present copies to public libraries and any similar institutions, which may be brought to their notice. They would also be glad to forward copies to public men exercising an influence upon opinion, if friends of the movement will furnish the Committee with their names.

The Committee rejoice to know that very general approval has been expressed regarding the arrangements which they had made during the course of several months for the conduct of proceedings.

Considering the variety, and complexity of the questions on the Programme, the number of speakers and writers for whom it was necessary to secure adequate time, and the difficulty as to foreign languages which attends such meetings, the Committee think that the success of the Congress is a matter for hearty satisfaction. They hope and believe that this success will tend to make future gatherings even more useful, by encouraging a larger number of men and women to contribute their aid.

In the hope that many of those who met in London this year may be spared to renew next year, in Rome, the ties of esteem and affection constituted by a common aim, the Committee conclude this part of their work with a sense of profound gratitude, and of faith in the ultimate triumph of right and justice among mankind.

On behalf of the Executive Committee,

HODGSON PRATT, Chairman.

London, October 24th, 1890.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Service in St. Paul's Cathedral ; Sermon by Canon Scott Holland.
 Opening of Congress : Address by Hodgson Pratt ; Question of
 Admission of Delegates ; Report of Committee of Organisation ;
 Reading List of Delegates ; Rules of Procedure ; Appointment of
 Bureau ; Committee of Procedure ; Special Committees ; Opening of
 Sessions ; Announcements 1-6.

Inaugural Meeting : Address by the President ; Letters of Apology
 and Congratulation ; Addresses by J. Allanson Picton, M.P., M. F.
 Passy, Rev. Dr. Murkland, Gustav Maier, F. Bajer, E. T. Borg, and
 E. T. Moneta ; Conversazione... .. 7-24.

Section A of Programme : Sir Wilfrid Lawson, M.P., takes the chair ;
 Opening with Prayer ; Report of Procedure Committee ; Committee
 on Memorial ; Address of Sir Wilfrid Lawson, M.P. ; Introduction of
 Subjects : Resolution I. : Paper by Edward Butler, by Miss M. L.
 Cooke, by Geo. Gillett, by Mrs. H. M. Wigham, by l'Abbé Defourry,
 by Geo. Gillett ; Discussion : Resolution II. : Paper by E. T. Moneta,
 by G. W. Minier, by Frederick Sessions, by Henry Stanley Newman,
 by J. Bevan Braithwaite, by Rev. F. M. Cameron, by J. Jowett
 Wilson, by J. B. Wood ; Discussion ; Amended Resolution ... 25-82.

Tuesday Afternoon's Sitting : Chairman's Address ; Explanation by
 Signor Moneta ; Baroness Von Suttner ; Memorial to Heads of States ;
 Section I. Educational Aspects, &c. : Paper by J. W. Graham, by
 Frau Fischer-Lette ; Resolution II. : Paper by W. Evans Darby ; Dis-
 cussion : Resolution : Paper by Frau Fischer-Lette, by Rev. J. P.
 Gledstone ; Resolution III. ; Paper by Hodgson Pratt ; Theodore
 Neild ; Paper by Levi K. Joslin, by Signor A. Mazzoleni ; Suggestion
 as to Reading of Papers ; Thanks to Chairman... .. 83-104.

Banquet at National Liberal Club ; Speech by Passmore Edwards,
 by D. Dudley Field, and others 105-106.

Declaration of War ; Speech of President ; Resolution : Paper by
 W. Martin Wood, by the Abbé Defourry ; Discussion ... 107-128

Wednesday Afternoon's Sitting : Sir Jos. W. Pease, M.P.,
 Chairman : Chairman's Address ; Section G : Resolution : Paper
 by W. C. Braithwaite, by Miss Ellen Robinson, by H. R. Fox Bourne,
 by M. De Montluc, by Mrs. Richardson and M. F. Bajer, by Signor
 Mazzoleni ; Discussion : Section H : Paper by Hodgson Pratt, by
 Thomas Crosfield ; Resolutions ; *Précis* of Paper by Alfred H. Love ;
 by John Hilton ; Resolution by Chevalier V. De Bolesta-Koslowski ;
 Women's Work for Peace ; Resolution ; Speeches, &c. ; Service on
 Wednesday Evening 129-163.

Thursday Morning Sitting : Referred Resolution : Discussion : Section E : Disarmament ; Resolutions : Paper by Rev. R. B. Howard : E. T. Moneta's Report of Sectional Committee ; Paper by Mrs. Belva Lockwood ; Paper by Jean B. De Ferrer ; *Précis* of Paper by Captain Siccardi ; by Dr Boardman ; Discussion 168-182.

Mansion House : Visitors : Lord Mayor's Speech : Speech by David Dudley Field, by Marquis of Bristol, by F. Passy, Dr. Boardman, Geo. Gillett, and H. Pratt ; Acknowledgment of thanks : Service at Stamford Hill Congregational Church 183-187.

Friday Morning Sitting : Revised Resolution : Section B : Report of Committee and Resolution I. : Paper by Dr. Pankhurst ; Discussion : Resolution II. : Paper by Hodgson Pratt ; Discussion : Third Resolution : Paper by Signor Mazzoleni ; Section C, International Law : Report of Committee : *Précis* of Paper by Crews Dudley ... 188-205.

Friday Afternoon Sitting ; Section D : Neutralisation : Resolution : Speech by Dr. Charles Richet : Paper by Hodgson Pratt : Discussion : Report from Special Committee on Memorial : Section J : Section K : Communications by F. Bajer and Giuseppe Salmeri : Report of Committee on Miscellaneous Business : Recognition of Honours : Invitation to America : Resolution of Gratitude and Faith : Valedictory
[206-220.

Saturday, 19th July : Visit to Windsor : Banquet at Holborn Restaurant : Speeches, &c. 221-223.

Addenda : Paper by M. Doyen (Guise) ; Extract from Professor Henri Marion's Book. Appendix ; Preliminary Arrangements : Documents, Programme, &c. : Appointments ; List of Vice-Presidents ; List of Delegates 224-241.

THE
UNIVERSAL PEACE CONGRESS,
1890.

SPECIAL SERVICE IN ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL.

CANON SCOTT HOLLAND'S SERMON.

On Sunday, 13th July, the delegates attended the afternoon service at St. Paul's Cathedral, when the preacher was the Rev. Canon H. Scott Holland, M.A. By the Dean's permission, seats were reserved for the delegates. The text of Canon Scott Holland's sermon was part of the fourth verse of the second chapter of Isaiah, "They shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks." This sermon is published in full in the *Family Churchman*, and as a tract by Dyer Bros., 31, Paternoster Square, E.C.

MONDAY, 14TH JULY,
PRELIMINARY BUSINESS MEETING.

The opening meeting of Congress for the transaction of business connected with the meetings was held at the Westminster Town Hall on Monday morning at eleven o'clock.

On the motion of Mr. W. EVANS DARBY, one of the Secretaries, Mr. Hodgson Pratt, Chairman of the Organising Committee, was voted to the chair.

MR. HODGSON PRATT'S ADDRESS.

Mr. HODGSON PRATT said: Ladies and Gentlemen, in the name of the Congress Committee, nominated to their work by the several Societies of Great Britain, I welcome you heartily on this occasion. This Congress is held in London at the express desire of the several Peace and Arbitration Societies in Europe and America. At the conclusion of the Congress held last year in Paris it was unanimously resolved that such a Congress should be held annually in different great cities of the world, and it was also felt that as regards the choice of place and time for the meeting of such Congresses, this object should be borne in view, that the Universal Peace Congress and the Inter-Parliamentary Conference, which have become, I may say, our annual gatherings, should meet at the same place and about the same time on each occasion. It was felt that the Universal Peace Congress and the Inter-Parliamentary Conference formed two branches

of one great whole : that whereas the Inter-Parliamentary Conference is necessarily confined to the members of Parliamentary bodies, this Universal Peace Congress represents all men and women, whether in Parliament or out of it, who care for the progress of concord amongst mankind. It was thought essential that the resolutions adopted at this Universal Peace Congress should be at once communicated to the Inter-Parliamentary Conference, so that the representatives of various Parliaments meeting in the latter might be acquainted with the wishes and desires of the representatives of peace all over the world. I may say, on behalf of the Organising Committee, that we have been most anxious for many months past to adopt every step that shall facilitate the convenience and promote the aspirations of those who attend this Congress. One of the rules that we have adopted in the interests of order and regularity has been that the front seats in this hall shall be occupied by delegates appointed by recognised Peace and Arbitration Societies. In addition to the delegates there are visitors, ladies and gentlemen, specially invited in consequence of their interest in, and their services to, this movement. The rules for the order of proceedings have been carefully drawn up, and will be supplied to members of the Congress. According to these rules the delegates will have the right of voting and speaking, but visitors will have the right of speaking only. The galleries are provided for the public, who will not have the right of voting or of speaking. We believe that that will lead to right order. We believe that those who are properly appointed delegates from properly organised and recognised societies are the only persons that should vote, but we are glad, of course, and desirous to have the opinions and views of the friends of peace, who are numerous, but who have not received the formal appointment of delegate. Our days and our hours are precious : we have a very large programme before us, and we are anxious to economise every minute. We feel sure that nobody will talk at greater length than is absolutely necessary for the expression of what he considers it essential that he should put forth, because every minute that is unnecessarily spent in speaking has this result, that it deprives some one else who has an equal right of speaking of the possible chance of doing so. The Committee are glad to announce that written communications have been received upon all the various topics of our rather lengthy programme. A day has been fixed for the consideration of each of the particular subjects, which will be announced to you. For each of those subjects a special sub-committee of three or four persons qualified to deal with it, has been appointed. The duty of each of those sub-committees will be to examine the communications which have been made and to report upon them to the Congress. It will also be a duty of the sub-committees to formulate resolutions, which will be submitted to the Congress at the beginning of each sitting in order to give a solid foundation to the discussion that is to follow. That will be, I think, an excellent arrangement. We are most happy to announce that we have secured for our President the services of one than whom no one is more entitled to preside at a Congress of this nature. I refer, as you all know, to the Hon. David Dudley Field, a member of the House of Representatives of the United States, who is specially known for his long devotion to questions of International Law, who was appointed by the State of New York, a member of the Commission to prepare Codes of the law of that State, and who is himself the author of an International Code. We think it due to him, and we think it due to the great nation which he represents on this occasion, to invite him to preside here to-day, and on the following days of the Congress. The United States of America have

rendered an immense and lasting service to mankind during the last few months. No step has ever been taken perhaps in the world which may have such important consequences as the result of the resolutions for the Model Treaty adopted by the National American Conference. No act perhaps can be more important than the resolutions of the Congress of the United States, which invite the President of the Republic to place himself in communication from time to time with other nations, with the view to the adoption of permanent treaties of Arbitration under which no war will ever be possible between the United States and nations entering into such treaties. I think therefore, from every point of view, that no man could be more appropriately invited to preside at our deliberations, and we are sure that the fact of his being our President will give greater importance to them in the eyes of the world. We have also desired to mark our thoroughly international character by appointing on this occasion a president who is not an Englishman, but who is a citizen of a friendly nation on the other side of the Atlantic. You are all welcome, most welcome. We hope that our deliberations will mark a further step towards the attainment of that great future, when different nations shall look upon themselves as members of a vast human community, when they shall feel that peace is the ultimate condition of all progress in religion and in civilization. We are sure that the deliberations of this Congress, wisely conducted under such leadership, will lead to further progress in the education of public opinion—an opinion based upon principles of truth and guided by judgment and reason. We hope that very great results may arise; we hope that the foremost friends of peace in different countries meeting on this occasion may form warm friendships and intimacies, and may, therefore, enter into permanent relations with each other, and may thereby enable their countries to know each other better; for a greater mutual knowledge and a greater mutual respect are very necessary conditions of the universal concord which we desire. I have now great pleasure in introducing the Hon. Dudley Field to you as President of this Congress. We shall have the pleasure of hearing him this afternoon.

QUESTION OF ADMISSION OF DELEGATES.

Mr. KIMBER, from the visitors' seats, asked why delegates from the British and Foreign Arbitration Association had been excluded from the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN, in explaining the matter, said that it had been fully considered by the Committee of Organisation, who had deliberately resolved that they could not accept the nominations of Mr. Lewis Appleton, or hold any communication with him. This decision was arrived at on public grounds, and with the deepest regret. He must decline to enter into details.

[NOTE.—Mr. Appleton having subsequently withdrawn his name, the Committee authorised the admission of the delegates in question.]

REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF ORGANIZATION.

Mr. W. EVANS DARBY read a brief report on behalf of the Committee of Organisation, detailing the various steps which had been taken in summoning the Congress.

Mr. J. F. GREEN, one of the Secretaries, read the list of delegates.

RULES OF PROCEDURE.

The Rules of Procedure were then submitted and accepted as follows :—

REGULATIONS.

1. The Bureau, or Committee of the Congress, shall consist of the President, Chairman of Committees, the Secretaries, and one representative of each Country sending Delegates, who shall be appointed by the Congress.

2. The business for each day shall be prepared by a Procedure Committee consisting of the Bureau and those already acting in that capacity, which shall determine what papers shall be read at the Congress, wholly or in part, and shall have general direction of the work of the Congress.

3. At the close of each Session this Committee will meet for consultation on all matters that may require their attention.

4. The Secretaries shall announce to the Congress the business for each sitting, shall receive communications relative to the business of the Congress, shall keep minutes of its proceedings in English and French (which shall be read at each sitting), and shall have care of all documents properly belonging to the Congress.

5. The discussions of the Congress shall have as their bases, Resolutions carefully prepared under the direction of the Procedure Committee. Amendments to these may be moved during the discussion, but they must be handed in writing to the President.

6. Every proposal which any Delegate or Visitor may wish to bring before the Congress must, in the first instance, be submitted in writing to the Procedure Committee, who are empowered to decide upon its relevancy, and to fix the proper time for introducing it to the Congress.

7. Delegates and Visitors who wish to speak on any Resolution before the Chair, must send up their names to the President, and they will be heard in the order of their application.

8. No speaker will be allowed more than ten minutes, except by special leave of the Congress : should he exceed that limit, the President is authorised to remind him of the rule.

9. No speaker shall address the Congress more than once on the same resolution, unless in strict explanation, and with the consent of the President.

10. Speakers are requested to avoid in their addresses any direct allusion to the political events of the day : should they persist in so doing, the President shall call them to order, and, if necessary, withdraw the right to speak.

11. The Resolutions proposed for the adoption of the Congress shall be decided by a majority of votes. Only Delegates shall vote.

12. On all matters of procedure not provided for in these Rules, the President's decision shall be final.

13. The Committee of Organisation shall be charged with the carrying out of the decisions of the Congress, and it shall publish a printed report of its proceedings.

NOTE.—The members of the Congress are respectfully and urgently requested to be in their places at the commencement of the proceedings of each Session.

RÈGLEMENTS.

1. Le Bureau comprendra : le Président du Congrès, le Président des Comités, les Secrétaires et un représentant de chacun des Pays qui envoient des délégués. Ces derniers seront nommés par le Congrès.

2. Le programme de chaque journée sera préparé par une Commission des séances dont le Bureau fera partie d'office. Cette Commission désignera quels mémoires doivent être lus, totalement ou en partie, devant le Congrès, et aura la direction générale de ses travaux.

3. A la fin de chaque séance, cette Commission se réunira pour délibérer sur tous les points qui pourront demander sa décision.

4. Les Secrétaires feront savoir au Congrès l'ordre du jour de chaque séance, recevront les communications relatives à ses travaux, rédigeront, en anglais et en français, les procès-verbaux de ses actes (qui seront lus à chaque séance), et auront charge des documents qui lui appartiennent.

5. Les discussions du Congrès auront pour base des résolutions soigneusement préparées sous la direction de la Commission des séances. Pendant la discussion chacun pourra proposer des amendements à ces résolutions pourvu qu'ils soient transmis par écrit au Président.

6. Toute proposition que les Délégués ou Visiteurs désireront soumettre au

Congrès devra, tout d'abord, être communiqué par écrit, à la Commission des séances qui a le pouvoir de décider sur son opportunité et de fixer le moment convenable pour l'introduire devant le Congrès.

7. Les Délégués et les Visiteurs qui désireront donner leur avis sur une résolution devront envoyer leur nom au Président et pourront parler quand leur tour sera venu.

8. Aucun orateur ne pourra parler pendant plus de dix minutes, excepté avec la permission expresse du Congrès : s'il dépasse cette limite, le Président est autorisé à lui rappeler le règlement.

9. Aucun orateur ne pourra parler plus d'une fois sur la même résolution, si ce n'est dans le but d'éclaircir la discussion, et avec le consentement du Président.

10. Les orateurs sont priés d'éviter toute allusion directe aux événements politiques du jour : à défaut de quoi, le Président les rappellerait à l'ordre et, s'il était nécessaire, leur retirerait le droit de parler.

11. Les résolutions proposées au Congrès seront décidées à la majorité des suffrages. Les Délégués auront seuls droit de vote.

12. Sur toute question d'ordre non prévue dans ce règlement la décision du Président sera sans appel.

13.—Le Comité d'organisation sera chargé d'expliquer les décisions du Congrès, et publiera un rapport de ses actes.

N.B. Les Membres du Congrès sont instamment priés de bien vouloir être à leur place dès l'ouverture de chaque séance.

APPOINTMENT OF BUREAU.

Mr. W. E. DARBY said the Committee of Organization have great pleasure in nominating the following to represent their various countries, and to form a Bureau or Committee of the Congress :—As representing England, Sir Joseph Pease, Bart., M.P. ; America, Rev. R. B. Howard ; France, M. Frédéric Passy ; Denmark, M. F. Bajer, M.P. ; Sweden and Norway, E. T. Borg, M.P. ; Germany, Madame Fischer-Lette ; and Italy, Signor E. T. Moneta.

COMMITTEE OF PROCEDURE.

The Bureau thus elected was then appointed as a Procedure Committee, in conjunction with Mr. Geo. Gillett, Mr. W. C. Braithwaite, and Mr. Thos. Snape, who had been already acting with the officers in that capacity by appointment of the Committee of Organization.

SPECIAL COMMITTEES.

Mr. W. E. DARBY announced on behalf of the Procedure Committee that each subject on the programme with the communications which had been received, would be referred to a series of committees, who would consider the subjects and report to the Procedure Committee, by whom it would be introduced to the Congress. The names of gentlemen forming these Committees were read and approved.

OPENING OF SESSIONS WITH PRAYER.

The REV. DR. GRAMMER, of Baltimore, introduced the question of opening the sittings of the Congress with prayer, and moved the following resolution, which, after some conversation, was referred to the Procedure Committee, the

Chairman remarking that provision had been made for a devotional meeting to be held every morning from 9 o'clock to within a quarter of an hour of the meeting of the Congress, viz. : "Whereas in the programme for the Universal Peace Congress subjects are set forth for 'the Christian and other Religious aspects of the question of Peace and War,' therefore resolved that all Sessions of the Congress be opened by asking the blessing and guidance of Almighty God."

Mr. DARBY announced that the delegates would be allowed to visit Windsor Castle on Saturday next, that being a day on which the Castle is not usually open to the public. Also that Mr. Passmore Edwards, the editor and proprietor of *The Echo*, had invited fifty Foreign delegates and a certain number of English delegates to dine with him at the National Liberal Club on Tuesday evening.

The Congress then adjourned.

THE INAUGURAL MEETING.

The Inaugural Meeting was held at three o'clock in the afternoon, the chair being taken by the President, the Hon. David Dudley Field.

ADDRESS BY HON. DAVID DUDLEY FIELD.

The PRESIDENT delivered the following address :—

Gentlemen,—First of all, let me thank you for the honour of presiding over this Congress. We are here to do our part in influencing public opinion to promote the peace of nations. We pretend to no public function—we have no authority from any Government—we appeal, as we can only appeal, to the reason and the consciences of our fellow-men.

This Congress meets pursuant to the suggestion of a similar Congress held in Paris last year. That body passed a series of resolutions—thirty-nine in number—which may properly be called a programme for the consideration of subsequent Congresses ; but it did not bind them or confine them to the resolutions thus passed ; and if it had so bound them it would be impossible to discuss, or even to consider, all the resolutions within the time to which this Congress is limited. I venture, therefore, to confine myself in the observations I make to two, which appear to me most prominent and most urgent, and these are : Arbitration for those contentions between nations which cannot be adjusted by negotiation ; and a proportionate and simultaneous Disarmament. In discussing the former I do not enter into the question of a permanent Court of Nations, but confine myself to the principle of Arbitration, believing that, when that is settled, the means of carrying it out will easily be found.

That these subjects are worthy of serious consideration few will deny ; whether they are as practicable as they are desirable, or are practicable at all, are the questions which, in the long run, the people more than their Governments are to decide. For it may be assumed that in the present state of the world there is in every Christian country a body of thoughtful and cultivated men and women whose judgment and wishes may, after all, sway the Governments to which they bear allegiance. With this view we undertake to show that most of the disagreements which arise between the Governments of the world can, and should be, settled by disinterested arbiters. I do not mean to say that all disagreements, without exception, can be thus disposed of. In the memorial that was presented two years ago to the Congress of the United States by a Committee appointed by the Mayor of New York, the prayer was for a joint resolution, “ requesting the President to propose to the Government of Great Britain the making of a treaty between the two nations, for a limited period at least, providing in substance that in case a difference should arise between them respecting the interpretation of any treaty which they may have made, or may hereafter make with each other, or any claim of either under the established law of nations, or respecting the boundary of any of their respective possessions, or respecting any wrong alleged to have been committed by either nation upon the other, or its members, or any duty omitted, it shall be the earnest endeavour of both the contracting parties to accommodate the difference by conciliatory negotiation, and that in no event shall either nation begin a war against the other, with-

out first offering to submit the difference between them to Arbitrators chosen, as may then be agreed, or if there be no different agreement, then by three Arbitrators, one to be chosen by each party, and an umpire by those so chosen, it being understood, however, that Arbitration, as thus provided for, shall not extend to any question respecting the independence of sovereignty of either nation, its equality with other nations, its form of Government, its internal affairs, or its Continental policy."

And in the resolutions of the International American Conference, which were agreed to at Washington in April last, it was recommended that Arbitration should be "Obligatory in all controversies concerning diplomatic and Consular privileges, boundaries, territories, indemnities, right of navigation, and the validity, construction and enforcement of treaties," and in all other case, whatever might be their origin, nature or occasion, with the single exception of those "which in the judgment of any one of the nations involved in the controversy may imperil its independence."

A resolution of the Peace Congress of last year declared that "it is expressly understood that no decision of the Arbitrators can affect the independence or internal Government of any nation."

With these qualifications is not our demand for Arbitration, not only not chimerical but reasonable? Who at this moment, when the nations of Europe are facing one another, if not with menaces, yet with an ostentatious display of strength, which is akin to menace, who, I say does not wish that such a treaty of Arbitration existed between them? If it were now in force, and men felt sure of its inviolability, the armaments which disfigure the Continent of Europe would melt away, and nations might rest in quietness and safety with armies no greater in proportion to their people than is the army of the United States in proportion to theirs, where 25,000 men, supplemented by the militia of the States, suffice for sixty-four millions of people. I add the qualification that, in order to make such a treaty effective, men must feel assured of its inviolability, because in the practice of Governments, it has been too often assumed that war abrogates all treaties, and a treaty of peace is annulled by an act of war. Such a doctrine makes the most solemn engagements of nations mere ropes of sand. The Franco-Prussian war of 1870 was begun in violation of the Treaty of Paris, solemnly made in 1856. It seems almost to have been heretofore the nature of Governments to distrust one another, and to seek advantages by deceit and surprise. This distrust, I am convinced, is the chief obstacle to the adoption of Treaties of Arbitration. How can that distrust be overcome? By making it morally certain that the Treaty will be kept; and that can be done only in one of two ways—either by such pressure of public opinion as to make it infamous for a Government to break the Treaty, or by some penalty to follow the breach of it. For my own part, I am satisfied that the first of these ways will prove the best. At least, it is worth the trial; and if on trial it is found to be insufficient a penalty of some sort might be devised. Two have been proposed—war, or non-intercourse: war by the other parties to the Treaty, against the offending party, or non-intercourse with the offender. The objection to the first lies in the question so often put—"Will you be guilty of the solecism of making war in order to prevent war? making, it may be, a great war to prevent a small one? It might be answered that this is the way in which every political society deals with offenders. A member of the society assaults a fellow-member, and the rest of the society seize the offender, imprison him, fine him, or kill him. Here violence is resorted to in order to prevent violence. And as to non-intercourse, it is asked, Would that be a sufficient penalty? In

the present state of the world, denial of intercourse between two nations would be a serious inconvenience, and, perhaps a very great loss. A political boycott might, indeed, prove more effective than an armed conflict. Speculations about penalties are, however, premature. No nation which has once agreed to Arbitration has, I believe, yet been found refusing to comply with the award.

I argue that controversies between nations can be settled by Arbitration before a war, because they are always settled by negotiation after a war, and are, therefore, just as capable of discussion and settlement before, as they are after cities have been sacked, provinces ravaged, treasuries exhausted, and thousands upon thousands of lives destroyed.

I argue, further, that these controversies can be so disposed of because many, and enough to settle the question, have been so treated already. How many times has arbitration been tried? Some sixty times since the general pacification of 1815. It is, therefore, no longer a doubtful experiment. It is said that irritation has followed in every instance. Has anybody ever heard of a lawsuit where both parties were satisfied with the decision? Both thought themselves right at the beginning, and probably both thought themselves right at the end; and so there has always been one dissatisfied party reluctant to submit. But nobody has ever thought such dissatisfaction to be a sufficient reason against allowing to an aggrieved party resort to the Courts for the vindication of his rights. The nature of man is the same, whether engaged in arbitrations or in lawsuits, and settlement by judges without violence is in both cases better than the chances and evils of violence.

American example has no little significance. There are now in the Union forty-two States, each sovereign in all things except as provided by the Constitution of the United States. Some of the States are more powerful and opulent than some European kingdoms, but they are all subject to the jurisdiction of this Supreme Court by an express provision of the Federal Constitution, which declares that the Court shall have jurisdiction of all controversies between two or more States. Such controversies have arisen, and been peacefully adjudicated. One was decided two months ago, in a suit by the State of Indiana against the State of Kentucky for the possession of what was once an island in the river Ohio, but is now absorbed into the north mainland by a change of the channel. I have now a copy of the opinion, an unpretentious document ending with these words:—"Judgment in favour of the claim of Kentucky will be entered in conformity with this opinion, and commissioners will be appointed to ascertain and run the boundary line as herein designated, and to report to this Court; upon which appointment counsel of the parties will be heard on notice." Now Kentucky and Indiana are powerful States facing each other on opposite sides of the Ohio; each has an area of about 40,000 square miles; Kentucky has a population of 2,000,000 or so, and Indiana some hundreds of thousands more. Greece and Denmark have about the same population, Switzerland half as many more, but in twenty-five years each of these two American States will probably have more people than Holland, or Belgium, or Portugal, or Roumania, or Sweden and Norway. It may be said that our Federal Court did not prevent the great Civil War. No, it did not, nor is any Court or Arbitration likely ever to prevent such a war in such an exceptional and supreme crisis. The questions between the North and South were questions of internal government, the quasi-independence of several States, and certainly of a kind not within the scope of legal or arbitral judgment.

An International Conference of all the independent States of North and South America was, as you know, held in Washington from

October of last year to the following May, and they adopted with unanimity, excepting Chili and one other, a series of resolutions designed to substitute Arbitration for war. The first Article agreed to was as follows:—"The Republics of North, Central, and South America hereby adopt Arbitration as the principle of American International Law for the settlement of differences, disputes, or controversies that may arise between them." The only exception made in the Articles which followed was the one which I have already mentioned, that the submission of questions which, "in the judgment of any one of the nations involved in the controversy may imperil its independence," was not obligatory. At the close of this Conference Mr. Blaine, Secretary of State, and President of the Conference, made the following observations:—"If in this closing hour the Conference had but one deed to celebrate, we should dare call the world's attention to the deliberate, confident, and solemn dedication of two great continents to peace, and to the prosperity which has peace for its foundation. We hold up this new Magna Charta, which abolishes war and substitutes Arbitration between the American Republics, as the first and great fruit of the International American Conference." It is true that two of the Republics represented have not yet given in their adhesion to these resolutions, nor has the Treaty yet been ratified by the Senate of the United States; nevertheless these brave words of Mr. Blaine were, as I think, justified by the occasion.

The practice of Arbitration between States is as old as civilisation. Two of the Grecian States, when Greece was in her glory, had a long-standing dispute about an island off their coast. They finally agreed to submit the dispute to arbiters, and the award was religiously kept. Since then the world has been deluged in blood, but now and then during the tempest a voice has been heard crying for the arbitrament of reason to replace the arbitrament of the sword. Henry of Navarre was one of those who cried for it, and the Papacy has more than once offered its mediation. Finally, when the Temple of Janus was closed in 1815, men turned their thoughts more than before to the means of preventing the re-opening of the gates. If the means adopted have not been altogether successful, they have prevented some, I may say many, wars, and even one war prevented is worth all the trouble that the friends of Peace have ever taken against the methods of war.

Besides these actual arbitrations, arbitral clauses have been introduced into many Treaties of Commerce—clauses which stipulated for Arbitration in case of disagreement between the contracting parties, respecting the interpretation or execution of the Treaty. Such a clause was inserted in eighteen or nineteen Italian treaties, negotiated by Signor Mancini, and it was inserted in the Treaty of Commerce between the United States and Spain, at the instance of Senor Marcoartu, one of the delegates to this Congress.

An agreement to arbitrate, upon the failure of pacific negotiation, would tend to make such negotiations more frequent and successful. I cannot doubt that the unmistakable drift of public opinion towards Arbitration has led to many a peaceful negotiation. The agreement to arbitrate about the Delagoa claims, which the Portuguese Government has just accepted, and, above all, the agreement between England and Germany for the delimitation of their respective claims in Africa are evidences of the inclination of the world to Peace. Here are vast territories, capable of forming in a future age great republics or great empires, divided between two European States, without a drop of blood or a draft upon either exchequer. All honour to England and Germany, the two great Teutonic nations of Europe, for their peaceful settlement of a controversy which two centuries ago would have blazed into a

devastating war.

Would that, in some new evangel of peace, a voice could be heard and heeded, calling to France and Germany: Put your swords into their sheaths, great and brave nations; each of you has overcome the other many times in battle; strive now to overcome in the contest of peace; be rivals, not in arms, but in arts; in the former you could only hurt each other; in the latter you would help each other, and help, too the world.

Arbitration and disarmament supplement each other; one leads naturally to the other. If nations disarm they do so because of their belief that they can settle their disputes in a manner different from a resort to arms. They have found another and better way. If they agree to arbitrate, and believe in the inviolability of the agreement, they will of course disarm, inasmuch as armaments will then have become useless. The burdens of the warlike establishments of the Continental States are already grievous to be borne. Yet the German Emperor has just called for more batteries of artillery to be added to his vast army, that he may be able to cope with the ever-increasing armaments of France: and even in England—impregnable England—it seems to be a political maxim that her navy must always be kept on a level with any two navies in the world. In the admirable address of Mr. Charles Roundell, on the progress of the working classes of England during the present reign, it is stated that “a calculation has been made for the purpose of showing how each pound of the National Taxes has been spent during the present century. The calculation is, that there has been spent out of each pound:—

			<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
On War and preparations for War...	16	3½
On all expenses of Civil Government	3	8½”

An International Code is mentioned in the programme, but I have not dwelt upon it. Such a work is only another name for a general treaty. If the nations of Europe and America would agree to enter into a general agreement upon subjects of International interest, or even upon one subject:—as, for example, extradition—they would make so far an international code. There is already at least one contract of the kind, the Postal Union, which has been signed by a score of nations. The more the different political communities of the world cultivate intercourse with one another, the more frequently will they enter into agreements concerning it, and by degrees will thus form a code, international in name as in substance: and once done, this will greatly promote the peace and happiness of mankind.

Now, in the hope that what we do here may strengthen the hearts and hands of those who in any part of the world are seeking peace on earth and goodwill to men, I have only to declare this Congress opened.

LETTERS, &c.

Mr. W. E. DARBY (Secretary) read the following extracts from letters of apology and congratulation from several friends who found themselves unable to attend:—

M. CHARLES LEMONNIER, in a letter dated 3rd July, 1890, after expressing regret at his inability to attend the Congress, writes as follows:—“This Congress should play a great part in what I will call the “Building up of Pacification.” It ought to pursue, consolidate, and develop the work commenced last year by the first Universal Peace Congress. The programme drawn up by the organizing committee is vast and comprehensive. I know of no questions which are not there indicated, or which might not easily be included in it. I

now suggest what appear to me the chief elements in that "pacific building-up," just referred to. (1) The population of peace-makers scattered over the world—the Peace Societies, of whatever origin and of whatever shade of opinion. (2) All those who aspire to eliminate war by leading nations to the *juridical state*, that is to *federation through arbitration*. (3) Congresses, or rather the Universal Peace Congresses, which unite, yearly, the delegates of the Peace Societies. (4) The Inter-Parliamentary Conference, in which Members of all Parliaments in the world take part by right. Such appears to me, described briefly, the little world of peacemakers. A meeting of the Peace Congress should immediately precede the Inter-Parliamentary Conference, in order to collect the communications and proposals of Peace Societies, and in general of all the friends of Peace, to discuss them freely, and throw them into the shape of resolutions. These should then be transmitted, not submitted, to the *Conference*, which latter—without expressing approval or disapproval—shall, by the mere fact of taking cognisance of them, make them known to all the Parliaments of the world. This, it seems to me, is the function of the Universal Congress of Peace. The *first* Congress—that held last year in Paris, immediately before the Inter-Parliamentary Conference—has supplied the outline of what should become a veritable institution. The mission of the *second* Congress which is about to open in London, is to carry on this work, to complete it, and lead up to the renovation of International Law. I will not venture to show how to convoke and carry on the functions of this Congress, so that these bodies may be perfectly free and independent. That question is too delicate for me to try and solve, the relations between them having now to be created for the first time. Our colleague, Fred. Bajer, member of the Danish Parliament and of the Central Committee of the International League of Peace and Liberty, of the Universal Peace Congress, and of the Parliamentary Conference, has sent to us—and I suppose to you—a communication on this question which indicates the principal points. In another branch of enquiry there was a question referred to last year in the programme of the Congress which appeared to us of very great importance, and which will now be raised by our Delegates. It is this:—"Can arbitrators, appointed under a permanent treaty of arbitration concluded between two States, enquire into acts done by either of those States in the exercise of its national sovereignty, without that enquiry being a violation of that sovereignty, or of the States' independence and self-government?"

M. LOUIS RUCHONNET, President of the Swiss Confederation, after expressing his regret at his inability to attend the Congress, says:—"I must, however, express my adhesion to your principles, and my hopes for the success of the meeting. The aim which we pursue is entirely in conformity with the aspirations of mankind, and is justified by the actual state of Europe. We are all called upon to make efforts in this direction, and I am convinced that the future will bring the triumph of our ideas. Many signs lead us to hope for the speedy arrival of that future. Public opinion will one day take a sudden development and put an end to the barbarism which now prevails. Let us strive with perseverance to bring about that change, and let us not be discouraged."

The *Unione Lombarda* writes from Milan, April 29th, 1890.

An examination of the questions contained in the programme of the Congress shows that the vexed and intricate subject of war has been considered under all its aspects. Since it is justly said that a problem if well stated is half solved, we hope that your Congress will solve—if not all the questions indicated in the programme—at least those which

are of chief importance. It has always been our ardent wish that the several Peace Societies, while preserving their respective modes of action, should unite in the consideration of the various subjects which it is their duty to investigate. While entirely appreciating the motives which have prompted the Committee to exclude the discussion of pending international questions, we think that those which more directly affect the peace of Europe should receive the consideration of the Congress. Trusting that you share in this opinion, we earnestly hope that if the pen is to break the sword, the glory of that result may to some extent crown the efforts of the Congress.

The letter bears the signatures of

FRANCESCO VIGANO, President.
 AVV. CERNEZZI.
 E. T. MONETA.
 AVV. VIGANOTTI.
 DALT. H. VISCONTI.
 ATTILIO GALLIANI.
 STEFANO LABUT.
 ART. SEMENZA.
 SICCARDI (Captain), Secretary.

From the New England Yearly Meeting to the Universal Peace Congress, to be held in London, Seventh Month 14th, 1890 :—

DEAR FRIENDS,—The Christian religion is the religion of Peace, our Lord Jesus Christ was the Mediator, He sought reconciliation of man to God, and also of man to his fellow-man. All, therefore, who call themselves Christians, whether individuals or nations, should distinctly teach, and practically illustrate, the peace principles proclaimed by our Divine Master. Now, therefore, we, the undersigned Yearly Meeting of Friends for New England, held at Newport, in the State of Rhode Island, U.S.A., on the Seventeenth day of the Sixth Month, 1890, do hereby most respectfully, but most earnestly, request your Congress to do such acts, and make such declarations, as shall in your judgment swiftly hasten the day when “Nation shall not lift up sword against nation.” And we request to this end that you impress upon the nations of the earth, with all the weight of your influence, the expedient Christian duty of submitting international questions to Arbitration, and further, that every attempt of one nation to acquire the territory of another by force of arms is unchristian and a thing justly to be condemned by all civilized nations. We suggest for your consideration the appointment by you of persons to visit those in authority in the armed nations of Europe, who shall present to them the practical conclusions of your Congress, and urge reasonably upon them the expediency and necessity of disarmament at an early day.—Signed by direction and on behalf of the Yearly Meeting aforesaid,

WILLIAM O. NEWHALL, } Clerks.
 ANNA G. WOOD, }

The Women's Liberal Federation send from their Meeting, held May 13th and 14th, 1890, the following Resolution :—

“That this Council is of opinion that the Liberal Party should bring into great prominence the importance of promoting International Arbitration, and that practical efforts should be made in this direction during the initial stages of international difficulties.”

After regretting that ill-health prevents him from attending the Congress, the Chevalier Dr. KARL VON SCHERZER (Consul General for
Univ Calif - Digitized by Microsoft ®

Austro-Hungary at Genoa) writes as follows :—

“ Since 1851, when I attended the first Peace Congress in London, held in Exeter Hall, under the presidency of Sir David Brewster, and the never forgotten and energetic Mr. Henry Richard as Secretary, I have followed the efforts of the Peace Society with the greatest interest and sympathy, and have always been happy to promote the aims of the Society. I shall also continue to do so, as far as my faculties and means reach, for nothing could contribute more to the welfare and happiness of mankind than universal peace. We must not despair in spite of the present state of things in Europe, the continual increase of standing armies, and of the national debts, and the decrease of the public wealth! A federation of the Societies of Peace in Europe and America appears to me one of the most important objects to be aimed at, and the Congress would be able to boast of having achieved a great result if it should succeed in creating such a federation, or at least in pointing out the way to establish such a federation.”

Sir JOSEPH PEASE wrote to say that he was exceedingly sorry not to be at the opening of the Peace Congress, owing to a pending election in Mid Durham, but that he would give £50 to the fund for expenses.

Rev. T. J. LAWRENCE, of Cambridge, wrote expressing his regret that he was unable to attend, being engaged at meetings of the National Home Reading Union, and concluded with the following words :—“ In the name of the God of Peace I wish for the Congress all power, honour, and success.”

ADDRESSES.

The CHAIRMAN : In pursuance of the plan I mentioned a little while ago, I will call first upon an English delegate, because we are in the home of the English people, and of right they should be first heard. I will ask Mr. Picton, M.P. for Leicester, to address the meeting.

Mr. J. ALLANSON PICTON, M.P. : Mr. President, I feel it a great honour indeed to be the first in this Congress to express what I am sure is a universal feeling, namely, an appreciation of the gravity, the judicial tone, the suggestiveness, instructiveness, and impressiveness of the address to which we have listened. I am particularly struck by the wisdom with which we have been pointed to certain limitations of any universal policy of arbitration. I am sure that even the wildest advocates of war could have no possible objection, or at least no reasonable objection, to a system of arbitration which is not to extend to any question that interferes with the independence of the nation, its equality with other nations, its form of government, its internal affairs, or its continental policy. If we look at the wars that have devastated the world during the present century, we should find very few indeed which are within the scope of those limitations. Of course, in the great Napoleonic wars the nations of Europe were struggling for life. It was not the case with our country, by the way, but it was the case on the continent of Europe. But if you look at the later wars, such as those between Austria and Italy, France and Austria, and Germany and France, I do not think the causes of war in any of these cases were outside the scope of arbitration, as limited in the President's address. It may be quite true that arbitration could not put down all wars, but if it could put down some it would save hundreds of thousands of lives, besides millions of hard-earned treasure. Only put down half the wars that arise, and you would do

a great deal for the progress of humanity. Therefore, I do not think it is a very strong objection to the policy of this Congress that it is impossible to put down all wars. You, Sir, have remarked upon the criticisms sometimes passed upon arbitrations that the two sides are never agreed. Of course they are not. As you have well observed, in no litigation are both sides satisfied. But did you ever hear of two sides satisfied at the end of a war? Therefore, if the fact that one side is always dissatisfied is an objection to arbitration, *a fortiori*, it is an objection to war, because the dissatisfied party has had to spend its blood and treasure before the unsatisfactory result is reached. Therefore, I think there is very little indeed in this objection to arbitration. I cannot imagine any human interest which at the present moment deserves more urgent and earnest attention than that which we are advocating now. You are happy in America, and I rejoice to think that an American citizen should preside over this Congress; but notwithstanding the inevitable calamity of the Civil War, in regard to all other relations to the world the United States of America set to the rest of the world a noble example which we should do well to follow. But if you look to the continent of Europe you have as much destruction in the course of the year as if a hurricane and pestilence had swept over the world. In our own country we devour every year, for non-productive purposes, the keep of about 300,000 families, or, taking five individuals to each family, father, mother, and children, we devour the keep of 1,500,000 individuals. Sometimes we hear of the great destructiveness of a fire; it is said that £10,000 or £50,000 worth of property has been lost, besides several lives, and yet, in this so-called civilised country of ours, we are devouring for thoroughly destructive and non-productive purposes the keep of some 300,000 families. If you multiply this by the number of families swallowed up on the continent of Europe, you will feel that the man who could induce the human race to do away with war would do more for his kind than any philanthropist who ever lived. I am proud to see this Congress meeting in our country, and I know I represent a very considerable number of the members of the English Parliament when I express the earnest hope that the results of this meeting may be to prosper and promote the great principles that we hold in common.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not wonder that the gentleman who has just spoken could not understand our qualification about continental policy. The continental policy was introduced into that resolution to which I referred, for I had the honour of drawing it up, at the urgent request or demand of some members of the Committee who considered that America would never agree to abandon the Monroe doctrine—that is to say, that they would never agree that any European power should colonise any part of America. Now, ladies and gentlemen, I have the pleasure of introducing to you a most eminent citizen of our sister state, beautiful France—France which has so long led in the cause of civilisation and the career of conquest and of arms—France which we hope and pray may now lead the world in the career of peace.

M. FREDERIC PASSY.

M. FREDERIC PASSY en se levant pour obéir à Monsieur le Président, dit qu'il n'aurait rien à ajouter au remarquable discours que vient de

prononcer celui-ci s'il ne tenait à affirmer comme l'un des représentants de la France à ce Congrès, les sympathies de son Pays pour la grande cause de la paix et de l'arbitrage. Ces sympathies sont aujourd'hui générales et M. Passy est d'autant plus heureux de pouvoir le constater qu'il est forcé de reconnaître qu'il n'en a pas toujours été ainsi. Il y a eu un temps qui n'est pas très éloigné où, lorsque l'on parlait de paix et d'arbitrage, d'arbitrage surtout, on était à peu près certain, de ne rencontrer que le dédain et la raillerie. Nous avons été, dit M. Passy, quelques-uns de mes collègues et moi, quatre ou cinq d'abord, au sein du Parlement français, conspués et honnis toutes les fois que nous tentions de faire entendre des paroles de sagesse et d'humanité. Tantôt l'on nous traitait de mauvais citoyens, d'hommes sans cœur et sans patriotisme ; tantôt l'on nous considérait comme d'honnêtes visionnaires et des esprits chimériques, et l'on nous faisait un crime de défendre, comme nous nous obstinions à le faire, le sang et l'or de la France. Il n'en est plus ainsi et nous aurions, si nous étions gens à rendre le mal pour le mal et l'ironie pour l'ironie, beau jeu à nous moquer, à notre tour, des moqueurs. Non pas assurément que tout le monde en France, non plus qu'ailleurs, soit encore converti à nos idées : que tout le monde surtout ose les professer ouvertement. Il faut compter, non seulement avec ce qu'on appelle le chauvinisme, mais avec les délicatesses de l'amour propre national, d'autant plus respectables, nous tenons à le dire, que la situation de la France a été plus douloureuse et reste plus difficile. Non pas non plus, que le poids des charges militaires qui pèse sur la France soit encore réduit ni peut-être prêt de l'être. Nous plions, comme les autres, encore une fois, peut-être moins que d'autres, sous ce fardeau écrasant. Le plus clair de nos ressources, au lieu de servir à améliorer la condition générale, sert à payer des armements, toujours à renouveler, toujours au-dessous des exigences du jour présent, parce que d'autres, à côté de nous, en poussant plus avant les leurs, nous mettent dans la nécessité cruelle de les suivre, et parce que la science, par les perfectionnements incessants qu'elle apporte aux industries meurtrières, fait passer le lendemain à l'état de vieille machine bonne à mettre à la ferraille ce qu'elle avait produit la veille de plus parfait, disons, de plus effroyablement destructeur. Nous nous ruinons à préparer les moyens de prendre part aux folles tueries de l'avenir ou à payer les intérêts des dettes laissées par les folles et coupables tueries du passé. Et comme le disait récemment un de nos poètes et de nos journalistes.

Nous mourons de faim pour pouvoir nous tuer.

Mais si nous subissons encore ce triste et absurde état de choses, nous commençons du moins à nous lasser de sa perpétuité. Nous nous demandons s'il n'y a pas d'autres moyens de préserver la paix que de se ruiner par une rivalité d'armements et de dépenses qui n'est pas, en fin de compte, moins meurtrière qu'une guerre ouverte. Nous ouvrons les yeux à ce qui se passe autour de nous, en Europe et en Amérique ; nous voyons dans des cas, chaque jour plus nombreux, des conflits, autrefois, insolubles, résolus à la satisfaction de toutes les parties par des procédés amiables, et n'en déplaît aux incrédules, nous constatons que l'arbitrage, dont on se moquait comme d'une impossibilité, est une réalité des plus pratiques et bientôt, des plus banales. Nous avons entendu, c'est à moi même, dit M. Passy, que la réponse a été faite, un Président du Conseil, alors Ministre des Affaires Étrangères, M. de Freycinet, aujourd'hui encore Président du Conseil et Ministre de la Guerre, déclarer, avec l'unanimité de la Chambre, ajoutait-il, qu'il était temps de substituer à la voix brutale du canon, la voix de la raison, de la justice et de l'humanité. Nous avons vu un autre Ministre des Affaires Étrangères, M. Goblet, insérer dans un traité de commerce avec un des États de l'Amérique, la République de l'Équateur, une clause d'arbitrage et

conclure avec le royaume des Pays-Bas, une convention par laquelle ce pays et la France remettaient à la décision souveraine d'un arbitre, le règlement de leurs frontières litigieuses dans la Guyane. C'est moi même, ajoute M. Passy, qui ai eu l'honneur de faire à la Chambre des Députés, dont je faisais encore partie à cette époque, le rapport de cette affaire, et c'est après m'avoir fait lire mon rapport à la Tribune, c'est-à-dire en approuvant non seulement les conclusions, mais les considérations sur lesquelles elles étaient appuyées, que la Chambre a émis à l'unanimité, un vote favorable. J'avais également, qu'il me soit permis de le rappeler, continue l'orateur, puisque nous devons ici nous prévaloir de tous nos avantages, présenté à la Chambre une proposition tendant à la conclusion d'un traité général d'arbitrage entre la République Française et la République des États-Unis, et cette proposition, je dois le dire, après avoir été une première fois ajournée, avait été, dans la dernière session, à la suite d'un remarquable rapport de la Commission d'initiative, prise en considération, sans qu'une seule voix se fût élevée contre. La commission chargée du rapport définitif était tout entière favorable et m'avait fait l'honneur, pour manifester dès sa première réunion son opinion, de me nommer son président et son rapporteur. Si quelque chose me fait regretter de ne plus siéger au Parlement Français, c'est assurément de ne plus m'être trouvé à même de reprendre et de suivre jusqu'au bout cette proposition. Voilà, dit en terminant M. Passy, pour les régions parlementaires ou officielles. Si nous interrogeons l'opinion populaire, nous ne la trouvons pas moins disposée, tant s'en faut. J'ai eu, dans ces dernières semaines, comme président de la Société Française pour l'Arbitrage, la pensée d'aller porter la question, comme je l'ai dit à mes auditeurs, devant le suffrage universel lui-même, en tenant dans plusieurs des mairies de Paris, gracieusement mises à ma disposition par les Municipalités, des réunions publiques, c'est à dire ouvertes à tous. J'ai voulu, pour reproduire encore l'expression dont je me suis servi, faire le procès du canon devant la chair à canons et provoquer, autant qu'il dépendait de moi, un plébiscite contre la guerre. Je puis vous affirmer, Messieurs et chers collaborateurs, que l'accueil qui m'a été fait a dépassé mes espérances et que la nation française, dans toutes les classes dont elle se compose, est animée d'un même désir, bien affirmé par elle déjà, pendant tout le cours de notre grande Exposition, le désir de travailler en paix et de donner au monde l'exemple de ce que peut une grande nation, également jalouse de sa dignité, de son indépendance et de sa tranquillité. Elle croit à un avenir de justice et de respect mutuel dans les relations internationales comme dans les relations privées. Elle croit que de peuple à peuple comme d'homme à homme, les erreurs du passé doivent être réparées et la solidarité succéder à l'antagonisme. Elle croit, pour tout dire, que cent ans après la *Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen*, il est temps de reconnaître les droits des peuples et de renoncer sans retour à toutes ces entreprises de la force et de la violence, qui, sous le nom de conquêtes, sont de véritables attentats contre l'humanité et qui, quoiqu'en puissent penser parfois l'ambition des souverains ou l'orgueil des races momentanément victorieuses, affaiblissent, appauvrissent et abaissent ceux-là mêmes qui paraissent d'abord en profiter. C'est, Messieurs, je dis en France, laissez-moi dire partout, le courant qui de plus en plus se dessine et s'affirme. Ayons donc confiance et après avoir combattu pour la paix et pour la justice, quand nous semblions avoir tout contre nous, redoublons d'efforts, en nous disant que la conscience du genre humain est désormais avec nous. C'est nous qui aurons le dernier mot et, comme l'écrivait dernièrement Castelar, nous aurons raison de la guerre comme nous avons eu raison de l'esclavage et de l'intolérance !

The CHAIRMAN then called upon the Rev. Dr. MURKLAND (of Baltimore), who said—

Mr. President, fellow-members of the Peace Congress, ladies and gentlemen,—Allow me first, as a humble representative of our great Republic, to thank you most heartily for the cordial manner in which you have received its delegates. I remember that we bear within our veins tributary streams from every nation represented in this audience, and when we come to you, we come as your children, speaking the same thoughts, and rejoicing in the same great goal. I stand here to-day as a representative of a great Government which has inscribed in its highest courts of legislation the great thought that from frozen pole to frozen pole, and from sea to sea, God helping us, there should not be another war within the Western hemisphere. The two continents that form that great hemisphere have pledged themselves to submit their differences to the judgment of chosen men, and to exhaust every rational resource before appealing to the arbitrament of the sword. I stand to-day as representative of the thought, that, God helping us, there should not be war again with the Western hemisphere. Our executive has been charged to extend to all nations of the world a hearty welcome to enter into this great association, to which we look forward as the great triumph of our race, when nations shall no longer learn the art of war, and shall settle contested questions according to reason, justice, and kindness. Yonder (referring to a motto on the wall) is the goal for which we are striving, “on earth, peace, good-will towards men”: and never shall my tongue be silent, or my efforts cease, until that song employs all nations. We have had our war, and we have had enough of it. Twenty-six years ago our land was an armed camp; more than a million of men stood facing each other along great lines, and when we had ceased to fight, 500,000 brave men had wrapped themselves in the mantle of their mortal beauty and gone down to the dust, and a thousand millions of money had been wasted. What we have to understand first of all is what war means—not in its banners, not in its grand equipment, not in its military history, but what it means in a million of individual cases. Will you pardon a single illustration? In one of the great hospitals in which hundreds of men were lying wounded to the death, there was an old man with grey hair, and his old wife kneeling by the bedside of their youngest son, who was stricken to the death. The physician said to the chaplain, “Hasten, hasten, doctor, and you will see something that you will not soon forget.” He saw the mother stroking the hair of her boy, and then falling upon his face to kiss his lips, which were dumb, and then when the struggle had passed, the old grey-haired father rose and put back his grey hair, and then tried to pray. A great many times has that prayer been offered on this fair earth which worships the Prince of Peace. “O God, Thou art just and righteous”—and then he stopped, and he tried again—“O God, Thou art just and righteous and good.” Ah! but what did that cost him? We have resolved, God helping us, that that scene, and such scenes shall never be repeated while the sun shines. That is the goal to which we are looking. Yesterday I worshipped at one of the magnificent temples of this great city: as I entered I passed through the vestibule, where there were effigies of brave men who had carried the flag of the crusaders, and there, at the other end, stood a minister of the Gospel to preach from the text, “To the unknown God,” and he said that on that altar should be placed the name of God, who is love. That is what we are working for. Twenty-five years have changed the map of the world, and if God please, twenty-five more years shall so change it that the old

battle-scarred world will not know itself, but there shall be "Peace on earth and goodwill to men." Cheer up, brothers! Many a man has seen the dawn coming over the Eastern hills when others did not see it. The end comes quickly. As I walked along the riverside, I saw an effigy of Tyndal, the translator of the New Testament; he was burnt at Villeford for circulating the Scriptures. The inscription of his dying words is carved in iron, and within one year after that prayer the Bible was put in every church in England. Every great truth has had to fight for itself—on the high seas, on the mountain tops, and under the earth; but every truth has in it an element of Divine immortality and shall conquer because truth is king. I do not want to trespass, but I am told that there are two minutes yet reserved to me. Fellow-members, all of us seem to see the day afar off, and we seem to expect some great crisis on earth, and some great foretokens in the heavens announcing this reign of peace, but it will come as all great changes have come—surely and imperceptibly, and men will awake some day to find it is here. When, some summers ago, I was sailing to the South Seas, the captain said, "We are going to cross the line." The heavens looked down smilingly and the sea was unmoved, but between one headland and another lay the invisible line which told us that we had passed into another ocean. So will the day come when softly, grandly as in all the works of God, this earth shall pass under a new sky and over all shall be blazoned "On earth peace, goodwill to men."

The CHAIRMAN: Now we will re-cross the ocean, and come to the great Teutonic nation in the centre of Europe.

HERR GUSTAV MAIER.

Herr GUSTAV MAIER, speaking in English: Ladies and Gentlemen,—It is not easy to speak in English. I have the honour to meet you here as a representative of the Peace Society at Frankfort on the Main. It has often been regretted that Germany, which you have been good enough to call the country of poets and philosophers, has given so little practical encouragement to the Peace propaganda. I would venture to suggest that this apathy might be logically explained, more by the political events of the last few decades than by the absence of sympathy with the principles which have now brought us together. Our movement finds plenty of friends in Germany. Only lately, Herr Windthorst, the capable leader of a great party, enthusiastically applauded, in the presence of the assembled representatives of the German Empire, the views of the Italian statesman, Signor Bonghi. It is, moreover, probable that our Emperor, with his strong idealistic tendencies, may—as he has already done with regard to social questions—take the initiative in finding means for the peaceful settlement of international disputes. The amicable arrangements which brought such critical points as the Samoan, Caroline, and African questions to a mutual and satisfactory end without risking a single life—together with Germany's share in the Convention of Geneva, the International Postal Union, and similar movements—might well lead us to hope that we may justly expect great and substantial help from that quarter. If I might be allowed to give a few practical hints towards the furthering of our movement from the German point of view, I would recommend abstinence, as far as possible, from meddling with actual political questions which, particularly in my country, lead to suspicions and injury to our cause. I would urge that we direct our action rather to inculcate ideas which would show to the middle and higher classes the injustice and crime of waging war on our fellow-beings, and which would prove the advantages of peaceful progress. Could we not,

to attain our object, try to gain a greater influence with the newspapers of all parties? Amongst others I would propose, what has been accepted freely by my Masonic friends in Germany, the compilation of a kind of Peace-Bible, composed of quotations from whatever great men of all nations have written in regard to this subject — pearls that could be raised abundantly out of the sea of the world's literature. As we see missionary societies distributing the Holy Bible, this Bible of Peace would be in every man's house in every corner of the world. If we could for instance, bring home to the people the words of Frederick the Great we would successfully diminish the number of those who think it is God's will that war should be. The prophetic words of the man, who was as great a warrior as he was a philosopher, are as follows: " Il paraît cependant, pour le bien de l'humanité, que la mode des guerres de religion est finie et ce serait assurément une folie de moins dans le monde; mais j'ose dire que nous en sommes en partie redevables à l'esprit philosophique qui depuis quelques années prend beaucoup le dessus en Europe; plus on est éclairé et moins on est superstitieux. . . . Les siècles polis qui ont vu fleurir les sciences, n'ont point d'exemples à nous présenter de guerres de religion, ni de guerres séditionnelles. Dans les beaux temps de l'empire romain, je veux dire vers la fin du règne d'Auguste, tout cet empire, qui comprenait presque les deux tiers du monde, était tranquille et sans agitation. Les hommes . . . préféraient les repos, les plaisirs et l'étude à l'ambitieuse rage de s'égorger les uns les autres, soit pour des mots, soit par intérêt, ou pour une funeste gloire. . . . Les sciences ont ainsi toujours contribué à humaniser les hommes, en les rendant plus doux, plus justes et moins portés aux violences. . . . Cette façon de penser aimable et douce se communique insensiblement, de ceux qui cultivent les arts et les sciences, au public et au vulgaire: elle passe de la cour à la ville, et de la ville dans les provinces. On voit alors avec évidence que la nature ne nous forme point assurément pour que nous nous exterminions dans le monde, mais pour que nous nous assistions dans nos communs besoins; que le malheur, les infirmités et la mort nous poursuivent sans cesse, et que c'est une démence extrême que de multiplier les causes de nos misères et de notre destruction. On reconnaît malgré la différence des conditions, l'égalité que la nature a mise entre nous, la nécessité qu'il y a de vivre unis et en paix, de quelque nation, de quelque opinion que nous soyons; que l'amitié et la compassion sont des devoirs universels; en un mot la réflexion corrige en nous tous les défauts du tempérament." I beg you will take these few words as a sincere assurance that what the Frankfort branch can do towards the spreading of our principles throughout Germany, shall be done earnestly and energetically. The public opinion of all nations must be gained for our noble cause, and then truth will tell, and at last victory will crown our philanthropic efforts.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is from that brave old country which has given England the Princess of Wales.

MR. FREDRIK BAJER, M.P.

M. BAJER, M.P., of Denmark, then addressed the meeting in French, as follows:—

Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs,—Pour la cinquième fois j'ai le plaisir de représenter, aux Congrès internationaux de la paix, des associations scandinaves. Mais pour la première fois je les représente hors du continent européen. Nous autres Danois nous avons le même désir que nos amis anglais. Nous ne voulons pas que nos capitales soient entourées de fortifications, de fossés et de remparts, munis de canons

et d'autres instruments homicides et fratricides, je le dis bien en me rappelant le jour où les fortifications de Copenhague divisaient les Danois et les Anglais en deux camps ennemis. Mais le bombardement de Copenhague, en 1807, par la flotte anglaise, n'était pas dû à la nation anglaise, mais à la prépondérance du militarisme européen. Voilà pourquoi nous combattons tous le militarisme, notre ennemi commun ! Le militarisme divise les nations ; la paix, au contraire, les unit. Qui sont ceux qui se sont opposés à ce que l'Angleterre soit réunie au continent européen par un tunnel sous la Manche ? Les militaristes anglais. Un grand géographe français, M. Elisée Reclus, a dit : "La génération actuelle, occupée de guerres et d'armements "pacifiques" voudrait-elle laisser au vingtième siècle l'honneur de rattacher l'Angleterre au Continent de l'Europe, d'unir de nouveau les terres qu'a séparées l'Océan ?" Certainement, le militarisme s'oppose à tous les vrais progrès soit économiques soit moraux. Disons donc aussi à nos amis anglais : "A bas les armes !" Et plus cordialement que jusqu'alors, l'Europe Continentale pourra presser sur son cœur l'Angleterre hospitalière.

The CHAIRMAN : Now, gentlemen, we have here a representative of another northern State--one of the old Scandinavian Kingdoms, the country of the North Star—M. E. T. Borg, M.P., of Sweden.

M. E. T. BORG, M.P.

M. E. T. BORG, M.P. : Ladies and gentlemen, Sweden will never desire war ; it has had too much of that, and it will always be in future on the side of peace. Therefore, I wish the greatest success to all the labours of the Peace Congress.

M. ADOLPH WOLFF then addressed the meeting in French.

The CHAIRMAN : I should have mentioned that we have one other representative of a most interesting country, which has lately emerged from its disintegration, and become one of the great Powers of Europe—Italy. Pray let me ask you to hear the representative of Italy.

SIGNOR E. T. MONETA.

SIGNOR MONETA (Editor of *Il Secolo*, Milan) then addressed the meeting in French as follows, after which the session was adjourned :—

Frères et Soeurs,—Permettez-moi que je vous salue avec ces noms, puisque nous nous croyons dans la fraternité humaine, et poursuivons le même but : l'union de toutes les nations dans une seule famille. Je vous remercie de vos applaudissements, que je crois adressés, non pas à ma personne, mais à la société que je représente ici. Ils auront un écho en Italie, et seront pour mes amis un encouragement à persister avec une énergie toujours croissante dans la rude besogne à laquelle ils se sont dévoués depuis trois ans. Quand nous avons débuté dans notre entreprise, mûs par les chaleureuses exortations de cet infatigable champion de la cause de la paix, le noble président de votre Comité d'organisation, M. Hodgson Pratt, nous étions en très petit nombre ; et on pouvait croire qu'on n'aurait pu faire aucun pas, vu l'indifférence glaciale du public à l'égard de notre propagande. Les principales difficultés nous venaient du monde politique. Chaque parti, à l'en croire, voulait la paix, mais après avoir vaincu ses adversaires. Les républicains nous disaient :—Aidez-

nous à renverser la monarchie, et la paix sera établie du même coup. Les socialistes disaient : C'est la bourgeoisie qui maintient un état de choses qui conduit fatalement à la guerre ; détruisons là et la paix sera faite tout de suite. Les conservateurs nous répondaient à leur tour : il faut supprimer partout l'esprit démagogique ; après nous songerons à la paix. Les vaticanistes aussi avaient leur objection toute prête : Inclinez-vous devant le souverain pontife, rétablissez son pouvoir temporel ; cela nous mènera à la paix du monde, qu'on attend si vivement. C'est toujours la même illusion : prétendre d'être eux seuls dans la pleine possession de la vérité toute entière. C'est comme ces despotes et ces démagogues qui jadis, à ceux qui réclamaient la liberté, répondaient : "Oui, la liberté nous la donnerons à tous, mais à la condition que tous pensent et agissent comme nous voudrions." Par cette voie, vous le voyez, on n'arriverait jamais à la paix. Nous répondions à tous : Si la paix, comme vous l'admirez, est un bien, il faut commencer par elle ; il faut la vouloir à tout prix. Une idée qui est commune à des partis, lesquels sont divisés sur les autres, ne peut être que vraie et juste. Pour réussir dans toutes choses, il faut écarter les idées qui divisent, et s'attacher à celles qui sont acceptées par tous les hommes de bonne foi et de bonne volonté : c'est en ce moment notre cas. C'est pour cela que la paix fait son chemin, malgré tous les obstacles qu'opposent les vieux préjugés et la mauvaise volonté du petit nombre des intéressés à maintenir la jalousie et l'antagonisme entre les peuples. En Italie, dans les derniers temps, l'idée de la paix a fait dans l'opinion publique, ordinairement si apathique chez nous, un très grand progrès. Nous comptons à présent sur l'élite des étudiants de Milan, de Pavie, de Turin, de Rome qui ont formé des Comités de paix, et sur les savants les plus distingués, tels que Henri Ferri, Bonghi, et les sénateurs Villari et Perez de Palerme. Celui-ci (qui est octogénaire et le plus illustre des patriotes Siciliens) a prononcé, il y a peu de jours, à l'inauguration de la Société Palermitaine pour la paix, un discours qui a fait sensation dans toute l'Italie. Il y a mentionné ce beau jugement de Philon d'Alexandrie le contemporain de Platon : Aucun être isolé ne peut se suffire à lui-même par la *suprema lex cosmica* de la coopération de tous les êtres de l'univers, et par l'unité et la solidarité de toutes les nations. C'est le fondement même de notre doctrine de paix ; c'est l'idée maîtresse du progrès. Attachons-nous à elle ; elle nous éclairera le chemin que nous devons parcourir, elle nous aidera à vaincre les obstacles qui nous séparent encore du grand but que nous voulons poursuivre : la fraternité humaine.

THE CONVERSAZIONE.

The first meeting of a social character in connection with the proceedings of the Congress took the form of a *conversazione* held at the Westminster Town Hall on Monday evening, to which all the British, Foreign, and American delegates attending the Congress, and a large number of friends of the movement, were invited. The visitors, who were received on entering by the Hon. D. Dudley Field, assisted by Mrs. H. Richard, Mrs. Southey, and other members of the Reception Committee, numbered in all upwards of 300, amongst whom were Sir George Campbell, M.P., Mr. Samuel Smith, M.P., Signor Tito Pagliardini, Mrs. Belva A. Lockwood, Miss Colenso, Mrs. Ormiston Chant, Mr. W. Hazell, Mr. W. Evans Darby, Mr. Hodgson Pratt, Mr. J. Fred Green, Rev. R. Thomas, D.D., and Rev. R. B. Howard, U.S.A., Mr. J. Allanson Picton, M.P., Rev. R. Spiers, Rev. Dr. Tyler, Mr. Percy W. Bunting, Mr. J. Hilton, Mr. J. H. Raper, Rev. J. P. Gledstone, Rev. J. O. Jackson, Rev. Newman Hall, Mr. W. Doubleday, L.C.C., and many others closely connected with the various Peace and Arbitration Societies throughout Europe and America. The room in which the gathering was held was appropriately decorated for the occasion, the walls being hung liberally with bunting intermingled with the ensigns of various nations. Below the platform was the figure of a dove, and over it the motto, "His name shall be called the Prince of Peace," whilst flowers in profusion were scattered all over the front. Around the walls the following appropriate mottoes were hung: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will towards men," "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more," "They shall not hurt nor destroy in all My holy mountain, saith the Lord." The musical programme which was ably performed by several of the friends of the delegates and others connected with the Congress, consisted of instrumental and vocal music and recitations. The choir sang three pretty choruses, "The Anvil Chorus," "How lovely are the messengers that preach us the Gospel of Peace!" and "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings." Miss Edith A. Darby, with considerable skill, recited Longfellow's "King Robert of Sicily," whilst Mr. Hodgson Pratt gave Longfellow's "The Arsenal

at Springfield." Miss Annie Harvey played two pianoforte solos, "Lorelei" and "La Napolitana." Miss Harvey was loudly applauded for her two songs, "The Harp that once through Tara's Halls" and "My Heart and Lute," whilst the other items in the programme included a well rendered song by Mrs. Marshall, the sister of Mr. Santley. Altogether a very enjoyable evening was spent, those present expressing great satisfaction at all the arrangements.

TUESDAY MORNING, 15TH JULY.

The morning session commenced at ten o'clock, and was well attended. The subject for consideration was

SECTION A :—

“THE CHRISTIAN AND OTHER RELIGIOUS ASPECTS OF THE QUESTION OF PEACE AND WAR.”

The PRESIDENT : Ladies and Gentlemen,—Sir Wilfrid Lawson, whose name is so well known to you, has been good enough to say that he will relieve me from the duties of the chair for this day, for which I am very much obliged to him, and I am sure you will be very much obliged to me.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON, M.P., then took the chair amidst applause.

OPENING WITH PRAYER.

Mr. W. EVANS DARBY : Mr. Chairman, Ladies, and Gentlemen,—The Report of the Procedure Committee on the resolution that was submitted yesterday will be presented later on. It has been felt, however, that as the special subject for discussion this morning is a religious subject, an appropriate opening of the meeting, without anticipating the report which will be presented, would be that a few minutes should be given for silent devotion. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that will follow immediately.

The meeting then engaged in silent prayer, after which

MINUTES.

Mr. W. E. DARBY read the minutes of the business meeting on Monday, which were confirmed.

REPORT OF PROCEDURE COMMITTEE.

Mr. W. E. DARBY, presenting the report of the Committee on Procedure, said : There were two questions yesterday referred by the Congress to the Committee on Procedure, the first relating to the opening of the meetings of the Congress by devotion, and the second in connection with the resolution that was moved—that a letter should be sent to the Queen. The Committee have very carefully considered the first question, and they have felt that there was a great deal of difficulty connected with it. Probably the majority of the members of the Congress would prefer—I think there is no doubt they would prefer—that the meeting should open with devotion—(hear, hear)—but a by no means inconsiderable minority would prefer that no such exercises were adopted. The Committee, therefore, felt that it could not recommend that any formal devotion should commence the proceedings of the Congress, but they would respectfully suggest that inasmuch as devotion does not consist in forms but in the spirit, those who are anxious to begin the meetings in that way should assemble five minutes before the time and spend that interval in devotion. They could not break the unity of the Congress. Some of our friends would be compelled—they were represented on the Committee, and their views were put before us—to remain away until that opening procedure,

if it were adopted, had been got through ; consequently, we felt the unity of the Congress was involved, and that it would be far better to keep the unity of spirit in the bond of peace rather than have any formal expression of devotion. With regard to the second question, the Committee report that they recommend the Congress to appoint a sub-committee, selecting the members from themselves, who should prepare a Memorial, not to our sovereign only—for it might possibly be invidious to select one sovereign out of a number—but to all the heads of civilised States. If the Congress accepts that report, it will be your duty first of all to appoint this Committee to prepare such an address.

The report having been adopted,

COMMITTEE ON MEMORIAL.

The CHAIRMAN said the next business was to appoint a Committee to draw up the Memorial referred to, and requested that nominations be now made.

Mr. HOWARTH (of Liverpool) moved, and a delegate seconded the resolution, that the matter be left in the hands of the Bureau.

Mr. WIGHAM moved an amendment, seconded by Baron DE ST. GEORGES ARMSTRONG, that the names might be suggested by the Procedure Committee, and be brought to the next sitting of the Congress.—The amendment was carried.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON, M.P.

The CHAIRMAN : Ladies and Gentlemen,—I got a letter this morning from a constituent. He said :—“Will you kindly give me a ticket of admission to the House of Commons ? I have never been in London before, and I am anxious to see the place where they make so many mistakes.” Well, I don't know whether I am not looked upon as one of the mistaken people, and whether you have not made a mistake in asking me to come here—if only for one reason—a reason that you have already seen manifested—that I am not able to speak any language except my own, and that very indifferently. I assure you that I feel it a great deprivation not to be able to express my feelings of good-will towards my fellow men from other countries who are here to-day in a manner which would be quite intelligible to them. There are no people who ever existed to whom I owe so great a grudge as the people who tried to build up the tower of Babel. Every day of my life I hate them. For I feel that they have brought upon us one of the greatest inconveniences which this world is subject to. I wish we had something like that language which I have heard recommended—I think it is called Volapük—by which we should all be able to communicate with one another. But, ladies and gentlemen, although there may be different tongues here to-day, I feel that our hearts are one. We all feel and admire that sublime sentence which says, “God has made of one blood all nations of the earth to dwell together in unity.” But, unfortunately, they don't dwell together in unity ; and it is to try to make them live in unity, to carry out the will of God, that this Congress has assembled. I said that I came from the House of Commons. In the House of Commons we are supposed to be all politicians. Now that puts me in a difficulty again, because when I read over the rules which you have decided on to regulate the meetings here, I find that “Speakers are requested to avoid in their addresses any direct allusion to the political

events of the day ; should they persist in so doing, the president shall call them to order, and, if necessary, withdraw the right to speak." But as I am president to-day, I don't know exactly how that will work. But I shall carry out the rule. I shall make no "direct" allusions to political events, but make some indirect ones. Now we are met here this morning, according to the programme, specially to consider the religious aspects of this great Peace question. I remember—I think it was during the Anti-Corn Law Agitation somebody wrote a tract entitled "Should Religious men be Political?" And somebody wrote another tract, and I think the name of it was quite a sufficient answer, "Should Political Men be Religious?" That settled the question, to my mind. If you are to have politics at all you can't do without them. I think they should be joined to your religion, or else your politics are not much worth. But there is a kind of idea abroad that religious people ought not to meddle with politics—one of the most mischievous ideas that ever injured the human race. What did the great *Times* newspaper say the other day when we were carrying on an agitation, with which we have nothing to do to-day, an agitation against what we thought was wrong? *The Times* said, "What does it matter what the great religious associations say! The House of Commons is not going to be influenced by them." Ah! but the House of Commons was influenced by them. The man who wrote that forgot the great maxim of John Stuart Mill, who said that "one man with a belief is equal to a hundred men with only interests." And so we, who had a belief in that matter, were triumphant over those who were only interested. And, ladies and gentlemen, so it has always been. I say that all the great triumphs of the world in political and public matters have arisen from the great religious feeling at the bottom of all those movements, and when I say religious feeling, I mean the great moral feeling, the great principle of obedience to the moral law which lies at the foundation of all real religion. What was it that did away with slavery? Why, it was the great moral feeling that it was wrong to rob your fellow man of his liberty. What gave us Free Trade? Why, it was the moral feeling that it was wrong to starve your fellow men for the benefit of a class. What gave us Reform? The great moral feeling that it was wrong to set one man up politically over another. And now I suppose all you who are here believe in the great moral doctrine, that it is wrong to settle disputes by the arbitrament of force, instead of by the arbitrament of reason. In fact, you believe in the great principle laid down by my ever-revered friend Mr. John Bright when he said, "Force is no remedy." But that is not the doctrine of the world exactly, and is not the doctrine of many so-called religious people of this country. I am always very much surprised at the way religion is carried on in this country. You send a boy to the Sunday-school, and you tell him, "My dear boy, you must love your enemies; if any boy strikes you, don't strike him again; try to reform him by loving him." Well, the boy stays in the Sunday-school till he is 14 or 15 years of age, and then his friends say, "Put him in the Army." What has he to do in the Army? Why, not to love his enemies, but whenever he sees an enemy to run him through the body with a bayonet. That is the nature of all religious teaching in this country. I do not think that that is a very good way of carrying out the precepts of religion. I think if it is a good thing for the boy to love his enemy, it is a good thing for the man to love his enemy. It is nearly nineteen centuries now since the foundation of the Christian religion, and all this time what have the Christian nations been doing? An account was published the other day, I presume tolerably correct, which showed that in Europe the great Christian nations keep among them—they are almost all Christian except Turkey—the nations of Europe, the great powers, keep among them,

considering the reserves as well as the men, who are always ready for action, somewhere about 28,000,000 of armed men to settle quarrels by killing one another, instead of by arguing. That is what the Christian nations of the world are doing at this moment. It is a very expensive way also : for this publication which I saw— I believe it was correct—made out that since the year 1872 these nations had spent the almost incredible amount of £1,500,000,000 of money in preparing and settling their quarrels by killing one another. Now it seems to me that with that state of things one of two positions must be accepted, either that Christianity is a failure, or that those who profess to expound Christianity have failed in expounding it properly. You may take your choice of those two positions. I have not much doubt in my own mind which one you will think is the correct one when you have thought it over. As to the religious aspects of this question—well, the religious people in this country, a great number of them, seem to rejoice greatly when they hear of any slaughter of the people whom they are pleased to call their enemies. When a man commits murder in this country, if they catch him they hang him, but this country sends out soldiers and great generals to kill thousands and thousands of people, and when they come home, instead of being hanged they are sent to the House of Lords to govern us, and the religious people have great services in their cathedrals and churches thanking God for the slaughter which has been accomplished. When I read of these thanksgivings I am reminded of Burns's lines. When he heard the bells ringing and the services going on in thanks for a great victory, he said :

Ye hypocrites ! are these your pranks
To murder men, and then give thanks ?
For very shame, proceed no further :
God won't accept of thanks for murder.

But of course there is great excuse in this country for that sort of thing because a great number of those who take a leading part in religious performances are connected with the State and the Sovereign ; and the Sovereign, the head of the State in this country, is also the head of the Church, and of course those who are in a church of that sort are obliged to obey the head of the Church, which is the Sovereign, and the Sovereign acts through the will of the Parliament of this country. I do not look for much change for the better from that sort of people ; I do not look for the great success of our peace movement to the high and the mighty, not many great, not many rich, not many noble are with us. I do not know that they ever will be : but I look to the democracies of England and of Europe to carry out the great principles which we are here to advocate. Why should we despair ? Why should we think things are going on so badly ? It is only a very few years since the democracies really got any power in this country at all. Government before that had been of the classes, by the classes, for the classes ; but now a change has come over the spirit of our nation, and here in England, Government is of the people, for the people, and by the people. And when we get the people right, all will be right. When they once understand this question, they will sweep away this vile system for ever. We may be encouraged. I speak with great delicacy concerning foreign countries, and with ignorance, too ; but from what I can gather, I believe in France there has been a strong condemnation of what has been called the adventurous colonial policy, which is, I believe, the great motive power in French politics at the present day, so far as I can understand it. Look at Germany, supposed to be the greatest military power at the present that we have. There is evidently the greatest discontent with the burdens which the people are bearing in that country. And in England, look back at the General Election of

1880—you see I can allude to that, not being directly political—in England in 1880 the great success which attended one party in the State at that election was because that party declared for the equal rights of nations and for the condemnation of the horrible war spirit which was then raging. The people of this country endorsed that doctrine, and I believe they will again when it is fairly put before them. And then look at America, that great Republic of the West. I heard Mr. Hodgson Pratt read yesterday a statement as to the decision which has been come to by the Legislature in America in favour of International Arbitration. That is a great step in the history of this movement. This Congress, this Inter-national or Universal Peace Congress, is intended for one object, and that is to spread the truth concerning these matters, to point out to the nations a more excellent way, and I think that you are doing a good work in attempting that. Of course the Press of this country will not make a great deal of your meetings. Naturally they only write for what at the present moment is of most interest to the people, and you cannot expect to have a report of your proceedings equal to a report of a glove-fight at the Pelican Club; that interests the people at the present moment far more, and, therefore, the Press writes for what interests the people; but you have to excite an interest in those far nobler movements which we are discussing to-day. Of course, you will be laughed at. Everybody will be laughed at who tries to do any good. Of course, you will be reviled; of course, you will be reproached—that is the lot of all reformers. Everybody would be a reformer if it was not a disagreeable business, and the more you are reviled the more the probability is that you are doing what is right, and if you are true men and women—which I believe you to be—the more you are reviled, the more you are ridiculed, and the more you are reproached, the harder will you work for the good cause in which you are engaged. We do not expect to win this peaceful battle to-morrow, perhaps not the next day, but we are looking to the future; we are looking to the children and the children's children, who shall come after us, and who are to make the world happier and better, and we want to show them the way.

Every age, on him who strays
 From its broad and beaten ways,
 Pours its sevenfold vials.
 Happy he whose inward ear
 Angel whisperings can hear
 Above the rabble's laughter.
 And when hatred's faggots burn,
 Through the smoke can still discern
 The coming, grand hereafter.

It is for the hereafter you and I to-day are working, and I believe that we are doing a work which, in God's good time, will do much to improve this sorrow-laden and sin-stained world, and therefore it is that in your honest and your unselfish endeavours I, for one, bid you the heartiest God-speed.

Mr. HODGSON PRATT gave a *résumé* of Sir W. Lawson's address in French for the information of foreign delegates.

The CHAIRMAN: The next part of the business is to move a resolution on Christian teaching about war.

INTRODUCTION OF SUBJECTS.

Mr. W. E. DARBY: You are aware, of course, that our English custom is to introduce resolutions by moving and

seconding them. The Committee on Procedure have decided that two papers shall be read, and you will kindly take those papers as if they came in the form of moving and seconding the resolution that I have the pleasure to read :—

RESOLUTION I.

(ENGLISH).

“ The Congress affirms its belief that the brotherhood of man involves as a necessary consequence a brotherhood of nations, in which the true interests of all are acknowledged to be identical. The Congress is convinced that the true basis for an enduring peace will be found in the application by nations of this great principle in all their relations one to another.”

(FRENCH).

“ Le Congrès affirme son opinion que la fraternité entre les hommes implique comme conséquence nécessaire une fraternité entre les nations, dans laquelle les vrais intérêts de chacune sont reconnus identiques. Le Congrès est convaincu que la vraie base d'une paix durable consiste dans l'application de ce grand principe par les peuples dans toutes leurs relations mutuelles.”

The following paper prepared by Mr. Edward Butler, of Leeds, was then read :—

THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN, HOW TO PROMOTE IT.

Most people have, at some time, been caught in a dense crowd, and carried hither and thither without a chance of escape. One of the things that in such a case strikes the tremulous nerves of the prisoner is the existence of what we may call the Spirit of the Crowd. No one admits that he is pushing, no one squeezing; every one is ready to make affidavit that the pressure which threatens your extinction is not *his* fault. Everyone, like you, is a sufferer, not an inflicter, of suffocation. The crowd becomes a malignant Entity, sublimated from all the individuals composing it, and independent of them. Under these circumstances one strenuous voice of command will sometimes control the spirit of the crowd, and “ guide its steps into the way of peace.” This experience is repeated in the crowd of individual judgments, which unite to form public opinion, resulting in legislative and administrative pressure, sometimes of a crushing kind. And in these crises a strong trumpet voice, from the mountain heights of God's moral law, will often avail marvellously to turn the crowd into the right way. It is, indeed, our business to call on the crowd to hear “ the voice of the arc hangel and the trump of God,” which, to the sensitive ear, is ever sounding. It is not *our* oratory, *our* rhetoric, *our* persuasive writings that can move the mass of men; but we can bid them listen, and perhaps secure a momentary hush of rattling wheels and trampling feet and eager voices, so that, in the silence, there may fall from above words which shall sway the spirit of the crowd, and change its purpose into conformity with heavenly counsels.

Whatever methods we may adopt of practical detail, whatever appeals we may make to the interests of commerce, of imperial finance, or of domestic happiness, we must, it appears to me, ever give the first place to those simple but majestic moral principles which have divine life in them, and power to control the set of public opinion. Among such principles I place the doctrine of “ The Fatherhood of God,” and its pendant the “ Brotherhood of man.” When this truth has sunk deep into prepared hearts, and sent its roots downward and its branches upward, the song-birds will come and dwell there, and the raven and the vulture will take flight. That “ plant of renown ” will overshadow and dispossess the wicked old maxim, “ Everyone for himself and God for us all.”

How shall we train and treat this plant so as to secure its flower and fruit of peace? We must create the atmosphere in which it can grow. We must change the climate. The great Calamities of the carboniferous age have dwindled down into the little “ mare's tails ” of our ditches, because their atmospheric environment has been altered: and the military habit of thoughts, the instincts for “ blood and iron,” will

surely die down and shrivel to the dimensions of a specimen-glass if we can succeed in suitably modifying the moral atmosphere. An iceberg, that would take a regiment of sappers and miners to blast to fragments, soon passes away in the Gulf Stream. In what way, then, can we assist in so diffusing the grand truth of the Fatherhood of God that its corollary, the Brotherhood of Man, shall take root and grow amongst us, not as a tender exotic in a theological hot-house, but robust as a British oak that "stands four-square to all the winds that blow"? Now, let it be observed, for our encouragement that the trend or tendency of the times is with us. There is less dogma and more life, less scholastic divinity and more humanity. Religion is less a matter of ornamental cut-glass, and more of a fragrant blossoming flower, with sweet fruit ripening under its beauty. In old times, Roman or Grecian, the sense of brotherhood was a "Lost Chord." The very string seemed missing from the lute of Humanity; now it is the note men listen for, and hail, and repeat. When a venerable statesman helps an old apple woman across Piccadilly, or a Royal person takes off her water-proof and spreads it over a forlorn drenched wanderer, or a sailor with his life in his hands springs into the sea to rescue a drowning mate, all hearers and readers acclaim the glory of manifested brotherhood. We have reached the eccentric stage of happy inconsistency. We equip mighty armies to tear and blast one another into fragments with all the infernal skill that the "Prince of this World" can suggest; and, having taken counsel with Apollyon, we follow up our armies with a "Red Cross" contingent to soothe and comfort, and if possible recover, as many as we can of those that are only half killed. "Oh! Mr. Smith," said a hazy hearer of his, "I owe you a great deal of gratitude. Before you came to this parish I cared for neither God nor devil. Now, thanks to you, sir, I love them both." But that state of mind is one of transition; and we may hope that the Pilgrim of the Ages—the Human Race—will struggle out of the Slough of Despond on the other side of the Celestial City.

It seems clear to the writer that every concrete illustration of the presence of the sympathetic and unselfish spirit of Christ, the Elder Brother of our fallen but redeemed race, in the hearts, lives, and actions of His followers, is a direct contribution to the atmosphere we wish to create. We do not crave logical proofs—we want living specimens. They will multiply vivaciously. We cannot give up pulpit and platform; they are needed for the interpretation, by the light of God's word, of what goes on in current history, and of the Divine order and purpose disclosed by the succession of events; but the great need is the raw material of the word-loom—namely, deeds of love, demonstrations of brotherhood, on the august basis of a common relation to our Father who is in Heaven. "Father," said a little lad to a minister who had laid down some stiff proposition to his son, "is that really true, or is it only preaching?" Is human brotherhood really true, or is it "only preaching"? Every loving, kindly, unselfish deed we do for those who have no other claim on us than the common brotherhood, freshens the air with breezes in which war withers, and begins to perish without axe or mattock.

We shall not do much to bring in the holy and happy time by collecting masses of statistics. The number of thousands of men who perished in battle between such a date and such another date, the number of millions of pounds wasted on this or that war, and the other terrible figures, are very impressive to those who can digest and use them; but for ordinary men statistics are somewhat like grass. They want a cow to eat the grass and turn it into milk, and then they can nourish noble thoughts upon the product. Meadows of statistics are turned into food for heart and mind by the kindly Christ-like deeds of hearts that assimilate them, incorporate them, turn them into motives, principles of life, vital force.

The Christian Brotherhood that we have to illustrate is a widely different thing from the hollow good-fellowship that has been accustomed to stand as one of the Three Graces in the group "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity." Awful crimes, as a victim of the guillotine declared, have been wrought in the name of Liberty; Equality has often spent its strength in pulling down from above rather than building up from below; and Fraternity has degenerated into mere companionship for selfish ends.

The Brotherhood we have first to feel, and then to illustrate, has its character determined by its source. The nature of the brotherly relation is fixed by the filial relation. It is "perfect as the Father in Heaven is perfect." Some day a blaze of moral illumination will flood men's thoughts about war. They will perceive, as the twilight passes into daylight, the shocking profanity of going forth to battle thirsting for the blood of those of the opposite camp, who, it may be, have, like themselves, ushered in the battle morning by hands clasped and eyes turned to heaven, and the prayer, "Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name, Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven."

We do not dogmatise pragmatically against those who think that defensive war

is still a necessity, and that we cannot yet dismantle our war-ships and dismiss our soldiers. We approach the solution from a different quarter of the heavens. We ask men to believe in the prayer their lips so lightly utter, and use every form and style and occasion to illustrate their belief in word and still more in deed. We ask men to believe that in the solemn " latter days " and close of the Gospel Dispensation upon which our lot is cast, Christ the Elder Brother is actually moving amongst us unseen by the bodily eye, though not unperceived by sensitive and watchful souls, and that it is the penetrating whisper of His Voice that we hear when we feel conscious of a summons to proclaim with joyful shouting the old but neglected truth of the Brotherhood of Men under the Fatherhood of God.

The resolution was seconded by the reading of portions of a paper by Miss MARY L. COOKE, of London, entitled,

OUR BROTHERHOOD A POWER.

Those glowing words, " The Brotherhood of Man," enshrine for us a truth which is a treasury of power, but which was long suffered to remain hidden, and in great measure inoperative. For centuries the world had so far forgotten the existence of such a truth that when, in the last century it again made its appearance in the world of thought, it was hailed with enthusiasm as a new discovery. More familiar to us now with the lapse of time, the idea of our fraternity continues to be an inspiration to those who hope for their race.

Again, through all ages, there have been, as there are now, unnumbered beautiful acknowledgments of the truth in practice. Brotherly kindness, sympathy, mutual helpfulness, were found in the world long before thinkers gave them formal leave to exist ; and in countless instances man has ever surrendered his life for man, where there has been in the ordinary sense no tie of kindred, and no claim of any kind save that of a common humanity.

In all this we may rejoice, but not as in a work fully accomplished. Those among us to whom the thought of our brotherhood is most dear, will be the first to acknowledge that we do not as yet believe in it with a faith worthy of such a truth. How many of us really know what it is to find a brother or a sister in every man or woman whom we may meet ? one whose welfare is in very truth dear to us as our own ? Yet what less than this can brotherhood mean ? And if, in individual life, we may find instances of a state of feeling approaching this, how often shall we find traces of it in our social and political life ? And yet we cannot, surely, put our brotherhood on and off to suit different occasions. If men are brothers in private life, they cannot cease to be so because associated in communities.

Now, if fraternity is really a truth, it is a truth that must be realised in action ; and, so realised, will exercise an influence on society, powerful and beneficent beyond calculation.

And it is precisely at the present moment that such a beneficent influence is needed. The inadequacy of force as a remedy for social disorders becomes every day more apparent, leading us to seek a more lasting social foundation ; a new law, broader and deeper than the old, and powerful where that has been found weak. Our sense of right, too, is leading us in the same direction as our necessities. We may note a growing impatience of all that is hard and unsympathetic in the relations of man with man ; of selfish advantages taken ; of privileges unshared ; of all, in short, which practically denies our brotherhood. On the realization of our brotherhood depends the future of mankind.

It is of the utmost importance that we should find a sure basis for a principle which has such a part to play in the regeneration of society. And such a basis we may find, as nowhere else, in the life and teaching of Jesus Christ. He was not content with the mere assertion of our brotherhood, nor did He leave us to find a ground for it in the belief of a common physical origin of the race. His way of teaching mankind the great truth of our fraternity was by making known to us a Father of whose great family every human being forms a part, and in whom, therefore, all are bound together by a tie of the utmost closeness. We must observe that Christ did not merely name this Heavenly Father, but, in His own life and death, revealed Him to us ; and that on the character of that revelation depends its significance as regards our brotherhood, and its power to inspire a lively and enthusiastic sense of our fraternal tie. To receive Christ's teaching respecting Himself, and His oneness with the Father, is to find presented to us, through the life and death of Him who was also a man among men, a living image of the Heavenly Fatherhood, unsurpassable in its glory of righteousness and self-sacrificing love. In such a Father, the members of our race are, indeed, bound together in bonds inexpressibly strong and tender ; by

teaching us to know him, Christ best taught us to know and to love one another. And further He who reveals the perfect Fatherhood, reveals also the perfect Brotherhood. In the record of His life among men we are taught as never elsewhere, what brotherliness can mean. We find visible there an innocence and harmlessness more heroic than all that has been known of heroism in the world besides—an untiring energy of love, expressing itself in continual deeds of blessing—the most tender consideration, the quickest sympathy, a forgiveness which was a fresh revelation to the world of the meaning of love, a self-forgetfulness which might be better described as the absence of any self-life at all; and finally, we find all this crowned by a death of willing self-surrender for the sake of mankind; not for the good alone, but for all even the most unworthy.

This is not the place to dwell on a theme which must ever be to Christians sacred beyond all others; but we must not fail to observe how the death of Christ, even more than His life, has taught us what brotherhood means, by showing us how, in abandoning the principal of selfish isolation, we find our truest life in the life of all. This was His law: "He that loveth his life shall lose it, he that loseth it...shall find it"; and we see now how that life which was once laid down for the sake of the Brotherhood, has become, even here on earth, a "quickening spirit"; for ever breathing love and brotherhood into the hearts of men.

Once more: By the very fact of Christ's identification of Himself with our humanity, in life and in death, He has for ever consecrated that humanity. To belong to the human race, has become a dignity beyond all those accidental and temporary dignities which have been so overvalued; and every man or woman, without distinction, has the strongest of all claims to our love, that of being allied to Him.

* * * * *

Such is brotherhood as taught by Christ. The practical results which follow from it are not far to seek.

First, as we have seen, it implies a new theory of life. Regarding ourselves no longer as isolated beings, but as members of a great family, we shall seek our happiness not in selfish gain of any kind, material or intellectual; not in wealth, nor in power, nor in knowledge, nor in culture, for their own sakes; but in sharing that which has been entrusted to us; in giving ourselves for the highest good of all.

The thought is not discredited because there have been mistaken attempts at realising it, and because movements that aimed at the general good, have ended in a mistaken adoption of that most unbrotherly of methods, violence. For if we truly feel our brotherhood—most of all if we feel our brotherhood in Christ—the consciousness of it will influence the means we adopt, as well as the ends we propose. However noble the object, we dare not, we cannot, while we remember our kinship with him, act unlovingly towards any one of those whom he calls brethren. Nor can we expect to gain any good for our race, by breaking His law of brotherly love towards even the humblest member of that race. For just as truly as each individual has his true life in the life of all mankind, just as truly does mankind live, does Christ live, in each individual; and apart from love to individuals, there is and can be no true love of humanity, nor can there be, in the sense, any service to humanity.

How much a true belief in our brotherhood will influence our practice as individuals, we must not here pause to consider; our present concern being rather with its bearing on social and national life.

Our social and national ties are surely not opposed to the universal one, but may be steps towards realising it, if only we do not permit these partial ties to become selfish limitations; thus marring their beauty and destroying their significance. Such is the narrowness which has made social differences into barriers to check the outflow of human sympathies, and has turned our patriotism into a hateful denial of our humanity, and of Him who is the head of our race. But there is hope of better things. We believe that Christ's teaching, now better understood than perhaps ever before, and Christ's own spirit of brotherhood, is teaching the world to understand that in the deepest sense there can be no conflict of interests; that the good of one individual or one nation is the good of all, and the loss or injury of one the loss or injury of all. And further, are we not learning to see that, in the case of those immediate and temporary interests which must sometimes be opposed, though by no means so often as our pride and impatience would fancy, we shall surely learn that as the brother proves his fraternity by self-sacrifice rather than by self-assertion—by the humility of love, and not by struggling for supremacy, so the true man proves his manhood. Yes, and the nation its claim to a place in the brotherhood of nations. For the life of nations is not so wholly different from that of individuals, that we may not apply the same

great principles to it. If an individual who chooses to separate himself from all human sympathies, is an object of pity, so must a nation be that separates itself from the world's larger life ; and more pitiable still, a nation that lives in hostility to other nations. A true sense of our fraternity must quickly destroy all enmities, and all rivalries, between nations as between individuals—the only kind of emulation that is compatible with the larger brotherly love, the love of humanity, is that generous emulation that “ provokes to love and to good works.”

It must be the earnest desire of all who love their kind, that hostility between nations may be brought to an end in this way, and not by the mere substitution of class sympathies for national feeling. For until these partial sympathies are purified and elevated by a true love of mankind, they bring their own hostilities with them, just as the national sentiment has done. If, instead of the destruction of national enmities in the white heat of love, there should merely be a suppression of them by other and more powerful enmities, it is possible that the change may be for the worse rather than for the better. If the extinction of war is to be more than nominal it must be accomplished by the spirit of brotherhood and love ; and all lower motives must be merely subsidiary to this.

It is indeed conceivable that war between nations may be put an end to, or at least suspended, in Europe, if nowhere else, by some active protest of the masses against the intolerable burdens it imposes, the enormous tax, both in property and in blood, which it demands. But if this should be the whole, the change will hardly be a radical one ; for unwillingness to surrender one's own life and property does not necessarily imply unwillingness to take the lives or appropriate the goods of others. A popular movement against war, to be truly successful, must proceed not only from self-interest, but far more from that lively regard for the interests of others which is inspired by brotherly sympathy. The protest must be made in the spirit of love ; and must be directed less against the suffering of wrong than against the doing of wrong, for on such a principle, and on such a principal alone, are we sure of final victory.

Therefore, whatever direct means it is well to adopt for the prevention of war between nations, the most practical means of all, because the most thorough, is the cherishing of that Christian spirit of brotherhood, which would render it impossible even to defend, much less to make war. Let the arguments for war be ever so cogent—let the seeming necessity of an appeal to arms, in any given case, be ever so urgent—arguments and apparent necessities will alike be swept away by the strong advancing tide of that fraternal love which not only will not, but cannot, harm one fellow man, a child of the Heavenly Father, a member of the family of which the Elder Brother is Christ.

Precis of the following important papers, written for the Congress on the special subject of the Resolution, were read by Mr. W. E. DARBY.

INVIOLABILITÉ DE LA VIE HUMAINE.

Mémoire présenté par M. SARRAZIN, secrétaire—trésorier de la Société de Paix et d'Arbitrage International du Familistère de Guise (Aisne).

Jamais aucun écrivain, avant le regretté Mr. Godin, le fondateur éminent de l'association du familistère de Guise, n'a autant insisté sur le principe de l'inviolabilité de la vie humaine. On a dit avant lui, et de nos jours dans de nombreuses et vaillantes publications émanant de nobles esprits, de belles intelligences, que : “ ne pouvant rien créer, il ne faut rien détruire,” que les lois de tous les peuples tant soit peu civilisés réprouvant l'homicide, les collectivités, pas plus que les individus, n'ont le droit de donner la mort à un de leurs membres, qu'une exécution ordonnée par la société est un assassinat, par conséquent un crime, la Morale, la Vérité, la Justice étant universelles. Que, d'ailleurs, les lois sont toujours temporaires, bonnes aujourd'hui, fausses demain : “ à vérité en dedà, erreur au delà,” et malheureusement trop fréquemment dictées par l'égoïsme. Bien souvent on ne peut juger que sur des apparences parfois trompées, il faut réfléchir, étant même admise cette énormité que l'homme soit en droit de supprimer la vie de son semblable, au grand nombre d'erreurs judiciaires. Quelle chose épouvantable que l'exécution d'un innocent ! Alors même que le crime est surabondamment prouvé, peut-on sonder le fond de la conscience du malheureux qui s'est laissé aller au crime ? Connaît-on les causes des effets produits ? N'ont-elles pas leurs racines dans des époques éloignées, englobant d'innombrables responsabilités et ne sont-elles pas surtout amenées par l'imperfection sociale. La société avait-elle accompli son devoir, au moins en partie, envers ce membre

dévoiyé ? Lui avait-elle, par des dispositions humanitaires de la plus élémentaire justice, assuré du travail, l'existence matérielle ? Avait-elle veillé sur son éducation, sur son instruction ? Par des milliers d'exemples que nous avons constamment sous les yeux nous pouvons affirmer qu'elle était, en général, restée au dessous de cette tâche. Et cependant, sans hésiter presque, elle punit d'une manière barbare, cruelle, féroce, des crimes qu'elle même a suggérés, pour ainsi dire, par son imprudence, par son irrévéoyance, par son incurie, par son égoïsme ! Elève-t-on des loups pour les jeter dans la bergerie ? N'avons-nous pas aussi les monomanes du crime, du vol, des pratiques étranges ? Est-ce que les nombreux travaux scientifiques faisant irruption dans le domaine psychologique, malgré les académies, n'ont pas démontré avec évidence que certaines affections, lésions morales, alcoolisme, se transmettent aussi bien que la phthisie, la syphilis, c'est-à-dire que la pourriture est aussi bien véhiculée, de génération en génération, au moral qu'au physique, au matériel qu'au spirituel ? Et la suggestion, l'hypnotisme, qui donnent tant à réfléchir à nos juges ! N'y-a-t-il pas lieu de méditer avec une certaine anxiété sur tant de cas observés de nos jours, présents à tous les esprits ? Le coupable est-il toujours bien celui qui a frappé ? Ne serait-ce pas un inspirateur qui reste dans l'ombre et que la justice ne pourra saisir, son ignorance des véritables lois de la vie ne lui permettant pas de suivre les fils invisibles qui font correspondre entre elles plusieurs intelligences. Nous convenons que la société doit se mettre en garde contre ceux de ses membres devenus dangereux. Mais n'y-a-t-il pas d'autre remède que de lancer ainsi brusquement une âme dans l'inconnu ! Ne peut-on mettre ces malheureux dans l'impossibilité de nuire, en les séparant des autres humains par des barrières infranchissables, et en les condamnant à un travail pénible qui materait presque toujours, dans un temps donné, ces rebelles et vicieuses natures ?

Quittons ces considérations pour montrer à quelle élévation Mr. Godin avait placé le respect de la vie humaine en lui donnant pour sanction la loi suprême de l'humanité. Sans suivre cet esprit éminent dans les développements qu'il a su donner avec une grande clarté à sa doctrine, nous voulons faire voir qu'il a légué à la génération actuelle des enseignements admirables que nous essayerons de résumer en ce qui a trait à notre sujet.

L'homme a toujours cherché en dehors de sa sphère un principe supérieur dont relèvent tous les actes humains. Les religions ont bien présenté Dieu aux hommes comme étant ce Principe et cette Cause, mais sans dévoiler le lien qui unit l'homme à Dieu et put servir de principe de Morale universelle, de Loi renfermant en elle le Droit, le Devoir, la Justice. Ce Criterium tant cherché, qui a échappé aux philosophes jusqu'ici par sa trop grande évidence, c'est la vie, la vie humaine, la plus haute manifestation terrestre de la puissance infinie qui nous gouverne, la vie qui est pour chacun de nous le bien le plus précieux, que nous devons respecter et à laquelle nous devons venir en aide avec amour, que nous avons le devoir d'employer pour être utiles à notre prochain et travailler à notre perfectionnement. De ce point de départ d'une extrême simplicité, accessible aux plus humbles intelligences comme pouvant donner satisfaction aux plus élevés, découle la connaissance du Bien et du Mal. Le Bien, c'est tout ce qui est utile, qui profite à l'existence humaine ; le Mal, c'est tout ce qui est nuisible, qui affaiblit la vie humaine. La vie que l'homme ne peut créer, il ne peut donc pas la détruire ; elle doit être pour lui absolument inviolable soit individuellement, soit collectivement. Donc, cette grande Loi est universelle, régit tous les faits humains, contient en germe dans son sein la Morale, la Justice, la Fraternité, la Charité, elle est applicable aussi bien aux particuliers qu'aux collectivités, aux nations qu'à l'humanité toute entière ; dans le domaine religieux comme dans le domaine politique, philosophique, économique, la loi de vie prime tout. Bien comprise et appliquée, elle ferait régner la Paix et le Bonheur sur la terre, impossibles à réaliser tant que les sociétés humaines honoreront la Guerre, laissant ainsi la Morale sans case. Alors serait comprise la vraie solidarité qui fait de tous les humains, à quelque race, à quelque couleur qu'ils appartiennent, des parties différentes du même corps, et d'après laquelle, suivant un précepte admirable : " Il ne peut y avoir de société heureuse là où se trouve un homme voué au malheur."

Avant de donner une conclusion à ce travail, nous ne résisterons pas au plaisir de citer les paroles suivantes prononcées à Paris au Congrès spiritualiste de 1889 par un écrivain des plus distingués d'Italie, le Professeur Jean Hoffmann : " Aujourd'hui la Loi Morale fait voir que toutes les maximes sociales ont leur sanction dans la pratique de ce précepte ; respecter et vénérer la vie humaine ; travailler avec amour au plus grand bien de la vie humaine, que nul ne peut affaiblir sans violer la loi L'œuvre sociale par excellence consiste donc à formuler des institutions en accord avec la véritable Loi Morale, c'est-à-dire avec la loi du Progrès Universel de la vie humaine, dans l'individu et dans les sociétés."

THE OLD TESTAMENT ON WAR.

By Mr. GEORGE GILLET, of London.

When Moses numbered the children of Israel in the second year of their national existence, he found that there were 603,550 men, all of whom were able to go forth to war (Numbers i., 45). But in order to estimate the character of so large a force, we must recollect that the long period of slavery, from which they had been delivered, had given them little or no opportunity to practice war—that their arms were probably very inferior—and that they possessed neither horses nor chariots. There is no reason, however, to believe that they were entirely disarmed by the Egyptians, and as occupying a frontier province, they may probably have been accustomed to the use of arms in repelling the attacks of wandering tribes. It is, however, pretty certain that they had neither horses nor chariots when Moses led them out of Egypt.

The absence of chariots is a very marked feature, not only when we consider the almost irresistible force with which they were driven at full gallop to the charge, but from the fact that all the nations which were opposed to the Israelites in war, possessed both chariots and horses. Rev. Hy. Wright Phillott, M.A., in an article in "Smith's Biblical Dictionary," says, "War chariots may be regarded as filling among some nations of antiquity—as elephants did among others—the place that heavy artillery does in modern times; so that the military power of a nation might be estimated by the number of its chariots." We are also informed by Rev. Wm. Latham Bevan, M.A., in another article in the same Dictionary, that the "two Hebrew words translated 'horse' may be construed 'chariot-horse' and 'cavalry-horse'—and that there are scarcely any notices of the horse in the Bible except for warlike purposes." In considering the wars in which the Israelites were engaged, it is important that these two interpretations should be kept clearly in remembrance, viz., that chariots for war exercised in that age the power and overwhelming force that heavy artillery does now; and that when the horse is referred to, it means war-horse, *i.e.*, either for "artillery" or cavalry.

Let us now picture what must have been the terror of the Israelites when they were shut in by the wilderness on either side, and with the Red Sea in front, they hear that Pharaoh was pursuing them with 600 chosen chariots, and all the chariots of Egypt, and captains over every one of them (Exodus xiv., 7). The "Speaker's Commentary" says, "24,000 horsemen besides the chariotry." From a military point of view, it was certain defeat for an army of infantry, however numerous, to have turned to fight against such a force. But God interposed for their deliverance. He placed the pillar of cloud between the two armies, so that the one came not near the other all the night. Then He caused His east wind to blow, and with it divided the waters of the Red Sea, so that the Israelites could pass over upon dry land. The Egyptians followed them, but were caught by the returning waters, and everyone was drowned. We can well understand how exultingly the Israelites could sing praises to God for such a deliverance. "The Lord is a man of war. The Lord is His name. Pharaoh's chariots and his host hath He cast into the sea." His chosen captains also are drowned in the Red Sea" (Exodus xv., 3, 4). Miriam and her women replying with timbrel and dance, "Sing ye to the Lord, for He hath triumphed gloriously—the horse and his rider hath He thrown into the sea."

Soon after the Israelites had entered the Sinaitic peninsula they were attacked by the Amalekites, who are supposed to have been a race of pure Arabs. At first they cut off the stragglers, as Moses says, "Amalek met thee by the way, and smote the hindmost of thee, even all that were feeble behind thee, when thou wast faint and weary, and he feared not God" (Deuteronomy xxv., 17, 18). But being a warlike race, and well armed, they finally forced Israel to a pitched battle in the valley of Rephidim. Moses having appointed Joshua to command the Israelites, went himself up to the top of the hill "with the rod of God in his hand," that rod whereby all the miracles in Egypt had been wrought, and by which the waters of the Red Sea had been divided. When Moses held up his hand Israel prevailed, and when he let down his hand Amalek prevailed (Exodus xvii., 8, 12). So that again their victory was not achieved by military strength, but by God.

Josephus says, in reference to this battle, "The Israelites became possessed by their victory of a large stock both of arms and armour, in which they had previously been very deficient. The armour was stripped from the bodies of the dead, the shields and coats of mail, thrown away as impediments to their flight by those who had escaped from the field, were collected, and from these two sources a large number of the Israelites were equipped so as to leave little to be desired. The Israelite heavy-armed infantry was now considerable." To whatever extent the

arms and armour thus acquired may have increased their warlike appearance—it did not apparently add to their courage. For when they had sent spies to view the land which God had promised to give them, their hearts failed them when they heard that the people were “great and tall, children of the Anakims, and the cities great and fenced up to heaven” (Deuteronomy ix., 1). They dare not advance, and for this want of faith in God’s protection He condemned them to wander in the wilderness for 38 years, “until all the men of war were consumed and dead from among the people” (Deuteronomy ii., 14, 15). Whatever of military experience we suppose the Israelites may have gained in Egypt, or in fighting with the Amalekites—God thus deliberately weeds it all out, and begins his nation again with a generation which had no military experience. Not only so, but He insists that they shall not acquire a military position. They were expected to dispossess nations of giant stature, fully armed, and well provided with horses and iron chariots. It might have been supposed that they would have been allowed to reserve some of the chariots and horses taken from their enemies in victory, and to organize a military force with which to overcome these nations. Nothing of the kind. In the very first record of a battle where the Canaanites brought “horses and chariots very many,” God’s command to Joshua was precise. “Thou shalt hough their horses and burn their chariots with fire” (Joshua xi., 6). To “hough” is to cut the sinews of the hinder hoofs. This sinew once severed cannot be healed, and the horses would thus be irreparably lamed (see “Speaker’s Commentary”). Similar in character were the instructions given by Moses to the Israelites in alluding to the time which he foretold when they would set a king over them. Their king was not to “multiply horses to himself nor cause the people to return to Egypt to the end that he may multiply horses” (Deuteronomy xvii., 16). Their battles were not to be gained by military power, but by what is so significantly called “the arm of the Lord”—“His stretched-out arm.” “Behold,” saith God, “I send an angel before thee to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him and obey his voice, provoke him not, for he will not pardon your transgressions, for My name is in him. But if thou shalt indeed obey his voice, and do all that I speak; then I will be an enemy unto thine enemies, and an adversary unto thine adversaries. * * * * * I will send My fear before thee, and will destroy all the people to whom thou shalt come, and I will make all thine enemies to turn their backs unto thee. And I will send hornets before thee, which shall drive out the Hivite, the Canaanite, and the Hittite from before thee. I will not drive them out from before thee in one year; lest the beast of the field multiply against thee. By little and little will I drive them out from before thee, until thou be increased and inherit the land” (Exodus xxiii., 20, 28). These nations thus condemned to destruction had for hundreds of years been exceedingly wicked in God’s sight. He had visited their land by special judgments, as in the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah—the time for mercy had passed and the hour of their judgment was now come. Notwithstanding the mention in several places of the attacks made by Joshua upon city after city, and how he “smote it with the edge of the sword” (Joshua xxxi.), we are compelled to the conclusion that these successive victories were not gained by military strength. First, there is the testimony of Joshua himself when, in the presence of the elders of Israel, and of their judges, and their officers, he said, Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, “Ye went over Jordan and came unto Jericho. And the men of Jericho fought against you, the Amorites, and the Perrizzites, and the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Girgashites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites: and I delivered them into your hand. And I sent the hornet before you, which drove them out from before you, even the two kings of the Amorites, *but not with thy sword, nor with thy bow*” (Joshua xxiv., 11, 12). Secondly, at the taking of Jericho, we see how God interposed by causing the walls of Jericho to fall down, so that the people went up into the city, every man straight before him (Joshua vi., 20). Although this is one of those cities referred to as having been “smitten with the edge of the sword,” it is also perfectly true that this victory was gained “not with thy sword nor with thy bow.” Similarly in their battle with the five kings, it is recorded that “they were more which died with hailstones than they whom the children of Israel slew with the sword” (Joshua x., 11). Again, after the death of Joshua, we read of Gideon’s victory over the Midianites, where the 300 men who followed Gideon merely carried a pitcher in one hand and a trumpet in the other. And when the 300 blew the trumpets, saying, “the sword of the Lord and of Gideon,” in the sudden fright the Lord set every man’s sword against his fellow, even throughout all the host of Midian. When Deborah and Barak fought against Sisera, with his 900 chariots of iron, though we have no detail we gather from the record: “The Lord discomfited Sisera and all his chariots and all his host with the edge of the sword before Barak”

(Judges iv., 15)—that which is also poetically stated by Deborah in her song—“They fought from heaven, the stars in their courses fought against Sisera” (Judges v., 20). We learn from these statements that some special Divine interposition had aided the military weakness of the Israelites. We might refer to Samson and his exploits. The only weapon mentioned as used by him, being, that on one occasion he slew 1,000 men with the jawbone of an ass. (Judges xv., 16). Right down to the early days of the reign of Saul, we find traces of this military weakness. Thus we are told : “Now there was no smith found throughout all the land of Israel ; for the Philistines said, lest the Hebrews make their swords or spears ; but all the Israelites went down to the Philistines, to sharpen every man his share, and his coulter, and his axe, and his mattock. ° ° ° So it came to pass in the day of battle, that there was neither sword nor spear found in the hand of any of the people that were with Saul and Jonathan ; but with Saul and with Jonathan his son, was there found” (I. Samuel xiii., 19, 22). At last we come to the period when the children of Israel desired Samuel to make them a king. And when Samuel prayed to God concerning this matter, the Lord said : “They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected Me, that I should not reign over them.” Samuel warned them of the manner of the king who would rule over them, but they refused to hearken to the voice of Samuel, saying : “Nay, but we *will* have a king to reign over us, that we also may be like all the nations, and that our king may judge us and go out before us and fight our battles” (I. Samuel viii., 19, 20).

“With the kings arose the custom of maintaining a body-guard which formed the nucleus of a standing army,” says Rev. W. L. Bevan, D.D., in an article in the “Army” in Smith’s Biblical Dictionary. “Thus Saul had a band of 3,000 select warriors—and David, before his accession to the throne, 600. This band he retained after he became king, and added the Chelethites and the Pelethites, together with another class, whose name, Stalishim, has been variously interpreted to mean (1) a corps of veteran guards equivalent to the Roman triarii, (2) chariot warriors, (3) officers of the guard. Whatever be the meaning of the name, it is evident that it indicated warriors of high rank, the chief of whom was immediately about the king’s person as “Adjutant” or “Secretary of War.” David further organized a national militia, divided into twelve regiments, each of which was called out for one month in the year, under their respective officers” (I. Samuel xiii. 2, xiv 52, xxiv. 2).

“Hitherto the army had consisted entirely of infantry, the use of horses having been restrained by Divine command. The Jews had, however, experienced the great advantage to be obtained by chariots, both in their encounters with the Canaanites, and at the late period with the Syrians. The interior of Palestine was indeed generally unsuited to the use of chariots. The Canaanites had employed them only in the plains and valleys, such as Jezreel, the plain of Philistia, and the upper valley of the Jordan. But the border, both on the side of Egypt and Syria, was admirably adapted for their use : and accordingly we find that as the foreign relations of the kingdoms extended, much importance was attached to them (II. Samuel viii. 4 ; I. Chronicles xviii. 4). David had reserved a hundred chariots from the spoil of the Syrians ; these probably served as the foundation of the force which Solomon afterwards enlarged through his alliance with Egypt, and applied to the protection of his border, stations or barracks being erected for them in different localities (II. Chronicles i. 14, i. 25). The force amounted to 1,400 chariots, 4,000 horses, at the rate (in round numbers) of three horses for each chariot, the third being kept as a reserve, and 12,000 horsemen. At this period the organisation of the army was complete ; and we have in I. Kings, ix. 22, apparently a list of the various gradations of rank in the service as follows : “Men of war,” *i.e.*, privates ; “Servants,” the lowest rank of officers, *i.e.*, lieutenants ; “Princes,” *i.e.*, captains ; “Captains,” perhaps equivalent to staff officers ; “Rulers of his chariots and his horsemen,” *i.e.*, cavalry officers.”

“It does not appear that the system established by David was maintained by the Kings of Judah ; but in Israel the proximity of the hostile kingdom of Syria necessitated the maintenance of a standing army. The militia was occasionally called out in time of peace, as by Asa, by Jehoshaphat, by Amaziah, and lastly by Uzziah, but these notices prove that such cases were exceptional (II. Chronicles xiv. 8, xvii. 14, xxv. 5, xxvi. 11). On the other hand, the incidental notices of the body-guard lead to the conclusion that it was regularly kept up (I. Kings xiv. 28 ; II. Kings xi. 4-11). Occasional reference is made to war-chariots, and it would appear that this branch of the service was maintained until the wars with the Syrians weakened the resources of the kingdom ; it was restored by Jotham, but in Hezekiah’s reign no force of the kind could be maintained, and the Jews were obliged to seek the aid of Egypt for horses and chariots (II. Kings viii. 21, viii. 7 ; Isaiah ii. 7 ; II. Kings xviii. 23-34). This was an evident breach of the injunction in

Deuteronomy, xvii. 16, and met with strong reprobation on the part of the prophet Isaiah" (Isaiah xxxi. 1).

We have quoted at considerable length from this article of Mr. Bevan's on the "Army," in order to set forth how fully Israel had departed from the counsel of God in respect to a standing army, and especially in the introduction and adoption of "chariots and horsemen" by David and Solomon. Let us now follow the history given to us in the Bible on this matter.

When Rehoboam ascended the throne after the death of Solomon, the people addressed him with these words: "Thy father made our yoke grievous—now therefore ease thou somewhat the grievous service of thy father and his heavy yoke that he put upon us, and we will serve thee" (I Kings xii., 4). His insolent reply to them, threatening a great increase of their burdens, caused a revolt. Ten out of the twelve tribes seceded and formed a separate kingdom with Jeroboam as their king, leaving only Judah and Benjamin for Rehoboam to reign over. This split in the kingdom may be regarded as a direct result of undue military preparation; for Solomon could hardly have imposed the "grievous servitude" without being backed by military power, and still less would Rehoboam have replied so impudently had he not expected to enforce his injustice by force of arms. In this, however, he was disappointed, for when he summoned his army to fight against Israel they were persuaded by "Shemaiah, the man of God," to return every man to his house without fighting. Although, during this, as well as subsequent reigns, there was continual war between Israel and Judah, the twelve tribes were never again re-united under one king, and it would not be difficult to trace the *disastrous consequences, both religious and political*, which resulted from this separation.

The narratives recorded in the Old Testament of the kings of Israel and Judah are full of illustrations of the pregnant words of Josephus, the great historian of the Jews, who, after referring to many of these narratives, sums up in these words: "To speak in general, we can produce no example wherein our fathers got any success by war, or failed of success when without war they committed themselves to God." (Book v., 414). The following are the chief military incidents recorded in Scripture of the reigns of the Kings of Judah, copied, so far as practicable, from the Bible narrative.

REHOBAM, 977 B.C.

During the first three years of his reign he fortified the cities of Judah and Benjamin. Fifteen places are mentioned as "fenced cities." He fortified the strongholds and put captains in them, and store of victual and of oil and wine (II Chronicles xi., 11-12). And in every several city he put shields and spears, and made them exceeding strong. And it came to pass that when Rehoboam had established the kingdom and had strengthened himself, he forsook the law of the Lord and all Israel with him (II Chronicles xii., 1-4). For this he was punished, for in the fifth year of his reign, "Shishak, king of Egypt, came up against Jerusalem *because they had transgressed against the Lord*, with 1,200 chariots and 60,000 horsemen, and people without number. ° ° And he took the fenced cities which pertained to Judah and came to Jerusalem." Then came Shemaiah, the prophet, to Rehoboam, and said, "Thus saith the Lord, ye have forsaken Me, and therefore have I also left you in the hand of Shishak." Then they humbled themselves and confessed, "The Lord is righteous." And when they humbled themselves a mitigation of the punishment was granted by the ever merciful God, and Shishak was forbidden to take Jerusalem, only they were to be tributary to him for a time.

ABIJAH, 960 B.C.

This reign is chiefly noted for a battle between Abijah and Jeroboam, king of Israel, who had sinned so wickedly before God by setting up the calf-worship at Bethel. Although Jeroboam is said to have had 800,000 men, being mighty men of valour, and the king of Judah only half that number, yet the children of Israel fled before Judah, and God delivered them into their hand. ° ° "The children of Judah prevailed, because they relied upon the Lord their God" (II Chronicles xiii., 11).

ASA, 958 B.C.

The first ten years of his reign were quiet, that is to say, no great war. Whilst on the one hand he took away the altars of the strange gods and the high places, and brake down the images and cut down the groves, on the other hand we find him acting on the heathen motto: "In time of peace prepare for war." He built fenced cities in Judah, for the land had rest, and he had no war in those years, because the Lord had given him rest. Therefore he said unto Judah, let us build these cities, and make about them walls, and towers, and gates, and bars, while the land is yet before us. ° ° So they built and prospered. And Asa had

an army of men that bare targets and spears out of Judah 300,000, and out of Benjamin that bare shields and bows 280,000, all these were mighty men of valour (II Chronicles xiv., 6-8).

Then Zerah, the Ethiopian, came against him with an host of 1,000,000 (men) and 300 chariots. And Asa cried unto the Lord and said : " Lord, it is nothing with Thee to help, whether with many or with them that have no power. Help us, O Lord our God, for we rest in Thee, and in Thy name we go against this multitude." So the Lord smote the Ethiopians and they fled—" They were destroyed before the Lord and His host."

After this victory Azariah, the prophet, went out to meet Asa with this message : " Hear ye me Asa and all Judah and Benjamin. The Lord is with you while ye be with Him, and if ye seek Him He will be found of you, but if ye forsake Him He will forsake you. Now for a long season Israel hath been without the true God, and without a teaching priest, and without law. But when they in their trouble did turn unto the Lord God of Israel and sought Him, He was found of them. And in those times there was no peace to him that went out, nor to him that came in, but great vexations were upon all the inhabitants of the countries, and nation was destroyed of nation and city of city, for God did vex them with all adversity." ° ° When Asa heard these words he took courage and put away the abominable idols out of all the land of Judah and Benjamin, and out of the cities which he had taken from Mount Ephraim, and renewed the altar of the Lord which was before the porch of the Lord. ° ° ° And they entered into a covenant to seek the Lord God of their fathers with all their heart and with all their soul. ° ° Also concerning Maachah, the mother of Asa the King, he removed her from being Queen because she had made an idol in a grove : and Asa cut down her idol and stamped it and burnt it at the Brook Kidron (II. Chronicles xvi. 1-16).

Fifteen years later, forgetful of the deliverance by the hand of the Lord from the Ethiopian host, Asa hired Benhadad, king of Syria, to fight against Israel and thus draw off Baasha, king of Israel, from himself. Although this policy was successful in its tactics, Asa was immediately reproved by Hanani, the seer, in these pregnant words : " Because thou hast relied on the king of Syria and not relied on the Lord thy God, therefore is the host of the king of Syria escaped out of thine hand. Were not the Ethiopians and the Lubims a huge host with very many chariots and horsemen ? Yet because thou didst rely upon the Lord He delivered them into thine hand. For the eyes of the Lord run to and fro throughout the whole earth to show Himself strong in the behalf of them whose heart is perfect towards Him. Therein thou hast done foolishly ; therefore from henceforth thou shalt have wars " (II. Chronicles xvi. 7-9).

JHOSHAPHAT, 917 B.C.

He is said to have had 1,160,000 troops in Jerusalem, and that beside these " he placed forces in all the fenced cities of Judah, and set garrisons in the land of Judah and in the cities of Ephraim which Asa his father had taken (II. Chronicles xvii. 2). We read that the Lord was with Jehoshaphat because he walked in the *first* ways of his father David, and sought not unto Baalim, but sought to the Lord God of his father and walked in His commandments, and not after the doings of Israel. Therefore the Lord established the kingdom in his hand ; and all Judah brought to Jehoshaphat presents, and he had riches and honour in abundance. And he sent Levites and Priests, and they taught in Judah and had the book of the law of the Lord with them, and went throughout all the cities of Judah and taught the people (II. Chronicles xvii., 3-5,9). And the fear of the Lord fell upon all the kingdoms of the lands that were round about Judah, so that they made no war with Jehoshaphat. Also some of the Philistines brought Jehoshaphat presents and tribute silver, and the Arabians brought him flocks (II. Chronicles xvii. 10, see also xx. 29-30).

For sixty years the kings of Judah and Israel had been in constant war with each other—but Jehoshaphat reversed this, and twice allied himself with the king of Israel in war. He joined Ahab in a military expedition against Benhadad, king of Syria, and on his return, Jehu, the son of Hanani the seer, went out to meet him, and said to King Jehoshaphat, " Shouldest thou help the ungodly and love them that hate the Lord : therefore is wrath upon thee from the Lord " (II. Chronicles xix 2). He subsequently allied himself with Ahaziah in a naval expedition against the king of Tarshish. Then Eliezer, the son of Dodavah, of Mareslah, prophesied against Jehoshaphat saying : " Because thou hast joined thyself with Ahaziah, the Lord hath broken thy works " (II. Chronicles xx. 35-37). Both these expeditions failed.

But the greatest interest of Jehoshaphat's reign centres round the invasion of the allied forces of Moab, Ammon, and Edom. There came some that told Jehoshaphat, saying, there cometh a great multitude against thee from beyond the sea on this side

Syria, and behold they be in Hazazon-tamar, which is Egedi. And Jehoshaphat feared, and set himself to seek the Lord, and proclaimed a fast throughout all Judah. And Judah gathered themselves together to ask help of the Lord; even out of all the cities of Judah they came to seek the Lord (II Chronicles xx. 2).

“Then the Spirit of the Lord came upon Jahaziel, and he said, “hearken ye, all Judah, and ye inhabitants of Jerusalem, and thou king Jehoshaphat, thus saith the Lord unto you, be not afraid nor dismayed by reason of this great multitude; for the battle is not yours but God’s. To-morrow go ye down against them; behold they come up by the cliff of Ziz; and ye shall find them at the end of the brook, before the wilderness of Jeruel. Ye shall not need to fight in this battle; set yourselves, stand ye still, and see the salvation of the Lord with you, O Judah and Jerusalem: fear not, nor be dismayed; to-morrow go out against them, for the Lord will be with you. And Jehoshaphat bowed his head with his face to the ground; and all Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem fell before the Lord, worshipping the Lord.”

And when Jehoshaphat had consulted with the people, he appointed singers unto the Lord to praise the beauty of holiness as they went out before the army. And when they began to sing and to praise, the Lord set ambushments against the children of Ammon, Moab, and Mount Seir, and they destroyed one another. ° ° And when Judah came to the watch tower in the wilderness, they looked unto the multitude, and behold they were dead bodies fallen to the earth, and none escaped. And they found so much spoil that they were three days in carrying it away.

There is also another interesting record of the way in which God helped Jehoshaphat against the Moabites, recorded in II Kings, 3rd chapter.

JEHORAM, 892 B.C.,

wrought evil in the eyes of the Lord like as did the house of Ahab, for he had the daughter of Ahab to wife. In his days the Edomites revolted from under the dominion of Judah, and made themselves a king. And Jehoram went forth with his princes and all his chariots with him, and smote them. Nevertheless the Edomites, and also the city of Libnah, succeeded in establishing their own independence, because Jehoram had forsaken the Lord God of his fathers (II Chronicles xxi.). The prophet Elijah afterwards wrote to him foretelling his downfall and death. The narrative then proceeds to show how this prophecy was fulfilled, and says, “the Lord stirred up against him the spirit of the Philistines and the Arabians”—the very nations who had paid tribute and brought presents to his father Jehoshaphat—and after they had devastated his kingdom and killed his wives, and all but one of his sons, God smote him with a fearful disease, a just punishment for his abandoned licentiousness, and he died.

AHAZIAH, 885 B.C.

He reigned but one year, and continued the abominable wickedness of his father (II Chronicles xxii., 1-9). It seemed as though the line of David would become extinct, for when Ahaziah had been slain, his mother

ATHALIAH, 884 B.C.,

who was the daughter of the notorious Jezebel, went and slew, as she thought, all the sons of Ahaziah, and assumed the throne herself. (II Chronicles xxi., 10). But Jehoshabeath, wife of Jehoiada, the priest, hid away one of Ahaziah’s sons, and after six years caused him to be proclaimed king, and deposed Athaliah.

JOASH, 878 B.C.

During the lifetime of his uncle, Jehoiada, the priest, Joash served the Lord, but after his death he forsook God. And when he was reproved by Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada, he ordered him to be stoned to death. This cruel ingratitude to the son of the man who had saved his life, was aggravated by his allowing him to be slain in the court of the house of the Lord. And it came to pass at the end of the year (the judgment was not long delayed) that the host of Syria came up against him, and they came to Judah and Jerusalem, and destroyed all the princes from among the people, and sent all the spoil of them unto the king at Damascus. “For the army of the Syrians came with a small company of men, and the Lord delivered a very great host into their hand, because they had forsaken the Lord God of their fathers.” So they executed judgment against Joash (II Chronicles xxiv., 24).

AMAZIAH, 839 B.C.

Whilst he did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, it was not with a perfect heart (II Chronicles xxv., 2). He organised an army which numbered 300,000 chosen men, able to go forth to war, that could handle spear and shield. When, however, he was fitting

out an expedition against the Edomites, he hired 100,000 men of Ephraim, for which he paid 100 talents of silver. After the men had arrived, a man of God warned him against taking them, for the Lord was not with Israel, to wit, with all the children of Ephraim. "But if thou wilt go, do it, be strong for the battle. God shall make thee fall before the enemy, for God hath power to help and to cast down" (II. Chronicles xxv., 7, 8). But what shall we do, said Amaziah, for the 100 talents of silver. And the man of God answered: "The Lord is able to give thee much more than this." So the Ephraimites were, much to their disgust, sent back, and Amaziah invaded Edom and gained a considerable victory.

Strange to say when he came from the slaughter of the Edomites, that he brought the gods of the children of Seir and set them up to be his gods, and bowed himself down before them, and burned incense unto them. And the anger of the Lord was kindled against him, and He sent a prophet to ask: Why hast thou sought after the gods of the people, which could not deliver their own people out of thine hand. But Amaziah continued in his idolatry, whereupon God turned his heart to go up against the king of Israel, who defeated him and brought him a prisoner to Jerusalem, and broke down the wall of Jerusalem and took great spoil. Finally his own people conspired against him because he had forsaken the Lord, and they put him to death.

UZZIAH, 811 B.C.,

seems to have followed the Lord during most of his long reign of 52 years. We read that God helped him against the Philistines and the Arabians, and the Ammonites gave him gifts, and his name spread abroad, even to the entering in of Egypt, for he strengthened himself exceedingly (II. Chronicles xxvi.). Uzziah had an host of fighting men that went out to war by bands, an army 307,500, that made war with mighty power to help the king against the enemy. And Uzziah prepared for them throughout all the host shields, and spears, and helmets, and habergeons, and bows, and slings to cast stones. And he made in Jerusalem engines, invented by cunning men, to be on the tower, and on the bulwarks, to shoot arrows and great stones withal (II. Chronicles xxvi., 14-16). For he was marvellously helped till he was strong, and when he was strong his heart was lifted up to his destruction, for he transgressed against the Lord his God, and went into the temple to burn incense upon the altar of incense. For this God smote him with leprosy, and after living for some years as a leper in a separate house, he died.

JOTHAM, 759 B.C.,

followed the footsteps of his father in doing that which was right in the sight of the Lord, and, like him, built cities in the mountains of Judah, and in the forests castles and towers. He fought also with the king of the Ammonites, and prevailed against them, so that they paid him tribute in silver and wheat and barley for three years. He became mighty because he prepared his ways before the Lord his God (II. Chronicles xxvii., 6).

AHAZ, 743 B.C.,

did evil in the sight of the Lord, and walked in the ways of the kings of Israel. He made molten images for Baalim, and burnt incense in the valley of the son of Hinnon, and burnt his children in the fire after the abominations of the heathen (II. Chronicles xxviii., 2-6). Wherefore the Lord his God delivered him into the hand of the king of Syria, and they smote him, and carried away a great multitude of captives to Damascus. He was also delivered into the hand of the king of Israel, who slew 120,000 in one day (which were all valiant men) because they had forsaken the Lord God of their fathers. And they took 200,000 captives to Samaria, but they were persuaded by the prophet Oded to clothe them, and feed them, and return them to their own land. The Edomites made inroads upon Judah and carried away captives, and the Philistines invaded the cities of the low country, and took possession of them. In the midst of these troubles he appealed to the king of Assyria to help him, and gave him treasure out of the house of the Lord, and out of his own house, but he helped him not. It is a complete picture of a king in open and determined rebellion against God, bringing his nation into war and captivity through his idolatry.

HEZEKIAH, 727 B.C.

In the first month of his reign he reopened the doors of the house of the Lord and repaired them, and gathered the priests and Levites together, and reorganised the worship of the temple of the Lord. In his appeal Hezekiah states that "the doors of the porch had been shut up, the lamps put out, and that no incense or burnt offerings had been offered to the God of Israel, wherefore the wrath of the Lord was upon Judah and Jerusalem, and He hath delivered them to trouble, to astonishment, and to hissing, as ye see with your eyes, for lo, our fathers have fallen by the sword,

and our sons, and our daughters, and our wives are in captivity for this" (II Chronicles xxix., 8-9). Hezekiah then arranged for a great passover to be kept, and sent messengers to all Israel to invite them to come and join in it. Although many laughed them to scorn, it is recorded that many humbled themselves and came to Jerusalem. And Hezekiah sought after God with all his heart, and prospered (II Chronicles xxx. and xxxi.). After this, Sennacherib, king of Assyria, invaded Judah (II Chronicles xxxii.), and sent Rabshakeh to Jerusalem with this message: "Thus saith the great king, the king of Assyria, what confidence is this wherein thou trustest? I say, sayest thou I have counsel and strength for war: now on whom dost thou trust, that thou rebellest against me? Lo, thou trustest in the staff of this broken reed, on Egypt; whereon if a man lean, it will go into his hand and pierce it: so is Pharaoh, king of Egypt, to all that trust in him. But if thou say to me, we trust in the Lord our God: is it not he, whose high places and whose altars Hezekiah hath taken away, and said to Judah and Jerusalem, ye shall worship before this altar? Now therefore give pledges, I pray thee, to my master, the king of Assyria, and I will give thee 2,000 horses, if thou be able on thy part to put riders upon them. How then wilt thou turn away the face of one captain of the least of my master's servants, and put thy trust on Egypt for chariots and for horsemen? And am I now come up without the Lord against this land to destroy it? The Lord said unto me, go up against this land and destroy it" (Isaiah xxxvi., 4-10). And turning specially to the people, he said, "Beware lest Hezekiah persuade you, saying, the Lord will deliver us. Hath any of the gods of the nations delivered their land out of the hand of the king of Assyria. Where are the gods of Hamath and Arphad? Where are the gods of Sepharvaim? And have they delivered Samaria out of my hand? Who are they among all the gods of these lands that have delivered their land out of my hand, that the Lord should deliver Jerusalem out of my hand?" (Isaiah xxxvi., 18-20).

When this message, and more to the same purport, was rehearsed to Hezekiah, he rent his clothes and covered himself with sackcloth, and went into the house of the Lord, and he sent a message to the prophet Isaiah to inform him of the insolent language of Rabshakeh, and to ask him to pray for the remnant that is left. And Isaiah replied: Thus saith the Lord. Be not afraid of the words which thou hast heard, wherewith the servants of the king of Assyria blasphemed Me. Behold, I will send a blast upon him, and he shall hear a rumour and return to his own land; and I will cause him to fall by the sword in his own land (Isaiah xxxvii., 6-7).

And Hezekiah prayed unto the Lord, saying; "O Lord of Hosts, God of Israel, that dwellest between the cherubims, Thou art the God, even Thou alone, of all the kingdoms of the earth; Thou hast made heaven and earth. Incline Thine ear, O Lord, and hear; open Thine eyes, O Lord, and see; and hear all the words of Sennacherib, which hath sent to reproach the living God. Of a truth, Lord, the kings of Assyria have laid waste all the nations and their countries, and have cast their gods into the fire; for they were no gods, but the work of men's hands, wood and stone, therefore they have destroyed them. Now, therefore, O Lord our God, save us from his hand, that all the kingdoms of the earth may know that Thou art the Lord, even Thou only (Isaiah xxxvii., 15-20)."

The angel of the Lord went forth and smote in the camp of the Assyrians 185,000; and Sennacherib returned to Nineveh, and was there slain by the sword.

After this Hezekiah was ill, and about to die, and he prayed to God. And the Lord sent a message to him by Isaiah the prophet, that he would lengthen his life fifteen years. And he gave him this sign, that the shadow of the sun on the dial of Ahaz should return ten degrees backwards; which accordingly took place (Isaiah xxxviii. and xxxix.). The king of Babylon having heard of this remarkable circumstance, and being no doubt a worshipper of the sun, sent ambassadors with presents to the monarch so favoured by his God. Hezekiah received these presents and displayed his own wealth before them, instead of setting forth to them the power and greatness of the Lord God, who had worked this miracle and healed him of his sickness. For this sin he was told that his children and all the treasures of his house should be carried away to Babylon.

MANASSEH, 698 B.C.,

began his reign by rearing up altars for Baalim, and made groves, and worshipped all the host of heaven. He even built altars for all the host of heaven in the two courts of the house of the Lord, and set a carved image, the idol which he made in the house of God. He used witchcraft, and dealt with a familiar spirit, and with wizards, and did much evil in the sight of the Lord. Wherefore the Lord brought upon them the captains of the host of the king of Assyria, who took Manasseh and bound him with fetters and carried him to Babylon (II. Chronicles, xxxiii.).

But when he was in affliction he besought the Lord his God and humbled

himself greatly before the God of his fathers and prayed unto Him : and He was intreated of him and heard his supplication, and brought him again to Jerusalem into His kingdom. Then Manasseh knew that the Lord He was God (II. Chronicles xxxiii. 12-13). And he took away the strange gods and the idol out of the House of the Lord, and all the altars that he had built in the mount of the House of the Lord, and cast them out of the city. And he repaired the altar of the Lord and sacrificed thereon peace offerings, and thank offerings, and commanded Judah to serve the Lord God of Israel.

AMON, 643 B.C.,

did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord and sacrificed unto all the carved images which Manasseh his father had made. And his servants conspired against and slew him in the second year of his reign (II. Chronicles xxxiii. 21-25).

JOSIAH, 641 B.C.,

served the Lord with all his heart, and caused all the people to return unto God and to keep His commandments. He kept a great passover to the Lord in Jerusalem (II. Chronicles xxxiv). He died from wounds received in battle, for he would go out to fight Necho, king of Egypt, who was passing by Judah to fight a city on the Euphrates. "I come not against thee this day," said the king of Egypt, "but against the house wherewith I have war : for God commanded me to make haste. Forbear thee from meddling with God, Who is with me, that He destroy thee not" (II. Chronicles xxxiv. 20-24). But Josiah would not hearken, and disguised himself that he might fight with him. But the archers shot at him, and he said to his servants, "Have me away for I am wounded." And they took him out of the chariot and put him into the second chariot that he had, and took him to Jerusalem, where he died. And all Judah mourned for him, and Jeremiah, the prophet, lamented also for him.

JEHOIAHAZ, 610 B.C. (II Chronicles xxxvi., 1-4).

JEHOIAKIM, 610 B.C. (II Chronicles xxxvi., 5-8).

Were subject to Egypt.

JEHOIACHIN, 599 B.C. (II Chronicles xxxvi., 9-10).

ZEDEKIAH, 599 B.C. (II Chronicles xxxvi., 11-13).

Were subject to Babylon.

DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM, 587 B.C.

Taking a general review of the subject of war, it is a help to compare it with the curse of slavery, which also existed under the Mosaic dispensation. By the law of Moses, every Israelite who had become a bond-servant, had a right to claim his freedom in the year of Jubile (Leviticus xxv., 39-41). It might be 49 years ahead, or it might be only 9 years—but the influence of such a provision can be readily understood to have modified the condition of slavery, so as to make it impossible to be developed to the hideous institution which it grew to be in modern times in the British Colonies and in the United States of America. Moreover they were distinctly forbidden to oppress one another (Leviticus xxv., 17).

Thus was slavery kept in check till Christ came, and then the "axe was laid to the root of the tree." The spirit of love and goodwill towards men taught by Christ, made it impossible for slavery to continue where His teaching was accepted and carried out. The great institution of slavery died from the root.

In the same kind of way we think that God has dealt with war. He forbade cavalry and artillery, and thus so far modified the military condition of the Israelites as to prevent its development to the standard of other nations. Had His commandment still authority, it would have made it impossible to have developed militarism to such an institution as we find it to-day, when the burdens of war in time of so-called "peace" are as great as were those of active war in former generations.

But Christ strikes at the root of war, and whenever His teaching shall be accepted by professing Christendom, not merely cavalry and artillery, but infantry also shall pass away, because their services are incompatible with the spirit of love and goodwill towards men which He enjoins (as their special characteristic) upon His disciples. The great institution of war will have died from the root.

It may be convenient just briefly to summarise the points that we think are established by the foregoing narrative :—

(a) That such military experience as the Israelites may have had in Egypt was in the direct providence of God, withdrawn by His keeping them in the wilderness until "all the men of war were consumed and dead from among the people."

(b) That in this non-military condition they dispossessed nations trained to war, of giant stature, and provided with chariots and cavalry.

(c) That the victories gained in taking possession of the land were not due

to military strength, but chiefly due to interpositions of God's providence in the favour.

(d) That the distinct command of God to Joshua, on the occasion of his first campaign, viz., "to hough their horses and burn their chariots," was designed to keep them as a nation in this non-military condition, in order that they might not trust in their own strength but in the providential care of God.

(e) That throughout the period of the Judges, and during the reign of Saul and the greater part of David's reign, they possessed neither chariots nor horses.

(f) That as a consequence through want of faith in God's power, they were unable to conquer some of the inhabitants of the valleys "because they had chariots of iron," so that God was reproachfully termed "a god of the hills and not a god of the valleys."

(g) That one of the objects of the Israelites in desiring to have a king, was that he might "lead them forth to battle," and that Saul, though he did not have either cavalry or chariots, did organize a large body of infantry.

(h) That in the latter part of David's reign, (*i.e.*, after the kingdom of Israel had attained its greatest political power,) David reserved 100 chariots with horses out of the spoil of one of his victories, and that this nucleus was enlarged by Solomon to 1,400 chariots and 12,000 horsemen.

(i) That as a distinct consequence of this militarism, the kingdom of Israel was rent in twain on the death of Solomon, from which disastrous religious and political consequences ensued.

(j) That apart from this lamentable result, the non-military period, which dates from the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan to the time when David inaugurated cavalry and chariots, was a period of over 400 years, during which the land was occupied, and the kingdom established, and its influence over surrounding nations obtained, and some of its greatest victories achieved; whilst the succeeding period of 65 years ending with the death of Solomon when militarism prevailed, was marked by many debasing alliances with surrounding nations, ending with the revolt of the ten tribes.

(k) That as regards the ten tribes which thereafter formed the kingdom of Israel, this militarism was maintained under a constant succession of wicked kings, till after 250 years the entire nation was carried away as captives in war, and are now known as "the lost tribes."

(l) That as regards the other two tribes which formed the kingdom of Judah, it had a chequered existence for 400 years, and was then carried captive to Babylon. And although, at the end of 70 years, they returned to Jerusalem, it was only to semi-independence.

Under the government of their God-fearing kings, such as Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, &c., they experienced very remarkable victories and deliverances, notwithstanding that those kings appear to have had no chariots or cavalry. But under wicked kings, in spite of big armies, they were as easily conquered by surrounding nations as before they had been victorious over them.

(m) In short, the words of Josephus are completely justified: "To speak in general, we can produce no example wherein our fathers got any success by war, or failed of success when without war they committed themselves to God. Thus it appears that arms were never given to our nation."

GOD'S TEACHING TO THE WORLD IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

By Mrs. WIGHAM, of Killiney, County Dublin, Ireland.

When we reflect on the object of our being in this world, we can hardly fail to observe how incomplete our life is; and that, either with or without the complicity of our wills, we are undergoing a course of education. We feel ourselves face to face with a "Purpose, not our own, for we often resist it," in contact with a "Power not ourselves, which makes for righteousness."

God reveals himself slowly and gradually, as man is able to receive the revelation. The idea of education involves that of an elementary beginning. We do not teach the higher mathematics to infants. We believe in evolution, in development, in growth, in education, in progress, as God's way of dealing with the race as with the individual. If we compare civilized man with the savage of the Australian woods, or with his ancestors of the Stone Age, we shall see that he has made great progress intellectually

and it is not surprising if a similar law applies to his moral and spiritual condition. Man is slowly rising out of his childhood and putting away his childish things. In an early stage of his development he thought of Power as the "greatest thing in the world." He could not do otherwise.

"Each age must worship its own thought of God." A lovely illustration of this occurred the other day, when an American Indian said, "We never thought of the Great Spirit as Father; we heard Him in the thunder, and saw him in the lightning, and tempest, and blizzard, and we were afraid. So when you tell us of the Great Spirit as Father, this is very beautiful to us." Thus the people of old could not have believed, as we do to-day, that wisdom is more than power, still less that love is greater than either.

God teaches the many by the few; the Jewish people were trained by him to be the instructors of the world about religion. They failed in their mission as a people, mistaking God's dealings with them for favouritism. And yet God's will has been accomplished by individuals among them, and from the cultured ground of Judaism has sprung the stately tree of Christianity. Christ and his Apostles were Jews. In the course of their training, one here and there of the finer spirits among them listened to the voices of Eternity, and preached the everlasting righteousness, but the Prophets were persecuted and slain. Their lawgivers gave them laws in advance indeed of their practice, and greatly in advance of the nations around them, and yet far short of the perfect teachings of Christianity. Moses was both Prophet and Lawgiver. Through the silence and darkness of the cleft in Horeb, he heard the name of the Lord, as a God full of compassion and gracious—under the outstretched wings of the Cherubin he placed a law which only love could fulfil. But many of the directions given to the people were "for the hardness of their heart," not ideally perfect, but in keeping with the stage of development at which they were arrived.

Thus we find in the Old Testament—the law of retaliation, commands to fight, instructions as to the treatment of women, of captives, and of slaves, which we know are not in accordance with the higher morality and more merciful teachings of the New Testament. The spirit of that old legislation was "Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy," and a marvellous step was taken when Christ said "But I say unto you love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them who despitefully use you and persecute you." He Himself had "many things to say" to His Disciples which they were not able to receive—and so He promised that His spirit should be their teacher, and should guide them into all truth. There is yet abundance of Christianity to flow out of the teachings of Christ. There are heights and depths yet to be illumined by the light of that Spirit which shines the brighter the more closely it is followed.

And so, from the day when God first spoke to Abraham and promised that in his seed all nations should be blessed, all through their wonderful history, and their contact with the civilizations of Egypt, Assyria, Persia, Greece, and Rome, God has been leading and instructing the Jews, and preparing them to be the medium of His fresh revelation to the world through Jesus Christ. We owe them an immense debt of gratitude.

This revelation teaches us that God is love, and that love includes all righteousness, all purpose to train man in righteousness, all needful sternness in that training, all patience, all humility, all self-sacrifice, all tenderness. It tells us that the life and death of Jesus Christ, is God's great parable of love, acted out before the world. It tells us that the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand, and that its all-sufficing law is love. It tells us above all that God is love. In the days when God was known only to the world as the Almighty—when in a certain sense power was enthroned as Deity—bodily strength gave pre-eminence, the leader was he who had the strongest arm, man fought hand to hand with his fellow man. Now God is known as the all wise, and to-day man worships knowledge, intellect, and learning; he discovers, invents, contrives, and executes; and his skill is employed to produce the most perfect engineering of war, that he may destroy his enemies by wholesale; slaughter is reduced to a science.

But the Eastern hills are already suit with the dawn of a brighter day. As Mazzini has said "Upon the soil rendered fruitful by the blood of fifty generations of martyrs, we stand to hail the gigantic future, wherein the lever of action shall rest upon the Fatherland as its fulcrum, with humanity for its scope and aim; wherein the peoples shall bind themselves in a common pact, and meet in brotherhood to define the future mission of each, the function of each in the general association, governed by one Law for all—one God for all." That Law—that God is Love."

ENSEIGNEMENT DE DIEU DANS L'ANCIEN TESTAMENT.

Par M. L'ABBÉ DEFOURNY.

I.

INVIOIABILITE DE LA VIE HUMAINE.

Les préceptes du Décalogue desquels relèvent la Paix et la Guerre sont les suivants. *Tu ne tueras point. Tu ne déroberas point. Tu ne porteras point de faux témoignage. Tu ne convoiteras pas le bien d'autrui.* De ces prescriptions, celle qui défend le meurtre et rend la vie d'un homme sacrée et inviolable pour tous les autres est celle dont l'observation s'impose avec le plus d'évidence, et dont la transgression inspire le plus d'horreur. De toutes les lois morales, voilà celle qui est le plus à la portée de toutes les intelligences, c'est la lumière même qui est en nous. Aussi l'ancien Testament nous montre Dieu notre Créateur, dans la famille d'Adam même, la proclamer en termes saisissants : "Caïn, qu'as-tu fait ? La voix du sang d'Abel est montée jusqu'à moi, de la terre qui l'a bu." Et la conscience du premier meurtrier, qui est le fils aîné du premier homme, fait écho au jugement de son Auteur ; il répond : "Mon crime est trop grand pour que je puisse obtenir grâce. *Major est iniquitas mea, ut veniam merear.* Je mérite d'être tué par le premier qui me rencontrera."

La Loi éternelle qui protège la vie de l'homme contre tout attentat est de nouveau promulguée au genre humain sortant renouvelé de l'Arche. Et Dieu dit : "Je vengerai le sang de vos vies contre toutes les bêtes de la terre et contre l'homme—contre l'homme son frère qui aura répandu le sang d'un autre homme ; parce que l'homme a été créé à l'image de Dieu. Quiconque aura répandu le sang humain paiera ce crime de son propre sang." Dans ces paroles de Dieu tout est à méditer. Et d'abord cette redondance et tout ensemble cette précision des termes : *de manu hominis, de manu viri et fratris ejus*, ne laissent la porte ouverte à aucune échappatoire. La vie humaine est sacrée et inviolable pour tous les hommes, et tous les hommes sont nos frères. La divine Écriture le prononce ici en termes qui ne laissent rien à désirer. Cette fraternité de tous les hommes résulte de l'unité d'origine, en Adam d'abord, en Noé ensuite, des descendants duquel sont sortis toutes les tribus et les nations de la terre. Il est inutile d'insister sur cette unité, l'ancien Testament l'articulant si clairement, que certains savants de nos jours lui en font un reproche. En outre et surtout, remarquons la raison dernière donnée par Dieu de l'invioiabilité de la vie humaine ; c'est que l'homme a été créé à l'image de Dieu. Comme s'il disait ; vous ne pouvez pas attenter à la vie de Celui qui est, vous ne devez pas non plus attenter à la créature en qui vit sa divine ressemblance. C'est ici le lieu de rappeler comment les premiers hommes traitaient les étrangers leurs frères créés à l'image de Dieu en exerçant envers eux l'office de l'hospitalité, vertu commune, pratique universelle chez les premiers hommes : ils se prosternaient devant eux, comme on le voit, entr'autres, par Abraham, ils les *adoraient*, non pas de ce culte suprême qui ne convient qu'à Dieu, mais d'un culte analogue qui convient à sa ressemblance vivante. C'est la fraternité augmentée du respect—du respect, Messieurs, le vrai gardien de la vie humaine ; *ad imaginem quippe Dei creatus est homo.*

Le sang de vos âmes ou de vos vies. Quelle est la raison de cette expression ? Dieu a établi la ressemblance de l'homme avec lui dans l'âme intelligente, capable de connaître et de vouloir le bien, sciemment et librement, et cette âme anime le corps, constitue l'être humain, au moyen du sang. C'est pour cela, dit Saint Thomas d'Acquin, que le plus grand crime que les hommes puissent commettre les uns contre les autres, c'est l'homicide, c'est de *violier le sang, domicile de la vie*, dit à son tour, en lui faisant écho, votre sublime Shakespeare.

Pour cela, un certain respect du sang s'étendra jusqu'aux animaux. La vie de l'homme seul est sacrée. Dans le verset qui précède celui que nous commentons, Dieu autorise l'homme au lendemain du déluge, à prendre pour nourriture les animaux, qui ne sont pas à son image, aussi bien que les végétaux, avec cette restriction de ne pas manger le sang avec la chair ; parce que le sang des animaux leur tient lieu d'âme, dit le Seigneur, tu ne dois pas manger l'âme avec la chair. *Sanguis enim eorum pro anima est et ideo non debes animam comedere cum carnis.*

C'est toujours pour donner plus d'horreur de l'effusion du sang humain, que Dieu dit : Je vengerai le sang de vos âmes contre toutes les bêtes de la terre. Il le fit dans les prescriptions secondaires de la Loi donnée par Moïse, lorsqu'il ordonna d'écraser et de couvrir sous les pierres l'animal qui aurait causé la mort d'un homme, avec défense de manger sa chair. Ainsi jusque dans les détails, nous voyons Dieu dans l'ancien Testament, légiférer le respect de la vie humaine.

LE PROGRAMME DEMANDE QUE L'ON PROUVE AUSSI PAR L'ANCIEN TESTAMENT LA FRATERNITÉ DES NATIONS COMME CELLE DES HOMMES, ET QUE L'ON RATTACHE L'UNE ET L'AUTRE À LA PAIX ET À LA GUERRE.

Que la fraternité humaine, telle que nous l'avons exposée, emporte avec elle la fraternité des nations, cela va de soi. Les tribus, les nations ne sont autre chose que des groupes d'hommes, ou plutôt des familles groupées sur un sol avec des gouvernements à elles, et des lois ou coutumes particulières. Demander si la fraternité humaine s'étend à ces groupes est à nos yeux une question inintelligible, bien que le programme ait bien fait de la poser. En effet, c'est demander si les lois ou coutumes nationales peuvent détruire la loi primordiale, ou si les hommes cessent d'être hommes parce qu'ils sont partagés en groupes, ou encore s'ils n'ont plus été créés à l'image de Dieu du jour où ils font partie de groupes différents, ou enfin si le Décalogue, expression du Droit éternel, et en particulier le précepte : *Tu ne tueras point*, ne les oblige pas, en tant qu'ils sont hommes, à quelque nation qu'ils appartiennent. Aussi nous ne trouvons pas dans l'ancien Testament l'expression *fraternité des nations*, ou *nations soeurs* : le langage divin et antique est simple, il dit : l'homme est le frère de l'homme et créé à l'image de Dieu : cela suffit.

D'où vient donc que la question est posée dans le programme ? C'est par suite d'une nécessité de notre époque, où les notions les plus élémentaires sont parfois obscurcies. Comme si les devoirs des nations pouvaient être autres que ceux des hommes, dont les nations sont composées, on distingue aujourd'hui entre les nations et les hommes, pour oser avancer que les règles de conduite ne sont pas les mêmes pour les gouvernements et les gouvernés, pour les hommes publics et les hommes privés, même quand il s'agit du respect de la vie humaine. On drape les hommes publics sous le manteau de l'Etat : et l'on imprimait il y a quarante ans que l'Etat est la source de tous les droits, que son droit à lui n'a point de limites et que les majorités n'ont pas besoin d'avoir raison. Ces jours-ci, on commence d'imprimer couramment que la justice n'a rien à voir dans la politique, c'est-à-dire entre les nations ou leurs gouvernements, c'est-à-dire en fin de compte, en matière de paix et de guerre, en matière d'effusion du sang. Jusqu'où descendrons-nous dans les profondeurs de l'abîme ? Cet obscurcissement de la vérité est tel que l'on s'en était occupé au Concile du Vatican, et que des définitions et des anathématises étaient préparés sur ce sujet comme sur celui qui nous occupe, lorsqu'il fut interrompu. L'Évêque de Paderborn a obtenu du Pape l'autorisation de publier ces travaux préparatoires, et voici un anathématisme dont je n'ai pas le texte sous les yeux, mais je réponds du sens et presque des termes : " Si quelqu'un dit que les lois humaines ne tirent pas leur vertu de la Loi éternelle et divine ou que les règles de la morale ne sont pas les mêmes pour tous, pour les hommes publics comme pour les hommes privés, pour les gouvernements et pour les particuliers, qu'il soit anathème."

Si pour les raisons données, nous ne rencontrons pas dans l'ancien Testament, le mot *fraternité des nations*, en revanche nous y trouvons la chose, avec application aux relations des hommes des diverses nations et en particulier à la Paix et à la Guerre.

Dieu veut qu'on traite l'étranger comme l'homme du pays en matière de justice publique : " Entendez les parties quelles qu'elles soient, et jugez-les avec droiture, nationaux ou étrangers [1]. Lors de la seconde promulgation de la loi, Moïse ordonna de prononcer des malédictions correspondantes aux préceptes du Décalogue. Il y en avait douze. Les lévites les prononçaient à haute voix devant tout le peuple rassemblé et le peuple les confirmait en prononçant aussi à haute voix le mot : Amen. Or vous allez entendre la cinquième de ces douze malédictions telle qu'on la lit au Deutéronome.

Maudit soit celui qui procure un jugement pervers contre l'étranger, l'orphelin ou la veuve. Et tout le peuple répondit : Amen. Maudit soit-il.

Est-il possible de pousser plus loin le sentiment de la fraternité et la loi de la justice fraternelle, à l'égard des hommes des autres nations ? L'ancien Testament veut, non-seulement qu'ils soient traités sur le même pied que les nationaux devant les juges, mais il les couvre de la même protection que l'orphelin et la veuve de son peuple.

[1] Audite illos, et recta iudicate, sive sit ille civis, sive peregrinus,

Cependant il est des hommes et des groupes d'hommes semblables à Caïn, qui par cupidité, haine, vengeance ou toute autre passion, attentent de verser le sang d'autres hommes ou groupes d'hommes, et de commettre d'autres grands crimes déclarés dignes de mort par Dieu même. Ceux-là violent la loi primordiale et méritent la punition édictée aussi par Dieu dans le texte commenté tout à l'heure, et dans ces paroles qu'il est temps de relever. Qui effuderit humanum sanguinem fundetur sanguis illius. Ceux qu'ils attaquent ou qu'ils offensent sont-ils tenus de se laisser faire, de se laisser tuer, chasser de leur sol, déponiller de leurs biens injustement ?

Malgré notre amour très religieux et très légitime de la paix, aucun d'entre nous quoi qu'on en dise en nous traitant à tort d'utopistes, ne blâmera le droit de légitime défense ni ne contredira l'axiome romain : " L'offensé a la garde de la justice," non plus que l'oracle divin ; Qui effuderit sanguinem humanum fundetur sanguis illius. Alors a lieu la guerre, toujours criminelle d'un côté, toujours juste de l'autre. Et ce qui constitue le crime d'un côté, et la légitime et nécessaire résistance de l'autre côté, ce n'est pas parce que ceux-ci font partie d'un groupe et ceux-là d'un autre groupe, c'est la violation de la Loi divine d'une part, et de l'autre la vindicte nécessaire de cette même loi, édictée pour la paix et la tranquillité des bons contre les entreprises scélérates des méchants.

Arrière donc les pratiques modernes, d'après lesquelles deux armées, deux groupes d'hommes ou deux peuples s'entre-tuent sans qu'il y ait entre eux un de ces crimes énormes, obstinés dont la punition est la mort d'après l'enseignement divin. Arrière cette abomination de deux armées de soldats qui vont aux batailles sans cause et s'entre-détruisent en s'estimant réciproquement innocents. Les misérables sont à la fois innocents et scélérats. Innocents parce qu'ils n'ont pas mérité d'être tués par leurs adversaires, scélérats parce qu'ils tuent ceux-ci, qui ne l'ont pas mérité d'avantage.

Revenons à l'ancien Testament. Que la fraternité des peuples comme celle des hommes y soit enseignée et pratiquée de la manière la plus formelle, c'est le patriarche Jacob, à son lit de mort où il prophétise, qui va le premier nous l'apprendre. Je suis d'autant plus heureux de citer cet exemple pour le premier qu'il s'y agit d'un fait de guerre qui aurait pu être juste, mais qui n'était pas nécessaire. Après le double crime commis contre Dina par le fils du roi de Sichem, le coupable s'était humilié devant sa victime, il s'était humilié devant le père, offrant la réparation possible : le mariage et l'alliance des deux peuples.

Le patriarche miséricordieux avait accepté. Deux de ses fils, Siméon et Lévi, entraînés par la passion de la vengeance, tendirent un guet-apens cruel aux Sichémites, tribu étrangère à la race d'Abraham, et tirèrent l'épée contre eux. Ecoutez le vénérable père des douze tribus interrompre les bénédictions qu'il répand sur elles, pour prononcer, plusieurs siècles d'avance, la malédiction du Deutéronome contre deux de ses propres fils : " Siméon et Lévi, frères, vases d'iniquité dans la guerre. Mon âme ne participe pas à leurs conseils, et ma gloire n'est pas dans leur compagnie. Maudite soit leur fureur obstinée et leur indignation sans pitié." *Vasa iniquitatis bellentis. Maledictus furor eorum quia pertinax et iniquitatio eorum quia dura.* Puis il édicte la punition convenable, non exagérée, à chacun. L'un sera disséminé dans la terre promise, l'autre n'aura pas de lot à lui et ses enfants n'y seront qu'usufruitiers. Ainsi le peuple élu pourra se souvenir à jamais qu'il ne faut pas verser le sang des nations étrangères, même avec une apparence de justice, sans nécessité et sans les formes requises.

En effet le crime ne peut-être constaté, ni par conséquent puni, sans que le criminel soit préalablement jugé, convaincu, et en matière de guerre, sans que de plus il refuse obstinément la réparation. C'est pourquoi Dieu voulut qu'il y eût des juges parmi son peuple, pour juger avec justice entre les nationaux et les étrangers sans aucune acception de personne : *Sive sit ille civis, sive peregrinus. Nulla erit distantia personarum.* Comme conséquence, il fit une obligation à son peuple des formes préalables et indispensables en matière de guerre nécessaire, avant toute hostilité, en ces termes : " Lorsque tu te trouveras dans le cas de combattre une cité, un peuple, tu lui offriras auparavant la paix [1]."

Ainsi firent les onze tribus lors de l'attentat de Gabaa à l'égard de la tribu de Benjamin. Bien que le crime fût évident, les Juges des tribus procédèrent comme il se devait, et rendirent leur sentence. Puis on envoya des ambassadeurs dans

[1] Offeres ei primum pacem.

chacune des villes de la tribu de Benjamin, pour les solliciter de punir ou de livrer les coupables. Et l'on ne procéda contre eux que sur leur refus obstiné de le faire et d'ôter l'opprobre qui rejallissait sur tout le peuple de Dieu.

Un autre exemple est celui de Jephthé dont nous parlerons dans un instant.

Bien qu'antres soient les faits et les crimes des hommes, autres les enseignements divins, on peut dire que les Hébreux n'ont pas rendu vaine la raison de la promesse du Messie faite à Abraham leur père, le jour où il demanda grâce pour Sodome. " Puis-je celer mes desseins à Abraham, dit le Très-Haut, lui qui deviendra le Père d'une grande et forte race, et en qui seront bénies toutes les nations de la terre? Non, car je sais qu'il donnera pour loi à ses fils, à sa maison après lui, de se maintenir dans la voie tracée par le Très-Haut, en faisant le jugement et la justice. *Judicium et Justitiam.*" En effet, il est vrai qu'ils furent les instruments de Dieu pour la destruction de cinq peuplades adonnées à toutes sortes d'abominations execrables et habituées à immoler jusqu'à leurs fils et leurs filles sur les autels de leurs idoles. Mais cette mission formelle que Dieu leur donna à maintes reprises ne change rien à ses lois éternelles. Au contraire elle les fait mieux ressortir. Les Hébreux étaient tenus d'observer le Droit des Gens envers tous les peuples, même idolâtres. Ainsi, à la même époque, il leur est défendu d'attaquer les Ammonites en même temps que de les fréquenter, de peur d'être gâtés par leur corruption. Jephthé ne leur fit plus tard qu'une guerre défensive, après avoir essayé en vain d'obtenir d'eux une paix équitable. Il ne leur résista que lorsqu'il leur eut envoyé successivement deux ambassades solennelles pour leur demander la raison de la guerre qu'ils faisaient au peuple hébreu, leur exposer son bon droit et la possession trois fois séculaire de la terre qu'ils n'avaient jamais réclamée jusque là, et qui ne leur avait jamais appartenu.

Nous conseillerons de comparer les prétendus manifestes modernes décorés du nom de déclarations de guerre à la vraie déclaration du cas exposé par Jephthé avant de tirer le glaive, même pour se défendre : ils apprécieront la distance qui sépare les chrétiens d'aujourd'hui des Hébreux d'alors. Le message de Jephthé se termine ainsi : " Ce n'est donc pas moi qui péche contre vous, c'est vous qui agissez mal envers moi, en portant chez nous une guerre qui n'est pas juste." Aujourd'hui on ne parle plus de péche, ni d'injustice, on dirait qu'on ne sait plus ce que c'est. Aujourd'hui, disait il y a vingt ans (en 1869) votre si sérieux juriconsulte M. Anstey, quand un souverain veut faire la guerre, il ne dit plus : tel roi ou tel gouvernement m'a fait tel tort et il refuse de le réparer. On dit : Je fais la guerre pour une *idée*, pour le *prestige*, pour faire une *évolution historique*, et d'autres phrases ignobles qui ne recouvrent que l'ambition, la cupidité et des desseins pervers.

David ne fit plus tard la guerre aux mêmes Ammonites qu'après qu'ils eurent commis des injustices énormes, dit Grotius. Tandis que les modernes énoncent sans vergogne la prétention de mettre hors du Droit des Gens les hommes qu'ils taxent de races inférieures, et les y mettent en effet, au mépris de la fraternité humaine, l'ancien Testament nous montre David et Salomon faisant des traités avec l'infidèle Hiram, roi de Tyr, et ils en sont loués de Dieu dans l'Écriture [1].

Plus tard le peuple éhû agit de même à l'égard de Sparte et de Rome, et l'on offre dans le temple de Jérusalem des sacrifices pour les nations alliées. L'historien Joseph met dans la bouche de Salomon priant dans la solennité de la dédicace de ce Temple, le langage que voici : " Nous ne nourrissons pas un esprit *inhumain* envers les étrangers et nous n'avons à leur égard aucun sentiment mauvais [2]." La pierre de touche de la fraternité des hommes de toutes les nations, c'est la justice et l'humanité.

Autant Moïse et les prophètes tendent à interdire au peuple hébreu enclin à l'idolâtrie des relations dangereuses pour sa foi, autant ils maintiennent la Loi divine donnée primitivement sur l'effusion du sang des hommes. Non seulement dans le cours du temps rien ne lui est permis contre elle, mais cette loi est perpétuellement relue chaque semaine par toute la nation dans les synagogues, avec le récit de l'admirable conduite d'Abraham leur père, les paroles de Jacob à son lit de mort, la manière de procéder de Jephthé et des autres ; et dans ses fêtes solennelles le peuple choisi convie tous les Gentils et tous les peuples à chanter avec lui les louanges du Très-Haut.

En résumé, l'ancien Testament nous montre Dieu déclarant la vie de l'homme sacrée et inviolable, la fraternité de tous les hommes à quelque nation qu'ils appartiennent, la guerre criminelle et caïnique de la part des méchants qui la font

[1] *Juxta sapientiam quam si dominus dederat.*

[2] *Non unquam inhumano ingenio nec male affecti erga extraneos.*

pour satisfaire leurs passions sans cause juste et nécessaire, n'autorisant même la résistance des bons qu'après l'accomplissement des formes préalables pour garantir que l'effusion du sang de leur part ne sera rien autre, sinon la vindicte de la Loi éternelle violée et l'exercice du droit de défense légitime contre les actes pervers des méchants.

THE TEACHING OF PROPHECY.

In a paper on this subject, Mr. Geo. Gillett, of London, came to the following conclusions :—

(a) That war is constantly referred to in the Scriptures as a consequence of man's unrighteousness or of unjust government.

(b) That peace was promised to the Jews under the dispensation of Moses, if they worshipped God, and kept his statutes. But this peace was to be partially secured by the sword.

(c) That Isaiah and Micah foretell a peace, equally based upon a belief in God and obedience to Him, but maintained *without the sword* by the authority and power of the Lord alone.

(d) That this peace is announced by the prophets as connected with the coming of Christ in the flesh.

(e) That Christ claimed to be a king ; set forth the spiritual and peaceable nature of His kingdom, and proclaimed that it was at hand.

(f) That His reign in Heaven has begun, and His reign on earth is to be accomplished through "the people of the saints of the most high." And that any further delay in realising "peace on earth" is not according to the purposes of God ; although a want of faith by the Church in Her risen Lord may postpone to another generation blessings of peace intended for us when the nations shall learn war no more.

DISCUSSION.

Chevalier VLADIMIR DE BOLESTA-KOZŁOWSKI, speaking as an Austrian, referred to the persecution of men for their religious faith in certain countries in Europe, especially in Russia. He said that civil courage was a much greater virtue than military courage, and called attention to the fact that Christ was the first Teacher who taught clearly the love of one's neighbour, but, unfortunately, men had deformed His teaching, those very men who had taken His name and had kept His clear words from due appreciation in the world. He then referred to the fact that there was a civil war, a war against liberty of faith in Europe, which needed attention. The Jews were persecuted in many European States, but in this respect Austria offered a striking contrast to some of her neighbours. He regretted that while at the Berlin Conference attention was called to the horrors of slavery, nothing was said as to an equally cruel form of slavery which came from religious persecution, and urged that religious liberty was one of the essential elements in the growth of true Christianity and true peace among men.

Rev. C. B. SMITH, Boston, U.S.A., said the brotherhood of man rests upon the supremacy of Almighty God. His law must of necessity be absolute, universal, immutable. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart," was accompanied by the equally imperative mandate, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." Supreme love to God would reveal itself towards men first by leading its possessor to acknowledge and respect the natural rights and privileges among the whole brotherhood of man. Equality of natural rights and privileges did not involve the equality of natural capacity or of social position. Love to God and the brethren would constrain those who possessed it to acknowledge and respect the natural rights and privileges among the whole brotherhood ; among which were life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Secondly, love to God would develop itself toward man by

restraining its possessor from doing anything to his brother man that he would not have done to himself under similar circumstances. Thirdly, love to God would develop itself towards man by constraining its possessor to actively oppose all others who would do him an injury. And lastly, it would lead its possessor to help those first who need help most. If we had an equal regard for two poor neighbours whom we ought to help, and one was in a starving condition while the other had a small supply at hand, we should help the most needy first. Evidently those were in most need of help, who were the most injured and helpless, and who were they if not the millions who were pressed into military service by the resistless power of mighty Governments to kill or to be killed. Does the world furnish any class of men so helpless and needy as the millions bleeding and suffering in military camps and on the battlefield? Is there so much ruin, so much sorrow, and woe from any other source on earth as from this? Any arrangement that should terminate the barbarous practice of war among men, and relieve the millions of the oppressed and suffering would be the work of the good Samaritan and receive the benediction of the Father of us all, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me."

M. A. DESMOULINS (France) proposed as an amendment the introduction of the word "solidarity" into the resolution in place of "brotherhood." He thought the substitution of the word "solidarity" put in harmony the two terms of the proposal before them, implying as it did more effectually identity of interest and equality of rights. He further argued that "fraternity" was included in "solidarity," but the latter would give a larger idea and another meaning necessary to complete the meaning of "fraternity." The argument used for "fraternity" had been based to some extent upon ideas that were not accepted by the whole world, by all phases and schools of thought, especially in these modern times, whereas "solidarity" was a word which was universally recognised as being the larger term which includes the less. The doctrine of fraternity, though preached so continually, was still not accepted by mankind, due to the fact that the most civilised nations of the world were at this moment armed against each other to the teeth. If, on the other hand, they presented to mankind the idea of the identity of interest and the equality of rights, which was included in the word "solidarity," they would have a clear declaration of the principle involved in the word "fraternity."

M. FREDERIC PASSY said that if the word "solidarity" had been in the resolution, he should not have moved an amendment to put "brotherhood" in its place, but he must say he saw no reason for substituting "solidarity" for "brotherhood." "Solidarity" was a fact, but "brotherhood" was not only a fact but also a feeling. It was quite true that "solidarity" contained "brotherhood" if well understood, but it was not less true that "brotherhood," when felt, involved "solidarity."

MADLE. RADU (of Paris) seconded the amendment on the ground that the word "solidarity" in the minds of many Frenchmen had a more effectual meaning than "fraternity."

The amendment was put to the Congress and lost, and the original resolution was agreed to.

RESOLUTION II.

The following resolution was next proposed that—

(ENGLISH.)

"The Congress recognises the important influence which Christianity exercises upon the moral and political progress of mankind, and earnestly urges upon ministers of the Gospel and other religious teachers the duty of setting forth those principles of peace and goodwill which occupy such a central place in the teaching of Jesus Christ."

(FRENCH.)

II.—Le Congrès reconnaît l'influence importante que le Christianisme exerce sur le progrès moral et politique de l'humanité, et rappelle avec instance aux Ministres de l'Évangile et autres personnes s'occupant d'éducation religieuse, la nécessité de répandre ces principes de paix et de bonne volonté qui sont la base des enseignements de Jésus-Christ.

(See page 82 for final form of resolutions.)

The following paper by Signor E. T. Moneta, of Milan, the editor of *Il Secolo*, was read as moving the resolution :—

At the head of the programme for this Congress the Committee have wisely put the question of peace and war viewed from the religious standpoint.

A desire is felt in some quarters, and could hardly fail being expressed, that the Congress might eliminate this matter as being too dangerous for the peaceful discussions of a Congress, composed of persons professing different religions or no religion at all.

As well might one wholly exclude from our debates politics ; for many of us, no doubt, entertain widely different ideas about the forms of government and the conduct of States.

We meet with the objection : " L'histoire est pleine de guerres religieuses. Que de sang versé ! Que de persécutions et quelles persécutions ! " (History is full of religious wars. How much blood shed ! How many persecutions, and what persecutions !)

But the same can be said of all the Governments of the past, both monarchies and republics. Are we therefore to give up the hope that now-a-days more civilized and better enlightened governments, obeying the impulse and sway of public opinion may be found seeking in the glories and benefits of peace that authority which hitherto they have sought in bloody and warlike undertakings ?

Moreover, inasmuch as in all historical religions, with few if any exceptions, there is a common moral substratum (for, in all such as are now professed by civilized peoples, at least in all the different sects and sections of Christianity, good-will toward men and nations is being taught and preached), we must acknowledge the office of religions to be eminently educational. Are not religions, indeed, the greatest effort made by humanity, throughout the ages, to wean wild men from early rudeness and barbarity, and win them over to higher and higher ideals of mutual help, equity, justice, and forgiveness ? Calling to their assistance the terrors beyond the grave or the encouragements of a beneficent God, they originally aimed at combating and overcoming brutish appetites by the satisfactions of the human soul, violence by love, egotism by altruism.

If religions have not always fulfilled their highest office, if some of them have degenerated from their earliest character, this sad lot they have in common with all governments, with philosophy, with the schools, with all other human institutions.

Such as they are, they constitute by their powerful organisations even now-a-days one of the principal forces, if not the very first power, of social life. They take man at his cradle, and do not leave him even at the grave. The sway they hold over the multitudes is the more strong the less it is visible.

Governments, knowing this power of forms of religion, have at all times striven either to suppress them (although persecutions have ever increased their vitality), or to make them subservient to their interests of dominion.

And we who have no interests of our own, nor party interests, to advance, we who sincerely wish for the happiness of all men, shall we, from vain, unjustifiable scruples, deprive ourselves of the powerful auxiliary that religions can give to the cause of Peace in the world ?

In order to well understand the importance of the query submitted to the Congress, it suffices for each of us to answer the following questions :—

(1). Is it a good or an evil that in all religions, however different their genius and origin, peace toward men and nations is included among the highest duties to which man is bound to conform his conduct ?

(2). If, notwithstanding this, the holy ideal of Peace has been and is still so long lingering to take root in the conscience and customs of people, is the cause thereof to be attributed to the religions themselves, or to the contrariety of adverse times, or rather to the want of energy and constancy in those who were bound to care for that ideal being fulfilled ?

(3). If, from the earliest times downward, the ministers of the different religions, caring less for questions of forms and more for the high purpose of their ministry, had made Universal Peace the main subject of their teaching, who does not see what immense progress this holiest of causes would by this time have made in the world ?

(4). And if that which has hitherto been only a desideratum were to become a reality, viz., if we were shortly to see a general crusade against war preached by the ministers of all religions, would not mankind much sooner be delivered from the great scourge of war, which is at the same time the greatest sin of men ?

(5). If truly religious men, animated with that spirit of love which raised in the middle ages a Saint Francis of Assisi, and in our own time a William Ellery Channing, were to go about the towns and villages of Europe teaching as the first duty of all such as wish to be at peace with God and their own consciences, to labour for promoting good-will and peace toward the peoples, and for obtaining the disarming of their governments, would not our cause be marvellously helped thereby ?

The answer to these queries cannot be doubtful in England and the United States, where religion does not fetter the individual conscience, and where public spirit and the genius of liberty find in the religious feeling of the people their greatest source and impulse.

The objection rises from the Latin countries, in France, and above all, in Italy.

Here the men devoted to the cause of human brotherhood say to us : “ What you wish for is merely a dream. The past cannot be recalled. The Catholic Church is engaged in deadly conflict with the spirit of modern times, and will never be found willing to disarm. The Pope, and the Clergy dependent upon him, are our greatest enemies. For the peace we invoke they care little or nothing ; they do care most of all for preserving an uncontrolled empire over the consciences of the people.”

One day, not long ago, the writer addressed himself to one of the most illustrious and venerable prelates of Italy, one of those few ministers of the altar who mournfully deplore the modern estrangement between Liberty and Catholicism, and after relating to him the efforts which are being made all over Europe and America by the Societies of Peace for the triumph of their sublime ideal, preached and sanctified by the blood of Christ, asked him how it was that the Catholic clergy, in presence of this most encouraging movement, could remain unfriendly or indifferent.

The prelate answered : “ We are neither unfriendly nor indifferent ; we do secretly wish God-speed to your efforts, and our inmost hearts and thoughts are with you. We do wish we could do more ; we *would* indeed unite our efforts with yours ; but how can we do this, if you look upon all of us as traitors to our country and foes to civilization, if all our doings are suspected, misinterpreted ; if you are continually pointing us out to the hatred and scorn of public opinion ? ”

The words of that prelate are most significant. One might answer that our being unjustly suspected and misinterpreted ought not to prevent us from fulfilling our duty. Very true this for highly developed and superior persons, but not for the majority of men and women. The majority are moulded consciously, or unconsciously, by their surroundings.

Let us strive to improve these surroundings ; to make the spirit of concord rise where now mistrust is reigning, and the ideal of peace and human brotherhood which now seems far off and covered with threatening clouds, shall soon shine out near us, purely and brightly.

The estrangement now existing in our countries between the Civil Society and the Church is mournfully deplored by the best portion of the Clergy. Many of our priests take to heart their spiritual mission, see pre-eminently in Christianity the religion of love and concord, and would gladly lay down their lives, if they could thereby spare new woes to mankind and hasten the reign of

peace and brotherhood upon earth. And yet, owing to the reasons you are now acquainted with, in the holy warfare we are carrying on for universal pacification, alas! they are standing aloof! Is not this a sad loss of power?

In this matter the history of Italian Independence teaches a great lesson!

As long as the whole clergy stood apart from, indifferent or opposed to, the efforts of the Italian patriots, the latter were dragged to prison and died on the scaffold, or found escape only in exile, but their cause made no progress.

But when Pius IX. appeared by his words and deeds to aid Italian Independence, the national idea very soon became most popular; both young and old seized upon it with enthusiasm. Mazzini tendered his services, and Garibaldi his sword, to Pius IX, and from that day the achievement of Italian unity was no more doubtful.

What happened in the struggle for Italian Independence, and before that at the beginning of the French Revolution, what has ever become manifest in all great national movements, cannot help taking place also in this our holy cause of Peace, which is not only political, but eminently moral, and which concerns, not one nation, but the whole human race.

What a blessing for all if this should happen!

Well then, let us do our duty that this great event may be accomplished.

Let us labour, as far as it depends upon us, that no active force should be excluded from this work of civil and moral renovation.

Let our call go forth to all classes, all governments, all parties, all churches, to help in this work of universal pacification.

Ladies and gentlemen,—We are met here from different parts of the world, and hold on many political, civil, and religious questions, widely different opinions; but we are all united in a common feeling: the abhorrence of internecine wars; the love of the whole human family.

Animated with this feeling, the word which we address, in the name of their own faith, to the ministers of all religions will be such as to level the barriers dividing them among themselves and also dividing a portion of them from civil society; and if it shall touch the hearts of the many good men that are among them, if it shall induce them to look with increased sympathy upon, and lend some help to, the work we are all devoted to, oh! then, be sure, this Congress will have well deserved of the cause of humanity.

The resolution was seconded by the reading of a paper prepared by Mr. GEO. W. MINIER (Illinois, U.S.A.) on

DUTIES OF MINISTERS OF RELIGION WITH REGARD TO PEACE AND WAR.

It is patent to everyone who reads the Bible that the prophets predicted a time when wars will cease. All of them, but especially Isaiah and Malachi (Isaiah ii, Malachi iv.), tell us it shall come to pass in the last days. The patriarchal Age, which lasted about twenty-five hundred years, ended when God gave His law to Moses on Sinai, some fifteen hundred years before Christ. The Jewish Age ended at the Crucifixion of Jesus. We are therefore living in the last time, the Christian Age. The three Dispensations, so-called by theologians, but which should be called three Administrations, for so Paul alludes to them (1 Cor. xii., 5), are three great divisions of time. At the head of these three great periods, stand three great personages, Adam, Moses, Jesus. We are living in the last period under the administration of Jesus the Christ, the Son of the living God.

One feels like dropping the subject just here. The meek and lowly, the loving Jesus, restrained Himself from asking more than twelve legions of angels at his crucifixion, and ordered Peter to put up his sword. (He is "the Prince of Peace.") To suppose that one claiming to be a minister of His, and should pattern himself after and follow his Master, can do otherwise than advocate peace, and deprecate war, is unthinkable.

What should he, the minister, do? He should preach it from his pulpit, and act it out in his life, and never suffer himself to be beguiled into the idea of becoming a chaplain in an army; unless he go there to tell the story of the Cross to soldiers, and administer to the sick and wounded. The minister should not

fail to instruct the youth in the arts of peace ; and in every way, by precept and example, denounce the horrors of war.

One way to do this is to show the waste of means, and the poverty brought about by War. Of the many millions of money which this Government of the United States of America owes, every dollar is a war debt. And this is mostly true of all nations. If all ministers of Christ's Gospel were as earnest in advocating Peace as they are in building up Sectarian *Systems* (something not found in Christ's teaching), what a delightful morn would soon break in splendour on the world ! Could we wake up some morning and find that all wars and armaments, for the destruction of human lives and the waste of material happiness, were abolished, we would need divine aid to convince ourselves that we were still inhabitants of this once cruel, but now peaceful and happy earth.

Would it not be a good and laudable effort for this " Universal Peace Congress " to request every preacher, in all denominations, to preach a sermon on peace, as opposed to war ? Suggest the day. The first Lord's day of the New Year would be a good time. It is vain to remind the ministers of the meek and forgiving spirit of the Master they serve, unless we get them to work also. Many of them have not studied this matter : too many chaplains in legislative halls, and in opposing armies, pray not for war to cease but for success in battle.

Few there are, perhaps none, we justly apprehend, who, in their hearts, are resolutely opposed to war. In behalf of humanity, in behalf of righteousness, let all ministers labour in the cause of peace. And in the name of the Divine Master, Heaven's glorious King, let the people be instructed in what Jesus taught in that wonderful Sermon on the Mount : " Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use and persecute you : that you may be the children of your Father in Heaven. For He causes His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sends His rain upon the just and upon the unjust."

" Then wars shall cease, and ancient frauds shall fail,
Returning justice lift aloft her scale,
Peace o'er the world her olive wand extend,
And white-robed innocence from Heaven descend."

Then too, in the emphatic words of Hebrew prophecy, " He shall judge among the nations and shall rebuke many peoples," and " They shall beat their swords into plough-shares and their spears into pruning hooks : nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more " (Isaiah ii., 4).

The following papers were also submitted :—

CONTINUATION OF PAPER

By M. L'ABBÉ DEFOURNY.

IV.

ENSEIGNEMENT DU CHRIST. NOUVEAU TESTAMENT.

Nous aurons moins à nous étendre sur le nouveau Testament. La raison en est que le Messie a confirmé l'ancien Testament. Je ne suis pas venu, a-t-il dit, abolir la Loi, mais l'achever, la perfectionner. Il a confirmé en particulier la Loi pénale sur l'Effusion du sang au jardin de Gethsémani lorsqu'il rappela à Pierre, qui venait de frapper du glaive sans autorité, et sans les formes requises, sinon sans justice, l'oracle prononcé au lendemain du Déluge : Quiconque répandra le sang humain paiera lui-même ce crime de son sang, et qu'il dit à Pierre, en guérissant la blessure que celui-ci venait de faire : " Rentre ton épée dans le fourreau. Tous ceux qui frapperont de l'épée, périront par l'épée." Tout ce que nous avons dit de l'ancien Testament doit donc être attribué au nouveau.

Ce qu'il importe de relever dans l'Évangile, c'est cette perfection de la loi ancienne, dont parle le Sauveur lui-même et dont nous allons dire quelques mots.

La fraternité et la Paix sont comme l'âme de l'enseignement moral de l'Évangile. Les Messagers célestes chantent sur le berceau du Messie promis à Abraham et à Jacob et qui avait été l'attente des Nations : Gloire à Dieu au plus haut des cieux, et paix sur la terre aux hommes de bonne volonté. Il est venu pour rétablir la paix entre le ciel et la terre, entre Dieu offensé et les hommes pécheurs, et entre tous les

hommes, et il a cimenté cette paix de son propre sang. Il s'est fait le frère des hommes, il les appelle de ce nom, il leur dit qu'ils ont tous un même Père qui est aux Cieux et qu'il faut que chacun prie en lui disant : *Notre Père*. Dans le Sermon sur la Montagne, il proclame les huit béatitudes, dont voici la septième : Heureux les pacifiques parce qu'ils seront appelés les fils de Dieu. Il recommande à ses Apôtres d'annoncer au monde l'Évangile de la paix, de dire en entrant dans chaque cité, dans chaque maison : Que la paix soit dans cette demeure. Il emploie lui-même cette forme de salutation, et dans le doux éclat de sa résurrection, les premières paroles qui sortent de sa bouche sont celles-ci : Pax vobis. Que la paix soit avec vous ! Ses Apôtres, fidèles à son enseignement, commencent leurs prédications par ces mots : Viri fratres, *Hommes Frères*, et ils s'appliquent à eux-mêmes ces paroles du prophète : Qu'ils sont beaux les pieds de ceux qui vont évangéliser la paix ! S'il dit en un endroit qu'un résultat de sa mission divine ne sera pas la paix, mais le glaive, il entend par là que ses disciples fidèles seront exposés aux persécutions et il veut qu'ils s'estiment bien heureux de les souffrir.

Sans doute, il serait peu conforme au sens de ces textes visant la paix, de les restreindre uniquement à la paix opposée à la guerre, puisque le Sauveur a laissé à ses Apôtres et à ses Disciples une paix supérieure à tout trouble humain, une paix telle, qu'ils la gardaient au milieu des guerres qu'on leur a faites, et qu'elle leur revenait doublée lorsque ceux à qui ils l'offraient ne l'acceptaient pas. Mais il serait non moins contraire à l'enseignement du Messie de dire qu'il n'avait pas en vue la paix opposée à la guerre, puisque celle-ci dénonce de l'autre et que si tout le monde avait la première, la seconde ne serait jamais troublée.

Enfin et surtout il a établi cette fraternité et cette paix sur un commandement nouveau, le précepte de la charité mutuelle, semblable à la sienne. "Aimez-vous les uns les autres comme je vous ai aimés moi-même. On a dit aux anciens : (ce qui ne signifie pas l'ancienne loi) : Aimez vos amis, et gardez votre haine pour vos ennemis. Et moi je vous dis : Aimez vos ennemis. Faites du bien à ceux qui vous haïssent." Il est inutile d'insister ; personne ne conteste et tout le monde sait que le Messie est venu annoncer aux hommes qu'ils sont tous les fils d'un même Père céleste, et que son enseignement vise à leur procurer toute justice et toute paix. Personne n'ignore non plus qu'il a confirmé la loi morale primitive, sans en excepter un iota, et qu'il l'a perfectionnée par la charité. Personne ne contestera non plus que ces trois grandes choses, la fraternité, la justice et la charité soient en relation intime avec la Paix et la Guerre.

V.

DEVOIRS DES ECCLÉSIASTIQUES AU POINT DE VUE DE LA PAIX ET DE LA GUERRE

INSTRUCTION RELIGIEUSE SUR LA PAIX ET LA GUERRE.

Il ne m'appartient pas de tracer leurs devoirs aux ecclésiastiques au point de vue de la paix et de la guerre. Toutefois il me semble que je répondrai suffisamment au vœu du programme en ce point et en ce qui concerne l'instruction religieuse, en résumant ici l'enseignement de l'Église sur ce grave sujet. Je serai d'autant plus à l'aise pour le faire que je suis certain de ne heurter personne dans cette Assemblée en le faisant. Cette doctrine en effet est contenue dans les Pères, les anciens conciles et les canons. Elle est ainsi le patrimoine commun, le code de toutes les nations chrétiennes. Car, dit un protestant anglais dont les amis de la justice et de la paix ne devraient prononcer le nom qu'avec un profond respect, David Urquhart, lors de la scission du XVII^e siècle, ni depuis, personne n'a rejeté ni songé à rejeter les admirables *Canons de Re Militari et Bello*.

Dès le second siècle un écrivain chrétien s'exprime ainsi : "Depuis que le Père a donné à Christ les nations pour héritage et pour possession la terre jusqu'à ses plus extrêmes limites, dès lors il a étendu le manteau du fraternel amour sur tous les hommes sans aucune exception." Dès lors l'Église acquiert cette gloire de professer l'horreur du sang versé, même avec juste cause. La guerre la plus juste et la plus nécessaire inspire de la tristesse, et le chrétien qui a trempé sa main même dans un sang coupable, est déclaré incapable des fonctions sacrées de participer au ministère de l'autel où s'immole l'Agneau. Quelques auteurs et même un ou deux Pères des temps primitifs semblent avoir condamné toute espèce d'effusion du sang de la part des chrétiens. Comme nous nous occupons ici de doctrine, non des sentiments particuliers, ni de controverse, nous ne les discuterons pas. Nous nous bornerons à dire ceci : à

une époque où la carrière militaire n'était pas obligatoire, en même temps que l'exercice de cette profession imposait, d'après les lois romaines, l'obligation de participer souvent d'une manière positive aux pratiques idolâtriques, et d'exercer des services, des tortures contre les malfaiteurs du delans, ces sentiments se comprennent. Et de fait, si l'on ne refusait pas le baptême aux soldats, les directions de l'Église basées sur ces deux motifs, faisaient une obligation aux baptisés de ne pas prendre la ceinture militaire après le baptême. Les mêmes directions étaient données aux magistrats chargés par état de participer à l'effusion du sang en prononçant la peine de mort, et en présidant aux tortures et aux exécutions.

Venons aux Canons, et comme nous disons à présent, aux décisions formelles et officielles qui s'adressent aux soldats, et condamnent l'injuste effusion du sang comme contraire à la Loi de Dieu. Nous n'en connaissons pas avant la fin du troisième siècle. Peut-être n'y en eut-il pas, et cela se concevrait. Gibbon nous raconte que lors du débarquement des Goths envahisseurs à Chalcedoine, en l'an 289 de l'ère chrétienne les habitants de l'Asie avaient perdu l'habitude du maniement des armes parce qu'ils n'avaient pas vu de guerre depuis trois siècles. Pour le dire en passant, la province romaine d'Asie, jouissant de trois siècles de paix, nous représente une Angleterre où l'on n'aurait pas tiré le canon depuis le règne de Henri VIII jusqu'au milieu de notre siècle, ou une France depuis celui de François Ier. Il ne serait donc pas surprenant qu'il n'y eût point eu alors de décision formelle sur le danger mortel que fait courir aux âmes la criminelle effusion du sang. La première connue est du Pape Saint Caïus (qui avait été esclave). Nous n'en avons pas les termes. Nous savons seulement qu'il instruisit sur leurs devoirs Maurice et la Légion thébaine lorsqu'ils séjournerent à Rome, à leur retour d'Orient où ils étaient allés défendre l'Empire contre les premières invasions des barbares. Le résultat des instructions que leur donna Saint Caïus fut le martyre de ce glorieux chef et de ses 6,600 compagnons, qui se laissèrent massacrer jusqu'au dernier à Octodure, aujourd'hui St. Maurice, en Valais, plutôt que de prendre part à une expédition injuste.

Saint Eucher évêque de Lyon, qui a écrit au Ve siècle, l'histoire de la Légion thébaine, nous a conservé les termes de la remontrance de ces généreux martyrs de la Loi divine au tyran Maximien dans le moment où il venait de les faire décapiter. En voici un fragment. C'est l'expression de la tradition chrétienne, dont Saint Eucher de Lyon est le témoin autorisé.

" Nous avons toujours combattu pour la justice, la piété et la défense des innocents. Ces nobles fins étaient les seules récompenses que nous ayons eues en vue au milieu des fatigues des camps et des périls des batailles. Mais le serment que nous avons fait à Dieu au baptême prime celui que nous vous avons prêté à vous-même. Comment pourriez-vous compter sur le second, si nous violons le premier ? Nos bras sont prêts contre tout ennemi. Mais nous aimons mieux mourir que de nous souiller du sang des innocents." C'est ici qu'a été prise la noble devise : *Potius mori quam fieri*. Seulement, on n'en sait plus le sens parce qu'on a retranché d'abord, oublié ensuite les mots qui suivent : *Potius mori quam fœdari innocentium sanguine*.

Plus tard, l'Église a institué la Chevalerie. En voici la définition en vieux français : Office de chevalerie est de maintenir la foi, femmes, veuves et orphelins sauvegarder, défendre hommes méaisés et non puissants. N'est-ce pas la traduction du texte de la remontrance de la Légion thébaine : *Pugnabimus semper pro justitia, pro pietate et innocentium salute* ?

C'est vers l'époque de Saint Eucher, du IVe au VIe siècle, que commencent à se formuler les saints canons de *Re Militari et Bello*, chefs-d'œuvre de la législation divine-humaine, qui rendaient muet d'admiration un puissant esprit de notre temps.

Citons textuellement, " La volonté doit toujours être à la paix, la nécessité seule impose la guerre." *Pacem habere debet voluntas. Bellum necessitas*. Alors sont fêtrés avec une énergie et une concision admirables les motifs impies de guerre, notamment dans le canon *quid culpatur in bello*. L'ambition de dominer, qui n'est qu'orgueil ; la rage d'étendre son empire, qui n'est qu'ambition ; la passion des richesses qui n'est qu'une variété de la servitude idolâtrique ; l'envie contre les autres nations, le propre péché de Caïn ; la joie sauvage et bestiale de verser le sang : Voilà ce qui est criminel dans la guerre.

" Toute guerre est injuste et criminelle par conséquent lorsqu'elle n'a pas été précédée d'un édit judiciaire préalable, rendu par des juges qui soient vraiment tels, c'est à dire qui disent le Droit au peuple. Car le juge n'existe pas si la justice n'est point en lui. Que le sang verse soit celui des païens ou celui des chrétiens, la conséquence est la même, elle entraîne l'inhabileté à exercer les fonctions sacrées."

C'est ici le lieu de rappeler cette incapacité à recevoir les Saints Ordres ou à en exercer les fonctions connue sous le nom d'irrégularité pour cause de crime de

meurtre ; que le meurtre soit privé ou collectif, il n'y a pas de différence. Elle a toujours existé dans l'Église, et elle est enconrue par tous ceux qui prennent part à une guerre injuste, n'y eût-il qu'un seul homme qui périsse du côté de ceux qu'on attaque injustement. Ainsi l'ont toujours enseigné tous les théologiens et tous les canonistes du monde y compris ceux d'aujourd'hui. " Il faut s'abstenir des armes non seulement en Carême, mais en tout temps, si ce n'est lorsqu'un concours de circonstances impérieuses et inévitables en rend l'emploi nécessaire et urgent pour notre propre défense, celle de la patrie et des lois de nos pères." Voilà bien la nécessité inévitable, hors de laquelle il est criminel de verser le sang.

Ce canon est tiré des Responsa du Pape Saint Nicholas Ier, aux Bulgares nouvellement convertis. Il est plus long, et entr'autres décisions le Pontife ajoute, écrivant au roi néophyte de ce pays. " Vous avez commis un crime en faisant périr les femmes et les enfants de vos ennemis, innocents de leur attentat. Nous savons que vous l'avez fait par erreur plutôt que par malice, néanmoins faites-en pénitence. Vous deviez conserver la vie à vos ennemis même après la victoire et même à tous ceux que vous pouviez épargner dans le combat. Et plus loin : Il ne faut user d'aucune violence pour convertir ceux qui sont dans l'idolâtrie."

Ici la formule du Droit des Gens conforme à la Loi évangélique se complète. La charité vient se joindre à la justice pour orner sa compagne de la miséricorde et la déponiller de ses rigueurs païennes. En effet, les peuples de l'antiquité, ceux même qui observèrent le mieux le Droit des Gens, ne se faisaient pas scrupule de massacrer les ennemis après la victoire avec leurs familles, ou de les réduire en esclavage perpétuel.

En voici un autre du temps que les Sarrazins envahissaient l'Espagne, la France et l'Italie : Autre est la cause des Juifs, autre celle des Sarrazins. Ceux-ci poursuivent les chrétiens, les chassent de leurs villes et des pays qu'ils habitent : C'est avec justice qu'on les combat, *juste pugnatur*. Ainsi, ce n'est pas parce qu'ils sont Mahométans qu'on leur fait la guerre. Jabrège, en citant Saint Bernard, qui va nous résumer en termes aussi clairs qu'énergiques la doctrine chrétienne sur la guerre.—Le passage est tiré d'un livre fait pour les soldats et adressé aux Chevaliers du Temple. *Ad Milites Templi*.

" Il faut tout ensemble une juste cause et une intention droite à celui qui se bat. Si l'une ou l'autre manque, malheur à vous ; vainqueur ou vaincu, la bataille finit mal pour vous. Car si c'est vous qui êtes tué en voulant tuer, vous mourez homicide. Et si c'est vous qui tuez, vous vivez homicide : misérable victoire qui en faisant de vous le vainqueur d'un homme, fait de vous le vaincu du crime."

Il parle ensuite du soldat chrétien, et il lui applique,—chose digne d'attention, les passages de Saint Paul dans lequel l'Apôtre recommande l'obéissance aux Puissances établies et en donne la raison.

" Le vrai soldat chrétien ne porte pas le glaive sans cause. Il est le ministre de Dieu pour la punition des malfaiteurs et la défense des gens de bien. Quand il tue un malfaiteur, on ne peut certainement pas dire qu'il devient homicide, mais plutôt exécuteur du méchant." Ici le passage est intraduisible en français.

Toujours la même conception, celle de la Loi divine. Le soldat n'existe que pour réprimer les malfaiteurs, soit du dehors, soit du dedans. Et il en était ainsi avant les temps plus modernes, comme dans l'antiquité. Le soldat n'était pas distingué de celui qu'on appelle aujourd'hui le bourreau. Ce sont des soldats romains qui ont crucifié le Sauveur sans savoir ce qu'ils faisaient ; ce sont des soldats qui ont décapité Saint Jean Baptiste, sur le commandement inique d'Hérode, et l'Église dans son antique liturgie flétrit tranquillement le tyran comme ceux qui lui obéissent : *Misit rex incredulus ministros detestabiles, et amputavit caput Joannis Baptistæ*. Antienne que nos pères du moyen Age auraient ainsi traduite : Le Roi sans *foi ni loi*, envoya des ministres indignes d'estimer en justice (detestabiles) pour couper la tête de saint Jean Baptiste.

Le texte de Saint Bernard n'est pas achevé, et j'attire votre attention sur la fin. " Car, poursuit-il, il ne serait pas permis de tuer même les païens (les lures) si l'on pouvait empêcher, de n'importe quelle autre manière, leurs ravages intolérables et l'oppression injuste dont ils accablent les chrétiens."

A genoux, suis-je tenté de m'écrier avec un de vos compatriotes, à genoux devant le prédicateur de la deuxième croisade, tenant cet admirable langage au moment où il la prêche.—Combien je regrette, Messieurs, que le temps me manque pour continuer à vous exposer cette Législation de l'Église ou seulement pour l'analyser, l'effleurer un peu davantage. Je vous parlerais des conciles des IX., X., et XIe. siècles interdisant les sacrements aux soldats qui prenaient part aux guerres injustes ou non-nécessaires de cette époque, et ne les y admettant que s'ils quittaient l'épée en faisant serment de ne jamais la reprendre, sinon pour la défense de la justice ou de la patrie

nisi pro justitia defendenda ; imposant la pénitence au chef et aux soldats qui avaient pris part à une guerre dont la cause n'était pas établie, comme votre concile de Winchester tenu après la conquête de Guillaume de Normandie et présidé par Lonfranc, où l'on édicta contre les soldats trois ans de pénitence pour chacun de ceux qu'ils avaient tués, quarante jours pour chacun de ceux qu'ils avaient blessés, trois jours pour avoir voulu tuer. Ce qui montre, comme tant d'autres monuments, comme Saint Bernard qui s'adressait à chaque soldat, que l'on n'abdiquait pas alors comme aujourd'hui sa responsabilité entre les mains de ceux qui commandaient la guerre, juste ou injuste.

Les chartes de cette époque sont les échos des Conciles. Je pourrais vous en citer des centaines dans lesquelles le Seigneur jure en ces termes comme le sire de Concy : Je n'aurai pas le droit de conduire les hommes aux batailles, sinon dans le cas où quelqu'un viendrait pour envahir injustement ma terre ou assiéger quelqu'une de mes forteresses. On lit dans une autre : Ils n'iront à la guerre que sous la pression d'une cause juste, et très manifestement reconnue pour telle. Nisi causa justa et manifestissima incumbente.

Mais je ne puis finir sans vous parler d'un grand homme qui fut en même temps un grand saint, et qui devrait être votre patron, parce que vous êtes vraiment ses disciples en ce point : je veux parler de saint François d'Assise, qui fonda le Tiers-Ordre séculier en vue de mettre fin aux guerres multipliées qui désolaient depuis deux ou trois siècles plusieurs contrées de l'Europe. Saint François d'Assise était un cœur fort. Il a de plus l'esprit plein de lucidité pratique, et il trace en quelques lignes dans sa Règle les vraies méthodes pour corriger les défaillants, prévenir et accommoder les procès ou les faire décider justement sans passion. Mais ce qu'il veut avant tout, c'est la paix ; il avait rétabli la salutation usitée par Notre Seigneur, et il abordait chacun avec les douces paroles chantées par les Anges au premier instant du beau Minuit sur le divin berceau : Que Dieu vous donne sa paix ! Le chapitre VII. de la Règle du Tiers-Ordre séculier est ainsi conçu : " Les membres du Tiers-Ordre séculier ne porteront pas d'armes pour envahir ou attaquer ; invasionis aut inugnationis : ils ne s'armeront que pour la défense.

Voilà, Messieurs, les deux lignes qui ont achevé de mettre fin à cet état de guerre et qui ont préparé le beau XIIIe. siècle, qui ne put être si grand que parce qu'il fut le siècle de Saint François et de Saint Louis, le siècle de l'arbitrage et de la paix.

Permettez-moi de citer à ce propos quelques lignes du Pape actuellement assis sur le Saint Siège, du Pape qui a prononcé la mémorable Allocution Consistoriale du 11 Février 1889, sur la paix et les moyens de la rendre au monde actuel.

S'il arrive que par le vice de la nature ou par la faute des hommes, le genre humain vient à tomber dans le mal et qu'un secours extraordinaire soit nécessaire pour qu'il se relève, il est absolument indispensable d'avoir recours à Jésus Christ et de voir en lui un puissant et très sûr moyen de salut. . . . C'est ce qui se produisit à la fin du XIIe. siècle et dans les premières années du XIIIe. Saint François fut l'ouvrier de cette grande œuvre. On ne saurait dire avec quel entraînement la foule se portait vers lui. On pleurait amèrement ses fautes, on oubliait les injures et l'on revenait par l'apaisement des discordes à des sentiments de Paix. C'est la raison qui détermina le saint à instituer l'Association du Tiers-Ordre qui admettait toutes les conditions, tous les âges, l'un et l'autre sexe, sans obliger à rompre les liens de la famille et de la Société. Il l'organisa sagement. . . . moins avec des Règles particulières que d'après les propres lois évangéliques, qui ne sauraient paraître trop dures à aucun chrétien : les règles sont en effet d'obéir aux commandements de Dieu, de s'abstenir des factions et des rixes, de ne rien vouloir détourner du bien d'autrui, de ne prendre les armes que pour la défense de la Religion et de la Patrie."

En commençant cette seconde partie de mon discours j'ai décliné, comme je le devais, la tâche de tracer leurs devoirs aux ecclésiastiques, relativement à la Paix et à la Guerre dans les temps présents. En terminant, il me semble que rien ne m'empêche d'émettre un vœu. C'est que ces simples et admirables doctrines que je viens d'ébaucher, formulées par l'Église en conformité des enseignements de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament, cessent d'être ensevelies dans la poussière des Bibliothèques ou renfermées entre les murs des universités, des séminaires, des Ecoles de Droit, qu'elles en sortent, érudites par les doctes professeurs, proclamées du haut des chaires par les cloquants prédicateurs, vulgarisées par la presse honnête et chrétienne. Bientôt le sens du juste et l'intelligence des Lois religieuses en matière de Paix et de Guerre pénétreront de nouveau dans les esprits. Alors, en présence des peuples imbus de ces fortes et claires doctrines, il ne sera plus guère possible d'oser leur commander des guerres injustes et inutiles, c'est à dire des massacres, réprouvés tout ensemble par la Religion et la Justice. Les litiges en matière secondaire, ne pouvant plus servir de prétextes à d'impies effusions du sang seront rares ; et ceux qui se présenteront, on trouvera tout

simple de les résoudre, soit de gouvernement à gouvernement, soit par des Arbitres et au besoin par cet Arbitre naturel des nations chrétiennes, le Saint Siège, que proposait, il y aura trois ans le 28 de ce mois, Lord Stanley d'Alderley à la Chambre des Lords, en affirmant, sans contradiction de la part des très honorables Pairs, son action salutaire et son impartialité dans les siècles passés.

DUTIES OF MINISTERS OF RELIGION WITH REGARD TO PEACE AND WAR

By FREDERICK SESSIONS, Gloucester.

In order to ascertain, with satisfaction to our own mind, whether any specified religious or philanthropic movement is a lawful or desirable question to preach about, we must surely first ask ourselves, "Why am I at this moment a recognised minister of the Gospel?"

We may take it for granted that no ministers, who will carefully follow this paper, are put into the "priest's office" merely that they "may eat a piece of bread." To those who look upon the ministry as *nothing more* than a "living," neither the movement in favour of peace, nor even "the cure of souls" will make any real claim on their consciences, or their love, or their time.

A similar question to the foregoing is, "What is the proper function of that ministerial calling into which we have lawfully and rightly entered?" Undoubtedly our first duty is—the Holy Ghost working with us—to preach the kingdom, to heal soul-sickness, and to cast out devils. If we wait on our ministry, as the Apostle Paul enjoins upon us, we shall endeavour, in season and out of season, to reprove, rebuke, and exhort the flock of God, and we shall, as ambassadors for Christ, put His atoning and sanctifying work in the forefront of everything. As did Peter to the multitudes, that came running together to see the notable miracle wrought by John and himself at the Beautiful Gate of the Temple, so shall we also declare that in the name of the crucified Saviour, through faith in His name, there is to be had perfect soundness of heart and life for all men, since the Father has sent His son in His resurrection power to turn each one from his iniquities.

But, over and above the message of reconciliation, through Christ Jesus, of a fallen and sinful world to God, we have a message committed to us for those who *are* thus reconciled to Him, we have to declare what ought to be the Christly life lived by all men and all nations. We cannot conceive that Christ intended to make *one* rule of life for the *private* citizen and *another* for him who is responsible for the well-being of communities. Surely He demands the highest possible exhibition of righteousness, peace, and goodwill towards others, from men of every social rank and condition—from the king as from the crossing-sweeper, and from the statesman as from the costermonger. When this truth is properly impressed upon everybody, then the family will live in the same spirit as we know individuals should do, and nations will live in internal quietude and prosperity, and the rulers of the earth will behave towards each other as children of the one common Father. It was *all men* (the nations), of whom our Lord was thinking when He gave His Apostles the great commission ordering them to teach the peoples to do whatsoever He had commanded them. The Christ-like life is the only ideal life that fits all humanity, everywhere and always. Towards this ideal, rather than to those of even the purest forms of philosophic paganism, our teachers should ever seek to lead the world, not only in the belief of God's Word, but in the doing of His commandments. We shall never bring it up to the highest standard unless, in the right spirit, free from assumption, and yet with all boldness, we "magnify our office" so as to deliver to it the message of peace and goodwill to men, with a "Thus saith the Lord." Political economies, commercial necessities, International codes, Parliaments of nations, all need advocating and enforcing: but the preacher's first duty is to teach our race the principles and essence of Divine and human government.

Says the Bishop of the Church of England to the clergyman in one portion of his ordination services:—"Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this office and ministrations, to serve God for the promoting of His glory and the edifying of His people?" The deacon answers, "I trust so." The Westminster Catechism teaches that "they that are called to labour in the ministry are to preach sound doctrine diligently, in season and out of season, plainly, not in the enticing words of man's wisdom, but in the demonstration of the Spirit, boldly, making known the whole counsel of God." In his "Congregational Church Polity," the Rev. Dr. Dale says:—"The true minister speaks under the inspiration of a strong affection for his people, and with a deep sense of responsibility for their faith and righteousness. If through want of urgency on his part any of them are living in

revolt against God he knows that he shares their faults, and if they remain in revolt to the last, the shadow of their awful doom will fall upon him. . . . There is something in the vigorous ethical life of a man who speaks under the power of a great enthusiasm, for justice and purity will give new force to the conscience of those who listen to him, and will exalt their ideal of moral perfection." The Rev. William Arthur, the eminent Wesleyan minister, says in his "Tongue of Fire":—"The most dangerous perversion of the Gospel, viewed as affecting individuals, is when it is looked upon as the salvation of the soul after it leaves the body, but no salvation from sin whilst here. The most dangerous perversion of it, viewed as affecting a community, is when it is looked upon as the means of forming a holy community in the world to come, but never in this. Nothing short of a general renewal of society ought to satisfy any soldier of Christ."

I want you to see my point clearly, which is that unless we feel, as we stand before our congregation, that we do so as those who have a *right* to declare a message from God, we may as well hold our tongues, and let the secular newspapers, and monthly and quarterly magazines, have things all their own way. Whilst personally most strongly opposed to mere priestism, I dread the threatened government by an irresponsible Press, and believe that in things religious and philanthropic the men anointed by God the Holy Spirit should stand between the living and the dead, and, as far as they realize and grasp it, should declare the whole counsel of God to the world. Without desiring to see a generation of "political parsons" who would range themselves on either side of the great *party* strifes of "the ins and the outs," I still hope that the time may soon come when the spiritual river flowing from beneath the altar of Jehovah will be permitted to bring to *every* burning question of the hour, and to the Commonwealth of the Nations yet to be. This it will do immediately the pulpit grasps the truth that its mission is to save the peoples of the earth in time as well as for eternity.

This matter of peace or war is "one of the burning questions of the hour." Universal peace is in the direct line of our Saviour's holy will, as revealed to us in the Gospels, and in those Apostolic Epistles to the infant Churches which constitute for us such valuable commentaries on that revelation. War is, from the preparation for it to the magnificent cathedral services in praise of victory, in flagrant contradiction to that practical exhibition of Divine principles which is demanded from the followers of Christ. The Church of England long ago recognised the prime importance of a peaceable life when it ordered the prayer to be written and to be offered in every service, "Give peace in our time, O Lord." Whatsoever a congregation might rightly pray for, the minister ought surely to preach earnestly in behalf of, and when he so preaches he ought not to let any excuses for breaking this peace, or for being a party to doing so, in thought, word, or deed, remain in the heart of any one of his hearers. A congregational prayer that is not honestly meant is a mockery of the Most High.

Turning to the Scriptures we find even in the Old Testament that the prophets were more widely concerned with denouncing national evils, and threatening Divine judgment upon wrong doers of their own and the surrounding nations, than even in foretelling the coming of the world's Messiah. I am not surprised, therefore, at the king putting Jeremiah into prison as a political firebrand, and I can thoroughly understand the desire of the Syrian monarch to capture Elisha, who so nobly ranged himself on the side of freedom, while at the same time giving us a magnificent example of how to turn armies back by the force of all conquering love rather than by that of arms.

It is in the New Testament, however, that we get, direct from Christ Himself, our commission and our messages of universal peace. Peace to men as between them and God; peace to men of goodwill as among themselves; and peace with their enemies and those who would spitefully use them and persecute them. There is throughout the Saviour's teaching a sweet sound of love to all men in which there is "no undertone of the battle's thunder, and no voice of tears." At any rate, so His apostles and the earliest fathers of the Church understood Him. Says St. Paul: "If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, be at peace with all men" (that is to say, *endeavour* to keep the peace; do not inflame men's passions, nor yield to senseless panics, but rather do *all that in you lies* to bring about a time when the nations shall *learn* war no more). "Avenge not yourselves, beloved," he continues, "but rather give place unto wrath, for it is written, 'Vengeance belongeth unto Me, I will repay, saith the Lord'; but if thine enemy hunger feed him, for by so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head; be not overcome with evil, but overcome evil with good." Says the Apostle James: "Where jealousy and faction are there is confusion and every vile deed, but the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits,

without variance, without hypocrisy, and the fruit of righteousness is sown for them that make peace." Says St. John : " My little children, let us not love in word, neither with the tongue, but in deed and truth : hereby shall ye know that ye are of the truth " ; and in another place he adds : " We love Him because He first loved us. If a man say I love God and hateth his brother he is a liar, for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen cannot love God whom he hath not seen ; and this commandment we have from Him, that he who loves God loves his brother also." We learn that the " brother " or " neighbour " is as much a man of another nation as one of our own from the Saviour's parable of the Good Samaritan.

The generation immediately following the Apostles held the same views of the Master's teaching. Tertullian, earnest and uncompromising, declares, in answer as to whether a believer may turn himself unto military service, and whether the military may be Christians, that there is no agreement between the standard of Christ and the standard of the devil, the company of light and the company of darkness, and regards the attempt to defend war from the Old Testament as mere *sporting* with the subject. He points out that the Lord, in disarming Peter, " unbelted every soldier," and affirms, in relation to military uniforms, that " no dress is lawful if assigned to an unlawful action." Justin Martyr, in his dialogue with Trypho, declares that " having learnt the true worship of God we have each, through the whole earth, changed our warlike weapons—our swords into plough shares, and our spears into implements of tillage, and we cultivate piety, righteousness, philanthropy, faith, and hope, which we have from the Father Himself, through Him Who was crucified." The twin message of private and universal peace borne to the world by those early Christians is seen to accord fully with those general and specific exhortations of Jesus, the Prince of Peace, already alluded to.

" With the pure teaching, the passionate love, taking thought for the humble and weak The pitiful scorn of wrong, which the scriptures everywhere speak ;
Not writ for the sage in his cell, but preached, mid the turmoil and strife,
And touched with a living brand from the fire from the Altar of Life."

But, need we go back to the Scriptures and to the Fathers only for our warrant to preach peace from the pulpit, as well as to proclaim it from the platform, and to write it up in the Press? Is not the Holy Ghost a living and ever present power, who, if we are truly called by Him to the work of the Master, will teach us day by day what topics to deal with, and how to search the consciences of men with regard to such thing as the lust and greed of commerce, and the sins of the flesh, and the pride and inhumanity and wicked waste that ever accompany the actual prosecution of all wars! If we be God's ministers in very truth how can we send our sons into the military profession, or by our presence at reviews, countenance a system which lives upon violence and outrage? In such a position of responsibility as we find ourselves ought we not rather to stand as heroically as Leonidas in his defile against the horde of fanatical and self-interested panic mongers, and against scheming generals, whose pathway to a doubtful fame, and whose right to wear gorgeous decorations, and to found peerages, is based on the skill and scornfulness with which their class can sacrifice to their own ends every other man's right to a quiet and peaceable life, and to the enjoyment of the hardily won wages of his toil. We cannot be too thankful to the Rev. H. Price Hughes for his manly and outspoken sermon against what he justly calls " the deadly militarism of Lord Wolseley." If only our 40,000 or 50,000 ministers in England would preach but one such sermon every quarter of a year for the next few years, Europe would soon hear once more a " Truce of God " proclaimed, such as the white-ribbon bands of peaceable citizens successfully wrung in the middle ages from their over-lords and barons, whose quarrels John Milton so aptly compared to the quarrels among kites and crows.

Is it possible that the preachers of righteousness are never moved by such considerations as that millions of men have been sacrificed upon the altar of Mars, among Christian nations alone, in this nineteenth century after the birth of the Prince of Peace? Is it nothing to them that at the present moment twenty-five millions of men are ready, at some wild young monarch's bidding, or after an inflammatory speech by some tottering statesman who dreads the coming loss of his political power—to dash at each other's throats like bulldogs slipped from their leash? Have they no thought that it is within their province to denounce that commercial immorality which cares nothing for the woes of the peasantry and the ruining of all trades and manufactures but their own, so long as good Government contracts for weapons, or ships, or military stores can be secured? Does it never occur to them that as the prophets of Israel fulminated against their own people for selling a girl for wine and giving a boy for a harlot ; against Tyre for trafficking in the persons of men : and against Babylon for its military ardour and violence : so it is

their own duty, as ambassadors for Christ, to point out the direct connection between the financial exigencies of militarism and the raising of oppressive taxes from the people? Have they never learnt that the true world-progress is by the power of the Holy Ghost, and the faithfulness of Christian professors to every minutest particle of the Master's teaching, and not by the breach of His holy laws, nor by ignoring the sacredness of holy life and the brotherhood of men and of nations? Do they not see that the unrest of Nihilism and Socialism is but the expression of the hatred of the oppressed multitudes of the continent of Europe for military despotisms, and for enforced services, and the grinding taxation under which they suffer? And do they not also see that unless the Church of Christ protests vigorously, in the name of Christ, against these things, the people will inevitably think it approves of them, and will be driven into the armies of the unbelievers, and possibly destroy in some mighty upheaval every vestige of religious worship together with their political oppressors?

“ Up from the mighty city
 A cry goes up to Heaven—
 A cry goes up from breaking hearts,
 A cry from souls unshriven.
 Up to the gates of Heaven
 The mournful burden flies ;
 Up to the gates of Heaven
 Laden with human cries.
 Up to the gates of Heaven,
 Up to the Prince of Peace—
 When shall the burden lessen ?
 When shall the burden cease ? ”

I frankly admit the difficulty of introducing doubtful disputations or the discussion of many-sided questions to congregations of persons holding every variety and shade of social and political view. It may be best to leave the practical solution of how to promote Arbitration and Disarmament to Parliament, the Press, and the Platform rather than to the Pulpit. Yet, while I never want to see our ministers become party preachers, on the other hand, I would not like them prohibited from taking their places as citizens in the political agitations of the day. I want them also to pray for the spirit of the prophet who, when he had yielded to the call of God and had had his lips touched with a live coal from off the altar, could set his face like a flint against the sinfulness of nations. We want the occupiers of the pulpits to be like the Apostles, who, when they were filled with the Holy Ghost, turned the prisoners' bar into a seat of judgment, and made their judges tremble. If we cannot, as ministers, enter the arena of party strifes, we can at least lay down, as clearly as words may do, the first principles of truth and righteousness. In this matter of peace, must it not be our duty to point the nations to a better and more sure protector than the might of armies and navies? That God is on the side of the strongest battalion is a truth or a falsity according to whether we look at it from a Christian or non-Christian standpoint. If God is to be ruled out of the universe it is a truth. It then only becomes a sneering way of saying that a greater material force must inevitably overcome a weaker one. But if God lives, as we know he does, it is a lie. Spiritual forces are mightier than material ones. History proves abundantly that God is *not* always on the side of the strongest battalions. Every honest soldier must admit this, and we believe that not God, but the adversary of the human race is working most earnestly and successfully through the military spirit and organisation of to-day. Not our army, for instance, but righteous government and missionary enterprise hold India loyal to the British Crown. Our narrow escape of losing it through the mutiny was the direct result of our military organisation. We had called a native army into existence, and it turned against us. It was a military and not a civil uprising, and illustrates the universal truth that “ They who take to the sword shall perish by the sword.” This terrible uprising was the result of the overbearing behaviour of military officers towards their subordinates, and probably dates back farther than the era of greased cartridges, to days when, as Canon Wilberforce has pointed out, in order to support our wicked opium traffic with China, Indian soldiers were compelled to break caste by crossing the Kali Pani, or black waters. The history of the Society of Friends in Pennsylvania, and during the Irish rebellion, and over and over again in remarkable episodes of the great European war and the Great American Civil War, proves that it is perfectly possible and safe to practise what the Psalmist sings, “ They trust in chariots and horses, but we will trust in the Lord our God.” The religious teachers of our day need to believe in a living, loving, and superintending Father in heaven. The ~~Only~~ ~~will~~ ~~hear~~ ~~our~~ ~~lessons~~ ~~of~~ ~~faith~~ ~~from~~ ~~the~~ ~~pews~~ ~~and~~ ~~from~~

"laymen," from the experience of missionaries and missionary converts, and from mission communities in times of war, who, like Nehemiah in pre-Christian days, have been ashamed to ask of the king a band of soldiers, because they have already boasted of their absolute trust in God. Friends and brethren—you whom the Lord has called to declare the coming of His kingdom in righteousness and truth—cannot you, of all men, trust Him in times of trouble and danger? Do you not believe what you teach? And even if it should please Him best that you should become martyrs in the cause of universal brotherhood, you would not be the first to lay down your lives for the truth. As Christ has loved us, and has given Himself for us, so ought we also to be ready to lay down our lives for the brethren. In any case, let us be true to our commission; not the heralds of war, but the peaceful soldiers of the Cross. To sum up the burden of this paper—our business is to teach the kingdoms of the earth that they are to become at once the kingdoms of our God and His Christ, and that they are all to live for Him and serve Him to-day, and not in the Millennium only—

"From the awaking of the glorious sun
In the far chambers of the crystal East,
To where he goeth down in pomp and power
Beyond the western seas."

We have lost strength in endeavouring to grapple with purely intellectual and scientific problems, while neglecting the vast social problems that so closely influence the moral force and material prosperity, and even the religious beliefs, of the masses of the community. Many of the scientific doubts of the day will clear up of themselves if let alone, but the pressure of the war system upon the nations is terribly real and full of awful possibilities for evil, which, to borrow a phrase of our Poet Laureate, we, who preach the Gospel, are bound to protest against as—

"Knights of God, working out His will
To cleanse the nations."

CHRIST'S TEACHING TO THE WORLD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By Mr. HENRY STANLEY NEWMAN (Leominster).

"HAVE FAITH IN GOD."—Mark xi., 22.

The keystone of right action is faith in God. The perilous link in every downward course is unbelief. Faith results in the patriotic and the peaceful. Unbelief interposes the doubt, "Hath God said?" and precipitates us in war with God and war with man. The reason men fight is because they distrust God and man. The reason I am at peace is because I rely on the All-Fatherliness of God. The practical application of this two-edged sword of truth is universal. By faith Moses was meek and peaceable when his sister and brother, Miriam and Aaron, declared family war. By faith Moses appointed Courts of Arbitration and Appeal in the Cities of Refuge when controversy suddenly arose between blood and blood. By faith King Saul held his peace when the children of Benjamin "despised him" and "brought him no presents." By faith David refused in self-defence to slay the Lord's anointed, saying, "The Lord judge between me and thee, and see, and plead my cause, and deliver me out of thine hand." In unbelief and forgetfulness of God, David brought a curse upon the nation when he numbered the 1,300,000 "valiant men that drew sword." By faith Ezra was ashamed to require of the King a band of soldiers and horsemen, for he had spoken to the King, saying, "The hand of our God is upon all them for good that seek Him, but His power and His wrath is against all them that forsake Him." By faith the Israelites besought the Lord on the banks of the Abava, and He "delivered them from the hand of the enemy." By faith William Penn, on the banks of the Delaware, made treaty with the Indians under the elm tree, subdued kingdoms, and established the Colony of Pennsylvania, by a compact which, in the words of Voltaire, "was never sworn to and never broken." In faith England consented to Arbitration on the Alabama claims, and cheerfully paid the award of the Arbitrators, achieving what has been termed "the most glorious event in English history." In unbelief and distrust the Continental Powers grind down their subjects under the iron heel of the conscription, so that tens of thousands of their best citizens escape to the freehold homesteads of America. A recent writer in Germany says, "Trade is simply dying. Every German one meets groans over the taxes. People are too poor to buy. The discontent is awful." In unbelief and distrust France holds her Colony of Algeria in the bonds of military despotism, so that soldiers are picketed at the four corners of a haystack to prevent the Arabs setting it on fire.

The doctrines of Peace lie deep in the heart of Christianity. "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." Adhered to, Christian faith leads nations

to prosperity; rejected, calamity results. Yet it is Truth we are to follow, whether it seem to lead to outward prosperity or not. We are to love Him who is the Truth, not for the gifts He brings, but for His own sake. Without faith it is impossible for a nation to prosper, because without faith it is impossible to please God. John Bright's great axiom for Ireland was that "Force is no remedy," and his words apply to every government on the face of the earth.

Our safety in India does not consist in a little standing army of 73,337 English soldiers among 252 millions of people, but we are strong in an administration of justice, conciliation and peace. By faith Schwartz was stronger in South India than all our troops. When our soldiers were starving, it was Schwartz alone that supplied them with bread. He was the one man whom Hyder Ali would receive as Ambassador from the English. "Let them send the Christian," said the Rajah, "he will not deceive us." By faith in God, Sir Herbert Edwardes, when Commissioner in the Punjab, established the golden maxim, that "Christian things done in a Christian manner will never alienate the people," adding, "Above all we may be quite sure that we are much safer if we do our duty than if we neglect it, and He who has brought us here with His own right arm will shield and bless us, if, in simple reliance upon Him, we try to do His will."

Sir Peregrine Maitland said to a missionary in South Africa, "You have done my government more service than a whole company of soldiers." Yes, love is mightier than the sword. The testimony of Napoleon Bonaparte is clear: "Alexander, Cesar, Charlemagne, and myself have founded empires by the sword, and they have dropped to pieces like ropes of sand. Upon what did the creations of our genius depend? Upon force. Jesus alone founded His empire upon love, and to this very day millions would die for Him." Christ came to establish a kingdom that shall never cease to increase. In enunciating the motive principles of His kingdom, He shows that the greatest of these is love. "My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews, but now is my kingdom not from hence." If we are members of His kingdom, we are subject to the laws which regulate that kingdom, and, subject to those laws, we are under the absolute guard and protection of Christ our King.

The legions of heaven camp round about us, as they encompassed Elisha. If we are in a furnace of distress or difficulty, there is the presence of a "Fourth like unto the Son of God." If I am a child of God, I can fearlessly commit my cause to the keeping of "Him that judgeth righteously." No emergency can arise in which the omnipotence of God is insufficient. The echo of this faith is heard more or less distinctly in every age of the Church. When Christ charged Peter to sheath his sword, Tertullian says that, "in disarming Peter, Christ unbelted every soldier."

Origen says, "If all the Romans embraced the Christian faith, they would overcome their enemies by prayer, or rather, they would not go to war at all, being guarded by that Divine power which promised to save five whole cities for the sake of fifty just persons." Again he says, "We do give help to kings, a divine help, so to speak. As by our prayers we vanquish the demons who stir up war, and cause the violation of oaths, and disturb the peace of nations, we are in this way much more helpful to kings than those who take the field to fight for them. None fight better for the king than we do. We cannot indeed fight under him even if he should require it, but we fight for him in offering our prayers to God."

The Donatists of Phrygia upheld the same truth. In 295 A.D. the young martyr, Maximilian of Numidia, was beheaded because he refused to be a soldier, saying, "I cannot engage in military service: I am a Christian." Martin, of Tours, on his conversion, when serving in the army, went to his general and said, "I am the soldier of Christ, it is not lawful for me to fight." Loring Brace, in his excellent book on the achievements of Christ in leavening the world, gives many illustrations of the way in which the "Peace of God," and the "Truce of God," were advocated in the middle ages. Men traversed Europe as pilgrims with banners pleading for peace. Duelling, which was so prevalent in Germany and Gaul, in England and in Spain, has to a large extent ceased, because the conscience of Europe rose against it.

During the Irish rebellion, the Friends, trusting in God, refused to take up arms in self-defence, and historians declare that the only houses at that time where there was safety were the houses of these peaceful non-combatants. During the Civil War in America in 1861 to 1865, Friends in North Carolina were subjected to abuse and torture because they refused to fight, and at the close of the war they state that "among all those who steadily refused to bear arms, many of whom were imprisoned, not one suffered a violent death."

(a) Among r-medial measures, Richard Cobden laid great stress on the influence of INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE AS A MEANS OF PROMOTING PEACE. Commercial

relationships may multiply occasions of difficulty, but we make a mistake if we imagine that on this account commerce does not promote peace. The fact is, the closer the communication between nations and the more mutually interdependent their commerce, the more arguments exist for maintaining friendly relations. While Christ heartily encourages industry and denounces the "slothful," He continually, by example and precept, condemns covetousness. In the presence of the unselfishness of Christ, Protective Tariffs must vanish, while Commercial Treaties, Industrial Enterprises, and Co-operative Societies for developing the wealth of earth, will be in the ascendant, binding nationalities together, and welding into community of interest every civilized nation. Healthy commercial intercourse is therefore on the side of Christianity. Agricultural pursuits prevail when men beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks. Dr. Chalmers says, "The existence of the prophecy, 'They shall learn war no more,' is a sentence of condemnation on war, and stamps criminality on its very forehead. So soon as Christianity shall gain a full ascendancy in the world, from that moment war disappears."

(b) The teaching of Christ is an absolute contradiction to INTERNATIONAL JEALOUSY and national pride. In the parable of the Good Samaritan our obligations towards WEAKER RACES, the claim of every man on the sympathetic help of his brother man, and the "rights of man," as man, are clearly recognised.

Do the principles of peace eat out our Patriotism or make cowards of us? Far from it. Patriotism consists in working and suffering for the welfare of our fatherland, not in drinking toasts in champagne. The bread-winner is the true patriot, for it is the toiler that really adds to the national wealth. Christ in the carpenter's shop in Nazareth manifested heroism. Weeping over Jerusalem, He became a voluntary sacrifice for His nation, and not for that nation only, but for the whole world. Instead of the interests of one nation being isolated or opposed to the interests of another, Christ teaches us the solidarity of mankind, that if one member or nation suffer, all nations suffer with it: if one nation is honoured and blessed, as Israel was blessed, all nations are blessed.

Bishop Westcott referred to this at the Church Conference last year: "In the light of Christian faith," he said, "the true interests of nations are identical, because they are the interests of humanity. The loss of one nation is the loss of all, the gain of one nation is the gain of all." "An unrighteous victory is above all a calamity to the conquerors. The incarnation proclaims a brotherhood of nations no less than a brotherhood of men." "Every duty which is recognised in our private dealing one with another, must find an analogous place in international relations."

(c) The establishment of COURTS OF ARBITRATION and the MEDIATION of NEUTRAL POWERS are the direct result on the world of the benediction of Christ's teaching, "Blessed are the peacemakers." Our beloved Queen has on several occasions during her reign exercised her royal influence in favour of mediation. President Grant said, "I look forward to an epoch when a Court, recognised by all nations, will settle all international differences, instead of keeping large standing armies as they do in Europe." Every nation has the option of a blessing or a curse. "Cursed be he that removeth his neighbour's landmark," and without his consent rectifies his frontier. "Cursed be he that smiteth his neighbour secretly," and layeth torpedoes in the course of his ships; and let all the nations say "Amen." "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord" (Ps. 33-12). Let the conscience of England declare which we have merited.

(d) IMPERIAL FEDERATION is in accord with the teachings of Christ. He died not for one nation only, "but that he should *gather together* in one the children of God that were scattered abroad." The proposal of Lord Rosebery to knit together in a compact of peace the Anglo-Saxon race is a step in the Christian direction. The position of the Anglo-Saxon communities on both sides the Atlantic is without parallel. Our rapidly increasing colonies impose upon us the responsibility to form a Federation giving to each a representative government. But Christ would carry us much further than this. He would gather together in one the spears of the whole world, and bring all into a compact of peace where the stronger and more civilised should help the weak. In Him there is neither Greek nor Roman, Jew nor Gentile, barbarian, bond nor free, but all are merged in one kingdom under one king.

The intention of LAW, as we find it in the teachings of Moses, is to protect the poor from the oppression of the strong, to maintain inviolate the person of every subject of the kingdom, to plead for the widow and the orphan child, to redress and repress outrage and violence. The tendency of all just laws is to keep man at peace with his neighbour, and when wrong is done, for the man, instead of avenging the

wrong himself, to refer the matter to the arbitration of magistrate or jury. The teaching of Christ throughout is in the direction of the fulfilment of law. He infinitely strengthens law, by giving us power to keep the law.

(e) This leads us to the great necessity for the establishment of a CODE OF INTERNATIONAL LAW. If law is good between citizen and citizen, it is also good between nation and nation. If 250 millions in India, composed of many races and many languages and religions, are at peace one with another, because they are under one government and one law, why should there not be an international code for Europe to bind over belligerents to keep the peace, and to pledge each other to refer their differences to a Court of Appeal?

It is to the Christian Church that we must look for active co-operation in the formation of Courts of Appeal and Arbitration and for help in the formation of an International Code. The Church, while separating herself from sin, must not and dare not stand aloof on questions like these which affect the well being of millions for whom Christ died.

America has set us a noble example in the Pan-American Congress. In the preamble of the treaty then formed, the Delegates declare that "War is the most cruel, the most fruitless, and the most dangerous expedient for the settlement of international differences." The first article states, "The Republics of North, Central, and South America, hereby adopt Arbitration as a principle of American International law for the settlement of all differences, disputes, or controversies that may arise between them"; the only exception for any nation being where the matter in controversy "may imperil its independence." Mr. Blaine, Secretary of State, observes, "We hold up this new Magna Charta, which abolishes war, and substitutes Arbitration between the American Republics, as the first and great fruit of the International American Conference."

Mr. Wm. Evans Darby in his address to the Paris Peace Congress, proposes a "League of Peace," "the formation of a solemn International Treaty providing for the submission of international differences to arbitrators to be chosen by the Governments interested, or by their representatives forming a Nomination Board," or "better still, the appointment of a permanent Court of Arbitration."

(f) If Europe will thus follow the example of the American Republics, it will naturally lead to the next step, DISARMAMENT AND THE DISBANDING OF STANDING ARMIES. The teaching of Christ on this point is equally emphatic, "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." Bearing the sword, and training for war, form no real security. Our standing army is a disgrace in England. Our vast National Debt of £713,000,000 is not so important as the low moral status of our English soldiers depicted by Mr. Labouchere in the House of Commons: "Ninety-four per cent. of the rank and file in the army, on completing their original term of service, decline all invitations or inducements offered them to renew their engagement," showing their own judgment against life in the army. "Within the last ten years between 40,000 and 50,000 men have deserted." "In 1889 there were only 111 men per 1,000 in our army over 30 years of age." "During the same period of ten years no less than 110,000 men or boys in our army have been sentenced to various terms of imprisonment." Such statistics are sufficient, without note or comment, to condemn a standing army in time of peace. As we sow, so, as a nation, are we reaping the immoral harvest. Our standing armies are a witness against ourselves that we distrust God.

(g) Christ teaches us the doctrine of NON-INTERVENTION, or, as St. Peter puts it that no man or nation "suffer as a busybody in other men's matters." We read in Chronicles (II. Chron. xxxv. 20-24) that King Josiah was warned, "Forbear thee from meddling," but refusing the warning, he perished for his folly. Many wars, in which England's life-blood has been spilt, have been purely "meddlesome."

(h) Christ maintains the right of the lowly citizen. "He hath put down the mighty from their seats, and exalted them of low degree." As such teaching prevails, the franchise of the people becomes honoured. In lieu of "declarations of war" at the caprice of monarchs or tottering cabinets, war will only be declared by deliberate submission to the VOTE OF THE PEOPLE." President Harrison, in bidding adieu to the Delegates at the Congress in Washington, pointed to the smallness of the United States army, and proudly and justly observed, "Our securities are lodged with our people." Such noble words are a humiliating contrast to our condition in Europe, where 3,242,000 men are standing with bristling bayonets waiting for war, while no less than 17,314,000 trained soldiers are ready to be called out in case of a war panic. Let not the exhilaration of our meeting together in this great Congress hide from us the need for deep humiliation. At our Missionary Conference in London in 1878, the aged Dr. Moffat rose and quoted the words of a heathen chief to his comrades in

South Africa : " What is War ? War cultivates no fields. It plants no gardens. War raises no families and builds no houses. Will you know what War has done ? Go to the fields where the strife of battle has raged, and ask the enslaved people, What are you doing here in slavery ? They will reply, War sent us down here. Go to the widows and ask, Why do you mourn ? and the widow will answer, War devoured my husband and I am alone. Go to the fatherless, and they will tell you, I had a father, but War ate him up."

When visiting Ephesus, I was shown the Cave of the Seven Sleepers. We are told that seven soldiers in the Roman army on becoming Christians, were sentenced to death. They escaped, and were fed month by month by fellow believers in this cave. When the Government of Ephesus was changed, they again appeared in the streets of the city, and offered their coins for purchases in the Agora. But they had been so long in the cave that their coins had become obsolete. So will it be with War. A time will come when a dead past will bury its dead. The military platitudes and glamour of war will become unmarketable. Children will play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child on the cockatrice' den. Faith in God will take the place of fortifications, " For verily I say unto you, whosoever shall say unto this mountain, be thou removed and cast into the sea, and shalt not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that what he saith cometh to pass, he shall have it. Therefore I say unto you, all things whatsoever ye pray and ask for, believe that ye receive them and ye shall have them."

What then does Christ want us to do in the matter ? May we not send a delegation from this International Congress to our Queen to express our sympathy with her in the burdens of State, to ask her intervention among the nations in favour of peace, and to give expression to our united prayer, " that it may please God to give to all nations, unity, peace, and concord " ?

THE EARLY CHRISTIANS AND WAR.

By Mr. J. BEVAN BRAITHWAITE, London.

The attitude of the Early Christians in relation to War is one of great interest.

It is difficult for us, after the lapse of so many centuries, to realise the position and circumstances of the infant Church, springing as it were into a new life, and with an unknown future before it.

It was the happy season of child-like faith, which could accept in their obvious meaning the words of Him who was revered and adored as the one Lord and Redeemer. In the simplicity of the early believers — this obvious meaning was not to be lightly explained away. It was rather in their view to be accepted as designed in His infinite wisdom at once for the exercise and the discipline of their faith and obedience. They had not yet been taught that " it is lawful for Christian men at the commandment of the magistrate to wear weapons and serve in the wars." It was only very gradually that the Church was persuaded that the words of her Divine Lord, " Love your enemies," could by any possibility be strained so as to allow of its being lawful to kill or even to injure an enemy. Thus we find Justin Martyr, about the middle of the second century, insisting upon the fulfilment under the Gospel of the independent, yet almost identical predictions of Isaiah and Micah, " Out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, and He shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people, and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks ; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more" (Isaiah ii., 4 ; Micah iv., 3). " That these things are come to pass," says the Christian Apologist, " ye may be convinced. For from Jerusalem there have gone forth into the world a company of twelve men, unlearned and unskilled in the arts of eloquence, but who, sent forth by Christ to teach unto all the Word of God, have proclaimed it to every nation of men, so that we who were formerly aliens one to another, not only do not fight against our enemies, but we do not even deceive them, or state anything falsely, but we cheerfully die confessing Christ." (Justin Martyr, Apolog. I, c. 39. See also his Dialogue with Trypho § 109-110.)

The testimony of the Athenian Athenagoras, about the same period, is to the same effect. " We can persuade you," he writes, addressing the Emperor Aurelius and his son Commodus, " by the doctrines to which we give heed, which are not human but divinely inspired utterances, no longer to esteem us as Atheists.

" What then are the commands in which we are trained ? ' Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, and pray for them that despitefully use you, that ye may

be the children of your Father who is in heaven, who causes His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth down rain upon the just and the unjust.' For amongst us ye will find men in humble life engaged in manual labour, and even poor women, who are not, perhaps, able to say much, but who show forth in action the excellence of these teachings. For they do not utter choice words, but exhibit good deeds. Being stricken they strike not again; they patiently suffer the spoiling of their goods, they give to those who ask, and "love their neighbours as themselves." (Athenagoras, *Leg. pro Christianis*, c. 11, p. 41, Ed. Dechair.)

Irenæus may be considered as representing the Church both in the east and in the west. Brought up at Smyrna as the disciple of Polycarp, who was himself the disciple of the Apostle John, his testimony carries us back beyond the latter end of the second century, when he is usually spoken of as flourishing, whilst his long residence at Lugdunum (Lyons), in Gaul, where he is believed to have died, identifies him with the Churches of that country. Like Justin and Athenagoras he freely quotes the words "Love your enemies" as part of the distinctive teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ, and as a command binding under all circumstances upon his followers. (*Iren. contra Hæreses*, lib. II., c. 32, § 1.) He insists upon this in another beautiful passage. "Enlarging the scope of the Mosaic Law, the Lord commands us not merely not to kill, but not even to hate; to love not merely our neighbours, but even our enemies. Whatsoever," saith he, "ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them; not grieving at wrong as unwilling to suffer it, but as rejoicing in having the opportunity of doing good; being rather forward in kindness towards our fellow men, than serving them by constraint as of necessity. These things, as we said before, are the commands not of one destroying the law, but of one who in fulfilling it extends it to us. For He redeemed us, not that we should depart from Him; (for none placed outside the Lord's provision can acquire for himself the food of salvation); but that obtaining more of His grace, we might love Him more. For the more we love Him the greater shall be the glory that we shall receive from Him when we shall be ever in the presence of the Father." (*Iren. adv. Hæres.*, lib. iv., c. 13, § 3.)

Brief as is the charming dialogue of Minucius Felix, it testifies to the horror of human bloodshed which pervaded the minds of the Christians of that day ("*Nobis homicidium nec videre fas, nec audire.*" *Min. Felix*, p. 299-300, Ed. Onzel.) about A.D. 180, or perhaps a little later.

The origin of the Latin Church of North Africa is involved in great obscurity. But whether derived from Rome or Alexandria, it had become by the end of the second century an important and influential community. Tertullian, of Carthage, was at that time its most distinguished ornament. ("*Hic apud Latinos nostrorum omnium facile princeps judicandus est.*"—*Vincentius Lirinensis Communitorium*, c. 24.) His father is said by Jerome to have been a proconsular centurion—a military officer under the proconsul of Africa (*De Viris ill.* c. 53)—a fact which may explain his apparent familiarity with military service, whilst giving colour to the doubt whether he himself was originally a Christian. His "Apology" has been justly styled a "masterpiece," and his other performances are written with art and force, and are edifying and instructive. (2. *Lardner's Works*, p. 268.) From them it is evident that although there was not in the Church at that time any distinct regulation prohibiting military service, there was an important and influential party who looked upon it with great disfavour. In his tract upon Idolatry, Tertullian strongly expresses his own opinion that a Christian cannot consistently engage in the military profession. Referring to the words of Christ to Peter: "Put up thy sword into his place; for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword"; (*Matt. xxvi. 52; Jno. xviii. 11*); he says "How shall the Christian carry on war; how indeed shall he act as a soldier, even in peace, without a sword, which the Lord has taken away? For although soldiers came to John and received advice as to their behaviour, and although the centurion had believed, yet afterwards the Lord disarmed every soldier in disarming Peter. With us no course of conduct is lawful which is attached to an unlawful act." (*De Idol.* c. 19.) Again, in his tract on "The Soldier's Crown," he writes: "A Christian is nowhere anything else but a Christian. There is but one Gospel, and the same Jesus, who will deny everyone who denies Him and will confess everyone who confesses God. Faith admits not the excuse of necessity. There is no necessity for sinning to those for whom the only necessity is not to sin." (*De Coronâ*, c. 11.)

The same views are expressed in his Apology. "If," says he, "as we said before, we are commanded to love our enemies, whom have we to hate? If, when we are injured, we are forbidden to return the injury, lest we should be like our tormentors, whom can we hurt? You yourselves acknowledge this. For how often do ye rage

against the Christians, obeying partly your own impulses and partly the existing laws? How often in the past has the enraged public attacked us of their own accord with stones and fire? With the very fury of bacchanals, they do not spare even the dead Christians, but cut in pieces and drag off the bodies of some from the rest of the grave, from the very sanctuary of death.

"But God forbid that the divine sect should be avenged by human fire, or should grieve at that suffering by which it is proved. For if we desired to act the part of open enemies, and not merely secret avengers, would the power of numbers and of forces be wanting to us? We were but of yesterday, and we have already filled all that is yours, your cities, your districts, your forts, your towns, your council chambers, your very camps, your tribes, your societies, the palace, the senate, the forum; to you we have left nothing but the temples."

Tertullian is the Carlyle of the ancient world, and the fervour of his rugged eloquence carries him away—

"For what war," he continues, "are we not prepared, yea, ready though with unequal forces, who are so freely butchered, if with our principles it were not lawful to be killed rather than to kill. By merely withdrawing ourselves, unarmed and without rebellion, we could effectually fight against you, by the evil effect of our example alone. For if so great a multitude were peaceably to retire into some distant corner of the world, the loss of so many and such excellent citizens would fill your empire with confusion, and punish it by the abandonment. Doubtless you would be affrighted at your own solitude and stand aghast at the spectacle of a dead world—you would vainly ask for those over whom you lately ruled" (Tertull. Apol., c. 37).

But I must hasten on. In Clement of Alexandria, we have a writer nearly contemporary with Tertullian, and equally able and learned, but of a sweeter spirit. Representing the Alexandrian Church, he thus addresses the Gentiles: "The purpose of God is ever to save the flock of mankind. To this end the good God hath sent forth the good Shepherd; and the Word having made the truth simple, hath showed unto men the height of salvation, that so they may rather repent and be saved, than, through disobedience, be condemned. This proclamation of righteousness is a message of glad tidings to them that obey, but of probation to the disobedient. But the voice of the loud-sounding trumpet has pealed forth, and collected the soldiers, and proclaimed the war. Christ has breathed His song of peace unto the ends of the earth; and shall He not gather together His peaceable soldiers? Yes, truly He hath collected His bloodless army with His blood and His word; and hath delivered unto them the Kingdom of Heaven. The trumpet of Christ is His Gospel. He hath sounded it, and we have heard. Let us clothe ourselves with His peaceable armour, putting on the breastplate of righteousness, taking the shield of faith and the helmet of salvation, and girding on the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God. Let us sharpen our weapons for the conflict. It is thus that the Apostle draws out the order of peaceable battle. This is the armour that is invincible. Armed with these, let us set ourselves in battle array, and be ready to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked one." (Clement Alex. Protrep., c. xi., § 116, p. 90, Ed. Pott.) The above is but a brief abstract from his earnest appeal. Yet more distinct and precise is the testimony of the famous Origen. He stands pre-eminent for learning and piety amongst the Christians of the third century. Many of his writings are only known to us in Latin translations, not always to be relied upon; but his Treatise against Celsus, which is one of his most carefully prepared works, has been happily preserved to us in the original Greek. It is generally supposed to have been written in the reign of the Emperor Philip, about A.D. 248, the year in which, one thousand years from the foundation of the city, the secular games were celebrated with unusual pomp. (See Gibbon's Decline and Fall, c. 7.) Origen was then in the maturity of his powers, a little more than sixty years of age. The passage is rather long, but it presents the ripe convictions of the most profound Christian scholar of the age. It occurs towards the end of the 8th book: "Celsus urges us to help the Prince with all our strength, to relieve him in his just quarrels, to fight with him, to bear arms under him, and if he calls upon us, to assist him in the conduct of his armies. Now, it may be replied, we do, as occasion requires, assist our Prince, taking up, if I may so say, Divine assistance, and the whole armour of God. And these things we do, obeying the voice of the Apostle when he says, 'I exhort you, therefore, first of all, that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, should be made for all men, for Kings, and for all that are in authority.' And by how much any is the more godly by so much is he the more efficient in helping princes than those soldiers who go forth to their armies and slay whomsoever they can of their enemies. Besides which, we

may say to those who are strangers to the faith, and who require us to fight for the common good and to slay men, that even those among you who are priests of your idols, and have charge of the temples of those whom ye esteem gods, keep their right hand undefiled on account of the sacrifices; that with hands unstained with blood and pure from slaughter, they may approach the appointed sacrifices to those whom ye call gods; and on the occurrence of war ye on no account permit priests to enlist in the army. If then this be praiseworthy, how much more, when others are fighting, do these Christians wage war as the priests and servants of God; both keeping their right hands pure, and earnestly contending by prayers towards God on account of those who are justly fighting, and on account of him who justly reigns; that all things that are in opposition and enmity to those who do righteously, may be destroyed.

And thus destroying by prayer all demons, who excite war, and set at nought oaths, and disturb the peace, we help our rulers more than they who seem to fight. And we labour for the common welfare who are offering up prayers with righteousness accompanied with a course of training and discipline, teaching us to despise the delights of the flesh, and not to be led away by them. Yea, we rather fight manfully for the Prince, whilst we do not engage as soldiers under him, though he urge us to do so, but we fight for him, training our own camp in righteousness through continual communion with God.

And if Celsus would have us take the command of armies for our country, let him know that we also do this, practising these things not to be seen of men, and to be applauded by them. For in secret, according to the ruling principle (of our lives) are our prayers sent up as from priests for those in our country. And Christians rather do good to their country beyond other men by educating citizens, and teaching them to live godly unto Him who is the God of all, training up for a divine and heavenly city those who have lived well in the lesser cities of the world. (*Origen contra Celsam, lib. xiii., c. 73-74, pp. 426-428, Ed. Spenc.*)

A little previously, in reply to the taunts of Celsus, "Where would the Empire be if all were to become Christians?" Origen writes: "If, as Celsus says, all were to act as the Christians do, it is plain that the barbarians coming to the Word of God would become obedient to the law, and gentle; every other religion would be abolished, and that of the Christians alone prevail, which, indeed, must at some time prevail, the word continually bringing more souls into obedience [to the truth.]"

Then Celsus, not listening to himself but affirming contradictory things, goes on to say: "Thou wilt not surely affirm when the Romans, persuaded by thee, shall have ceased to regard those things that are now established by law concerning gods and men, and shall worship thy Most High or whatever else thou mayst call Him, that He will descend and fight for them, and that there shall be wanting no other help. For formerly the same God having, as ye say, undertaken to do for those who serve Him, these and far greater things, ye see how much He will keep both them and you. Of whom to them indeed (namely, the Jews), instead of their being lords of the whole earth not a clod nor a hearth is left, and of you, if any yet remain lurking in some hiding place, he is still sought out for death."

To which Origen replies:—

"If then it shall be inquired what shall happen supposing the Romans should obey the law of Christians, and reject their former laws concerning their constituted gods, and concerning men, and should worship the Most High, we reply that if two of us shall agree upon earth concerning anything which they shall ask, it shall be done for them by the Father of the righteous, who is in Heaven; for God rejoiceth in the agreement of His reasonable creatures and detests discord. What then must we think, if not as now, only a very few, but if the whole Roman world were to agree together; for they would pray unto Him who formerly said unto the Hebrews when pursued by the Egyptians, the Lord shall fight for you, and ye shall stand still. And praying with an entire agreement they shall be able to destroy far more of their enemies than those who were destroyed at the prayer of Moses, crying unto God with those that were with him. And if those things are not performed which God promised to them who kept the law, it has come to pass not by the unfaithfulness of God, but by their unfaithfulness as to the terms upon which the promises were made concerning keeping the law and living conformably to it. And if neither a clod nor a hearth is left to the Jews who received the promises upon those terms, this must be attributed to all their transgressions, but especially to their sin against Jesus.

But if, according to the supposition of Celsus, all the Romans were obedient to the faith, by prayer they would overcome their enemies so that they should not

fight against the state, being kept by that Divine power which promised to save five whole cities on account of fifty righteous men. For men of God are the salt, preserving the constitution of the universe upon the earth, and things continue upon the earth as long as the earth is not changed, for if the salt lose its savour it is neither fit for the land nor for the dunghill, but being cast out it shall be trodden under foot by men. And we, when God turns us over to the tempter, giving him power to persecute us, we are persecuted; and when God is not willing that we should suffer, we marvellously enjoy peace in a world that hateth us, and stay ourselves upon Him who said, "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world." And of a truth He hath overcome the world, wherefore the world prevails only so far as He who overcame it wills, having received of the Father the victory over the world; and we rejoice in His victory.

And if He wills again to exercise us and bring us into conflict on account of godliness, let our adversaries come, to whom we shall say, "I can do all things through Christ that strengtheneth me"; for although two sparrows, as saith the Scripture, are sold for one farthing, one of them shall not fall into the snare without our Father who is in Heaven; and so far does the Divine Providence extend, that even the very hairs of our head are all numbered. (Orig. contra Celsum, lib. viii., c. 68-70, pp. 423-425.)

Still later than Origen, the testimony of Lactantius is decisive, "To fight cannot be permitted to the just man whose warfare is in justice (righteousness) itself." (*Lactantius de vero Cultu*, lib. vi., §20, p. 618. Ed. Hack.)

It would be easy to multiply these quotations by references to Cyprian (*Ad Donatum, de Gratiâ Dei* c. 6); Basil (*Moralia*, c. 1, 2, vol. II., p. 379, Ed. Gaume), and others; but what has been offered is sufficient to prove how strong was the body of sentiment opposed to war, among the Christians of the first three centuries.

And it was not in words only that so many in the early Church expressed their conviction that the profession of arms was contrary to the mind of Christ. One noble instance at least is recorded in which a Christian preferred to suffer death on this account rather than do violence to his conscience. The event occurred A.D. 295, at Teveste, or Theveste, an episcopal city in Numidia in North Africa. The recruiting-sergeant brought before Dion the Proconsul, one Maximilian, a young man of twenty-two years, as fit for military duty. It was during a season of toleration and general tranquillity, a few years previously to the breaking out of the last great persecution of the Christians under Diocletian. The young man was accompanied by his father. As he came up and was about to be measured to see whether he was of the required height, he said, "I cannot engage in military service; I am a Christian." The Proconsul, taking no notice of these words, quietly ordered the officers to take him to the measuring post. Whilst he was being adjusted he said again, "I cannot fight, I cannot do evil, I am a Christian."

Dion: Measure him. (The officers called out that his height was 5ft. 10in.)

Dion: Give him the badge.

The young man resisted, saying, "I will not suffer it, I cannot fight."

Dion: If thou wilt not serve, then thou must die.

Max: I will not serve. You may cut off my head if you will. I cannot engage in earthly warfare. I am God's soldier.

Dion: Who persuaded thee to this?

Max: My own mind, and He who called me to His service.

The Proconsul turned to the father, and said, "Advise thy son."

The father replied: "He knows his own mind; of what use would my counsel be?"

Dion (to Maximilian): Receive the badge.

Max: I will not receive your badge. I have the badge of Christ my God.

Dion: I will send thee straight to thy Christ.

Max: Do it now; I am ready.

Dion: Mark him, and fix on the collar.

Maximilian resisted again, saying, "I shall break it, for I count it a worthless thing. I am a Christian, and it is not lawful for me to wear on my neck a leaden seal of this kind, after having received the seal of salvation of my Lord Jesus Christ the Son of the living God.

Dion: Consider thy youth. It is honourable in a young man to be a soldier.

Max: I can engage in no warfare but for my Lord.

Dion: But there are Christians in the imperial army who fight.

Max: They know what is allowable for them: I am a Christian, I cannot do evil.

Dion: Why, what evil do those commit who fight?

Max : Thou knowest what things they do.

Dion : Do not scorn the service, lest thou perish miserably.

Max : I shall not perish : for though thou shouldst put me to death, my soul will live with Christ my Lord.

Dion : Erase his name.

It was erased, and the Proconsul proceeded : " Because with an impious mind thou hast refused the service, receive this sentence as an example for others : " and he read from his tablet, " Let Maximilian, because of his impious refusal to enter the military service, be put to death with the sword."

Maximilian answered : " Thanks be to God."

When he came to the place of execution, he said, " Beloved brethren, strive that you may see God, and receive from Him a like crown." Then turning to his father, he said with a cheerful voice, " Give this soldier the new military cloak which thou hast made for me. Thou wilt join me again, and we shall rejoice together with the Lord." When he had said this his head was severed from his body. His father returned to his house with joy, giving thanks to God who enabled him to send before Him so precious an offering. A lady named Pomponiana begged his body and laid it in her own house, from whence it was taken to Carthage, and buried under the hill by the palace, near Cyprian's grave. Thirteen days afterwards the lady herself died, and was interred in the same place. (Ruinart, *Acta Martyr* : 300-302. See also *Acta Marcelli Centurionis*, Ruinart, p. 302-304.) Thus did this brave man, according to the record which has come down to us, count his life of no value when weighed against the commands of his Lord. The soul-sustaining presence of a host of fellow confessors was not his : he did not breathe that exhilarating atmosphere which is generated in time of persecution. He suffered alone with his Saviour, who had suffered alone for Him. His example is worthy of the highest regard. Let it not be lost upon us in the present day.

To bring this statement to a conclusion :—

It has been seen how great and influential was the amount of sentiment among Christians of the first three centuries upon this subject.

In the early Church, military service was in fact strongly discouraged. Its actual allowance in the Church can hardly be dated earlier than the age of Constantine. The fact that no minister of the Gospel was allowed to be a soldier sufficiently proves that in their view all war and military service are incompatible with the highest standard of Christian life.

As to those who were not ministers, the canons of the Egyptian Church appear to show that military service was only sanctioned when it was entered into under compulsion. The following are the directions of these canons, viz :—" The catechumen, or believer, who chooses to be a soldier shall be cut off. But one who has been enlisted without his own free will does not fall under the same condemnation : he is only enjoined to respect human life as far as possible. Let the soldier who is under command never voluntarily kill a man ; and if he is ordered to do so, let him not obey with haste. If he takes life without being compelled to do it, let him be excommunicated." (See the Constitutions of the Egyptian Church in Bunsen's *Analeceta Anticæna*, vol. ii, p. 464.) The observations of Dr. De Pressensé throw considerable light upon these arrangements. " It must be remembered," says he, " that under the Empire (at least in the third century) military service was not, as formerly, obligatory. The Italians were exempted very early, and in the provinces there was no personal conscription ; and a freedom from service could be secured by finding a number of recruits proportionate to the means of the party required to serve. It was therefore perfectly easy to avoid serving. Subsequently the Emperors contented themselves with requiring payment in money, which enabled them to hire mercenary soldiers. By choosing the calling of a soldier, a Christian exposed himself to all the temptations of camp life, and showed a disposition altogether opposed to the spirit of his religion." (Pressensé's *Early Years of Christianity*, translated by A. H. Holmden, vol. iv., 457.)

Ministers of the Gospel enjoy an exemption from military service, not because they can claim special exemption from any duty which ought to devolve upon all, but because their exemption is the recognition by the universal church that wars and fightings are incompatible with the highest standard of Christian holiness. If those in the position of ministers could realise their high calling, and seek as not the least important part of their duty to bring all who are within the range of their influence to the same plane of Christian conduct and privilege which in this exemption they enjoy themselves, how great would be the step gained towards convincing the churches of the utter inconsistency of all war with the religion of Jesus. It is with the ministers of religion and with the Christian Churches generally that the responsibility of war mainly rests. Let our Christian brothers and

Christian sisters, fathers and mothers, dwell under the solemn sense of this responsibility. May they watch unto prayer continually, that they may be filled with wisdom and understanding rightly to fulfil it.

The youthful martyr Maximilian was a true Christian hero. May his touching example affect the hearts of the Christian youth of our own day, with so many of whom allegiance to Christ is the duty that is felt to be uppermost. If they were all brought to see that war of every kind is absolutely, in its every nature, repugnant to the Gospel, and were willing to act on this conviction, how quickly would there be an end to that military tyranny which grinds the faces of the people, and stifles moral and religious freedom. The cheerful readiness on the part even of a few truly noble and courageous souls to endure reproach and imprisonment, and, if needful, even death itself in simple faithfulness to their Redeemer and King, would be found an argument of irresistible force; leading on, may we not humbly trust, to the arrest and extinction, at no distant period, of the standing armies and forced conscriptions, the wars and the preparations for war, under which the world has so long groaned.

May the Lord in His infinite mercy, and through the effectual working of His Almighty Love hasten that day.

CHRIST'S TEACHING ABOUT WAR.

By the Rev. F. M. CAMERON, Bonnington Rectory, Hythe, Kent.

It is believed that the clearest ideas of Christ's teaching upon the subject of war will be found in the instruction which He gave to His own church—to whom was allotted the task of teaching and leavening the opinions of the world; and in this view this paper is written, which deals not so much with what Christ taught about war generally, as with the manner with which the Church ought to carry out her own work of instructing men, and imbuing them with the spirit of peace and self-sacrifice which her Master inculcated and exemplified. When Christ taught his disciples to pray that the day might come in which the common Fatherhood of God and the common Brotherhood of Man should be acknowledged by all mankind upon the earth—it is obvious that He meant them not merely to pray, but so to act as to hasten on that day of hope for the world.

We have His own prayer for that end to be attained, where we read that He asked His Father that His own people might be made perfect in united glory, that so the world might know the love of God—and in so praying He taught the Church that the end of her salvation was not simply her own blessedness but her blessedness as a means of blessedness to the whole world.

It is interesting to look at Christ's action as also intended to show forth, and be an example of, what the action of His people should be, with a view to bringing to pass the thing prayed for—the realization of the world's hope.

The last words of Christ's long discourse to his immediate followers (John xvi) were—"I have overcome the world." The full interest of these words must be, that He had taken the steps, and performed the acts which were to issue in the subjugation of the world to Himself. He had already declared that the judgment of the world had come, that is that He had assumed the right to judge and rule the world, because the Prince of this world was to be immediately cast out, and He was to take the power to Himself. Shortly after saying this, we find that by His own special appointment there were brought into juxtaposition two modes of warfare—it might be said two different weapons—and as they were thus placed we see the choice which the Redeemer of the world made between them; and surely in making this choice, He has given to His people an example that they should do as He had done. The choice thus made is placed before us in the words spoken to Peter—"Put up thy sword into its place, the cup which my Father hath given me shall I not drink it?" These words it will be readily seen disclose Christ's choice between two weapons—the warfare of the world by brute force—the warfare of Heaven by the power of self-sacrifice—between the sword and the cross.

Christ's words shew that He deliberately preferred the cross to the sword—self-sacrifice to brute force.

That this was the mode of warfare by which He designed that His kingdom should be established and upheld, He made quite clear by His words to Pilate. If my kingdom were of earth, then would my servants have fought that I should not be delivered to the Jews, but now is my kingdom not from hence, not from earth, but from Heaven. The contrast witnessed on this occasion was of Christ's own appointment. He had bidden His disciples to procure swords, two eventually were deemed enough: He did this knowing what would come to pass. By this appointment an

opportunity was afforded of bringing together as it were the cross and the sword, the manner of self-sacrifice, and the manner of human fighting. Thus too was afforded an opportunity for Christ to show plainly both to the disciples and to the world what was to be the conduct of His followers, and what the force by which His kingdom was to be established. And as He not only forbade the use of the earthly weapon but also healed the wound which it had inflicted, so He plainly showed that His kingdom was not only not to be upheld by the power of the sword, but was to be established for the healing of the sores which the sword had inflicted.

The power of self-sacrifice is the power of Godness itself. It is the power of life in action manifested as Divine Love. It is indeed the only force which can prevail.

The truth of this fact seems the most difficult, the last lesson that men learn.

The earthly idea of subjugation and perfect submission has been and is now, that of one compelled to do the will of the conqueror outwardly and visibly; and so it is held that a complete crushing of the power of the man is a perfect victory over him. But such a crushing is only a half victory—a victory over the body but not over the mind; and with such half victories brute force must be content. But such a victory cannot satisfy the demands of Him who made and claims the entire being. That triumph alone can do so, which binds the creature in willing submission to the power of the conqueror. Hence the foundation of the whole revelation of God is "Thou shalt love the Lord with thy entire being, with every power of soul and spirit"—the surrender of the creature in his entirety can alone satisfy the claims of the Creator. No victory which results in less than this can avail. In fact nothing short of this is true victory. For the Creator to be satisfied with less than this would be for Him to resign His rights and confess Himself overcome by evil. The victory which He demands is the victory of love. That this truth is hard to grasp, was seen in the difficulty with which the disciples themselves realised that salvation could come by way of the cross. It was seen in the ridicule which the Roman soldiers cast on a king who, as they understood, and who in very truth claimed a kingdom without a standing army. It was seen in the choice by the Jews of Barabbas who would win freedom for them by the sword, in preference to Jesus who would save them by the power of the sacrifice on the cross.

The Saviour knew all this and hence He intended in the most emphatic way to make clear to His disciples what His own choice of weapons was—that it was the cross and not the sword; what His mode of fighting was to be, not the putting forth of brute force, but the infinitely greater might of love manifested in self-sacrifice.

He aims to bring to bear upon the earth the power of the Father's kingdom; to prepare the way for this He brings to bear the power of the Father's character, the power of life manifested by love. This is in agreement with the prayer which He has taught us to use. He came to manifest a Father's name; to lay bare a Father's heart; to show a Father's image; to teach how in obedience to a Father's will rest for the weary could alone be found. So He shows that the Father's love gave the Son, to the end that man might share in the Father's life—through the sacrifice of the Son. He declared that in learning obedience, from the example of the Son, to the Father's will, rest for the soul could be found, and accordingly He taught us to pray that love to the Father's name, and obedience to the Father's will, might be learned upon earth; to the end that the Father's kingdom might come upon the earth, whereby want and sin and temptation and evil might depart from its inhabitants.

It would be a curious question to ask: How long has the coming of this kingdom been delayed? How long have the evils under which the world has groaned so long been continued because the Church has not properly learned and not fully proclaimed the true character of the victory of love? We cannot answer the question; but we feel assured that He who is love will not allow the world eventually to suffer for the unfaithfulness of His people. But for the future there is no doubt that the time is come when the people of God should proclaim aloud with one voice what are the true characteristics of the warfare whereby Christ designed to bring, and is now bringing, all things unto subjection to Himself.

The cries of oppressed humanity have gone up to the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth; and if the guardians and professed teachers of religion have nothing to say in view of those cries, and if by their teaching they say, or by their silence imply, that their religion offers no remedy of world-wide power for the sufferings of humanity—they must not wonder if their religion is despised; and if they cause that name of the Saviour to be blasphemed which they profess to honour.

We can only conclude by saying, when the Church will proclaim as with one

voice, that there is a Father of all—who loves all—yearns over all—longs to see Himself owned and loved as the Father of all, in the sense and presence of that love, men will know one another as brethren ; and then will come the end of war—the end of want—the end of injustice—and the establishment of true liberty—true equality—true righteousness.

THE KINGDOM OF THE PRINCE OF PEACE.

A STUDY FROM MATTHEW'S GOSPEL.

By Mr. J. JOWETT WILSON.

In speaking of the kingdom of the Prince of Peace we do not necessarily mean the professing Churches of Christendom. Those who humbly believe themselves to be the followers of Jesus Christ, have to confess with shame the great inconsistency which the churches called after Him have exhibited ; they have to mourn that the earth has been saturated by the blood of rival sections of His visible church ; that the sword, whose aid He never sought, has been drawn from its sheath again and again as the arbiter of disputes which should have been decided by mutual concessions and in holy love.

In some instances, cases of beautiful consistency are recorded of the followers of Jesus Christ, but these are so few that the enemies of Christianity and its holy founder, base some of their most effective arguments upon the repeated outbreaks of war that have occurred between nations making a high Christian profession.

But although this is so, we believe that there is a glorious Prince of Peace, immutable, eternal, compassionate, we believe that he lived a life of holy obedience to God and goodwill towards His fellow men, that He conquered all opposition, until with a broken heart yearning with infinite love and sympathy for man He conquered death by death itself.

His Kingdom is an mostentations, holy, spiritual kingdom, founded in the hearts of the lowly and meek, and composed of those who are willing to tread this earth as He trod it, bearing pain rather than inflicting suffering, assuaging grief rather than being its cause, dying rather than seeking life in the destruction of others.

The Prince of Peace was born at a time when the misery and sin of this world had reached its height, the whole of the civilized world was under the military sway of the Romans, on all sides were wars and rumours of wars. He was born of a virgin through the power of the Holy Ghost, and thus came to our earth as Son of Man and Son of God.

The Roman Emperors held their kingdoms by the might of their legions, but from the first Matthew tells us Christ refused the aid of physical force. When a babe His life was threatened by the ambitious Herod, but it is remarkable that Mary and Joseph were commanded to take their divine Son out of harm's way, rather than to invoke the aid of His heavenly hosts.

After His baptism, which He submitted to in order to fulfil the prophecies concerning Him, we read he was filled with the Holy Spirit and was commended from heaven by God in the words, "This is My beloved Son in whom I am well pleased."

It is in the following chapter that we have an account of the terrible struggle that took place between Christ and Satan.

Our Lord had fasted forty days, and it was after undergoing this, that Satan meanly attacked Him, asking Him to use His divine powers to supply Himself with food. Had He followed the course pursued by many nations in their so-called struggle for existence, in which might takes the place of right, and rapine, theft, murder, and bloodshed are called into the service of so-called "enterprise," we might not have been surprised at Christ's speaking a few words to satisfy His flesh, but He believed in a higher ideal than the gratification of self, and with heroic faith believed that come what might His existence depended upon the Divine Father, that life was bound up in union with Him, apart from Him was darkness and death, even in the midst of apparent plenty.

The Devil was not crushed by this rebuff : he leads the Prince of Peace to a pinnacle of the Temple, bids Him call out to His heavenly legions, and by throwing Himself down, show their fidelity to the Jews worshipping below.

Had Christ been imbued with the Spirit which prompts military reviews, demonstrations, mobilizations, etc., He might have yielded to the suggestion, He might have called the myriads of heaven, the fiery chariots, the glittering angels. Cherubim and Seraphim might have flocked to His side, and He might have thrown Himself from that giddy height where He then stood and have been borne up by His glorious bands to the sound of seraphic music,

A calm rebuke was all the reply Christ gave the insidious foe, as He quoted the words of Scripture, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." Surely each Christian who enters a battle, buoyed up on the false belief that he is in the angels' safe keeping, may ponder the Lord's reply.

Then came the final temptation. From the height of an exceedingly high mountain Satan caused all the kingdoms of the world to pass before the Lord: Rome with her might and empire; Greece, with all her wisdom and culture; luxurious Egypt, Syria; all passed before the Prince of Peace. If Christ had followed the policy of those who defend the English rule of the sword in India, because of the good it does; or the ultimatum sent by this country to Portugal to protect the mission work in Africa, or the bombardment of Alexandria; and military occupation of Egypt, for the benefit of the Fellahs. He might have obeyed the Devil's suggestion, that all these would be His if He would fall down and worship him.

What boundless good would spring from that one small evil: all the world would acknowledge His sovereignty; what peaceful policies would then be introduced, what reforms; it would be a crown without the cross. But with unswerving loyalty Christ laid aside this temptation. His mission was to worship God, to serve Him only, and He told the Devil so.

God showed the approval of His Son by sending Angels to minister to Him when Satan left Him.

Matthew tells us that where Christ went, "the people that sat in darkness saw a great light, and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light sprang up." Is Christ's conduct in this respect reconcilable with the belief that He approved of War? War is the very opposite; it lays the shining country under the darkness of battle-smoke and burning of homesteads, the air trembles with the roar of guns, the trees and fields are destroyed, death itself creeps over the land. Surely such a state of things so opposite to Christ's teaching can only come through the agency of the Devil himself.

But the ministry of Christ in all its details condemns War. He might well be called the Prince of Peace, the whole forces of physical evil quailed before Him. He healed *all manner of sickness*, all manner of disease, those in torment, those possessed with devils, those who were lunatic, the palsied were brought to Him, the leprosy left Him cleansed, fever gave place to health, storm to calm, blood was stanchied, the blind saw, the dumb spake, even death itself had to restore its victims whether it had held them for a greater or shorter period. Can we in the presence of this Prince speak of His sanction for the unmitigated cruelty we practise in war, when to gain *our ends* we call forth *every manner of sickness*—typhus fever, gangrene, thirst, starvation; when *we* cause our fellow men to writhe in torment on the battle-field; when we encourage and land our soldiers for "fighting like devils"; when reason of wives and mothers gives way as they read the lists of dead; when strong men return shattered, maimed, incapacitated; when the destruction of human life is devised not by units or tens but by thousands; and our Stock brokers invite us to join syndicates for the manufacture of every kind of instrument for the dealing out of woe and death?

But there are less marked alleviations of suffering, which none the less powerfully draw out our love to the Prince of Peace. We read again and again of His compassion, of His feeding hungry multitudes lest they should grow weary by the way, He was tender to little children, He was gentle even with the shortcomings of His followers.

Although He was so meek and lowly that he cheerfully paid tribute, we notice that on at least two occasions He did assume His princely position. Whilst praying with his three apostles, Peter, James, and John, He was transfigured before them, and again a voice from heaven declared Him to be God's well beloved Son in whom He was well pleased. But it would appear as though this only took place for the benefit of His disciples, to strengthen their faith in their coming trial, for he expressly charged them not to mention the fact at that time. Another instance was His triumphant entry into Jerusalem, a step taken for benefit of the Jews, and without the slightest trace of a military body guard, in fact the very assumption of this kingship proved His meekness and gentleness.

But the crowning point in the history of the Prince of Peace was His death. With a certain knowledge that His life would close at Jerusalem He steadfastly went there.

At that last moment if He had invoked the aid of even a few angels, or yielded to the Jewish craving for a temporal Messiah, He might have changed His cross for a crown; but he came to found a kingdom of love and he knew the price was His life.

His was not the death of a military general determined to die hard. He conquered many an enemy as He died, but they were vanquished by love. He wept over the city that rejected Him, He yearned over His betrayer, He pleaded for the disciples who deserted Him, He prayed for His executioners. His enemies struck Him, spat upon Him, buffeted Him, they derided Him, mocked Him, and crowned Him with thorns. Though pronounced innocent He was delivered to be crucified; though no fault was found in Him He was flogged. Borne down by His cross, He went onward to a death which could only crown a life of unfaltering consistency with glory. All that forbearance and gentleness which had marked His life, were accentuated in His death, enemies were forgiven, blasphemers pardoned, and the very centurion guarding the cross was compelled to admit that He must be the Son of God.

PART II.

It was after Christ's threefold temptation that He first called His disciples. He had conquered evil Himself, and He sought others who should in His strength do the same.

It was those of "loyal heart and true" whom He sought for His kingdom; those who would follow Him, who would take His yoke upon them, and learn of Him.

How imperfectly have the Christian nations obeyed! Have they not rather followed the false lead of Constantine who, seeing the cross in a vision, and hearing the words, "In hoc signo vinces," thought his armies were to conquer whilst bearing this emblem, rather than the cross conquer in the disbanding of his troops? Even if no actions of the Prince of Peace were recorded, His teaching to His disciples would be sufficient to condemn War. The Sermon on the Mount from first to last condemns it. His followers are to be—

Poor in spirit, not seeking military honour; mourners over wrong, not erecting "Arcs de triomphes" to celebrate slaughter;

Meek, not bombarding native ports;

Hungering and thirsting after righteousness, not after territory;

Merciful; without Gatling guns, Krupps, or Lebel rifles;

Pure in heart; free from a military system requiring provision for lust;

Peacemakers, there being no need for Secretaries for War, or Lords of the Admiralty;

Persecuted for righteousness sake if needs be, but not defending mission stations with gun-boats.

They are to consider themselves blessed, when reviled.

They are the salt of the earth, the preserving portion, not the destructive portion; they are like Himself, the light, not the darkness.

Until our ironclads are withdrawn, and our Army disbanded, we are not entitled to call ourselves a Christian nation. We know our Lord's will, but like the Pharisees, we know it but we do it not. It is the true Christian's endeavour to spread His Lord's kingdom, for he is convinced that wars will cease where Christ reigns.

The world with its millions of armed men has tried to seal the Prince of Peace in His tomb. His teaching is disregarded. He might be dead. But the seals will be broken, the stone which at times seems to us so exceedingly great will be removed, the military keepers will become as dead men, as over this dark earth—so like the valley of the shadow of death—the Prince of Peace, the glorious Sun of righteousness shall arise with healing in His wings.

CHRIST'S TEACHING TO THE WORLD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By Mr. JOHN B. WOOD, Philadelphia, U.S.A.

We believe Christ's teaching not only in every way discomtented war, but even the right of self defence.

His fore-runner, John the Baptist, said to the soldiers "Do violence to no man," or "Put no man in fear." Did Christ ever alter or question John's apparently absurd advice to the soldiers? We expect John was in a pretty practical state of mind when he said it, for the tax-gatherers had just been talking to him, and he seems to have satisfied them that he was not their man, for his reply, "Exact no more than that which is appointed you," had a little sting in it which would have caused many men now in an American Sheriff's office to leave. But "the soldiers likewise" not only asked, but demanded of him, saying, "And what shall we do?" And he said unto them, "Do violence to no man, neither accuse falsely, and be content with your wages." Is there anything sounding like lack of business in that? Everyone perfectly understands it all but the first sentence and to that we say, "It is impracticable." Well it matters not what you and I say, it is what Christ says. After Jesus Christ was transfigured before Peter, John, and James, Peter wanted to

build three tabernacles, "One for Thee, one for Moses, and one for Elias," but then God spake and what did he say, "This is My beloved Son, hear Him," just as Moses foretold 1,450 years before. Never mind putting up immense buildings or cities or fortifications or anything of that kind, but just *hear Christ, hear Him*.

That is what we have to do as Christians. We are not talking of others. We all want the full experiences that such men as J. Hudson Taylor, D. L. Moody, George Müller and others say they have. *Hear Him* is the way.

Now did Jesus Christ ever mention, advocate, or confirm this teaching which John then apparently sprang upon the world?

It is now a great thing to have a *war record*. *Jesus Christ* had one. What was it? He refused the Devil's aid in the temptation of power, selected twelve men, and after spending a whole solid night in prayer to God, probably that He might speak what He had to say in a good terse way and fully appreciating how he would be received, He re-affirmed John's saying by the following texts so familiar to you all, yet carrying not the slightest meaning to you because you have been taught to allow for them as not meaning anything. Let us read it in the Book:—

"Ye have heard that it hath been said, 'An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, but I say unto you that ye resist not evil, but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek turn to him the other also;'" and that there may be no misunderstanding, a little further on He not only commands you to be on good terms with your enemies as you would be with your friends, but He actually tells you to do something for them, *love them*. Now no one of common sense can make but the one thing out of all this, and there is nothing to contradict it. Here is new law, just the same as if the English Parliament should this day pass a law that gold should no more be money. It is just as radical and the common humanity cannot grasp it. Why? we don't know, but the fact remains the same. They cannot because they will not—will not what? Either carefully investigate or believe.

The testimony of the people at this very time when preaching the sermon on the mount was to his earnestness and power "that he taught not as the scribes, but as one having authority." Did He live it? *Always, universally, without exception*.

Look at the Crucifixion time. They came up how? Armed like an Irish rabble. Bible says so. Don't look so incredulous; and Peter started in good earnest, probably with no unmeaning blow, but fortunately his sword only grazed his opponent's head; but our Saviour, with all *His* work on earth finished, had to straighten things out for Peter, and cure the ear.

Suppose Christ had been your friend, could you stand by *still*? Would you not feel that you were denying Him if you let a set of scoundrels run Him off to jail? Don't make a mystery of a reality, put it right down here in a London street.

You have been with Him, seen Him cure the sick, the lame, the blind, raise the dead, and you have gone out into the country a little piece, say upon the hill of your Richmond yonder. He has told you since you have been lying under those magnificent trees on the hill to draw all your cartridges from your six shooters, for, says He, they that take the revolver shall perish by it. Yet soon after this some policemen and rabble take Him into your jail. Is there any dozen men in this audience whose human judgment would not command them to show fight, yet *Christ*, turning to the one most active of you, says, none of it. I control all—thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to My Father and He shall presently give Me ten legions of angels?

No, friends; Christ's war record is free from force, and we can give you hundreds of instances where He has protected those who believe in His power just as much as God did Daniel. And we know many now living whose lives He has kept because they trusted in Him.

You will find also that those who live nearest Him, under the daily control of the Holy Ghost, *generally*, if not universally, believe these truths, though of course the Holy Ghost only slowly overcomes education, except when God wants a quick actor, and then He uses means that reveal His teachings as clearly and convincingly as they came to Saul of Tarsus, and the chosen ones respond promptly, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?"

DISCUSSION.

MR. MARK HOWARTH moved as an amendment, that the third Sunday in December be specially set apart for this purpose.

M. le Pasteur CADOT seconded.

M. FREDERIC PASSY said that the Congress had no power over Ministers of the Gospel. All that they could do was to express a wish that certain things should be done.

A MEMBER suggested that probably the wishes of the meeting might be met if the Sunday nearest Christmas were specified.

The CHAIRMAN in putting the amendment said it would, if carried, be added at the end of the resolution :—“ *And it recommends that the third Sunday in December in each year, be set apart for that purpose.*”

The amendment was carried.

M. GASTON MORIN (Paris) moved that the words “ *The Gospel and other religious teachers,*” be omitted, and the words “ *religion and other teachers of morality*” substituted, and that the words “ *of philosophers and of moralists*” be added after “ *Jesus Christ.*” He called special attention to the fact that Conferences now occupied themselves more and more prominently with the great question of peace without any reference to religion.

Rev. G. D. BARTLETT : I wish to second that. I for one feel that the phrase before us is the very sheet anchor of the whole question. I do not see the possibility of the object we are aiming at apart from Christianity. I have no faith in the doctrine of the universal Fatherhood of God. There is no such doctrine in Christianity, and I challenge any Greek scholar to prove it from Scripture. I think that the greatest ground of regret we have as Englishmen, Scotchmen, and Irishmen is the silence of the pulpit with respect to this question. If I understand the Scriptures I say that men are only playing with Christianity when they ignore this question : but why is it that our pulpits are so weak, so feeble, and why is it that such a poor power results from them ? I have lived a longish life, I have heard many sermons, and I can say without any exaggeration that I never heard universal peace recommended from the pulpit half a dozen times in my life. I do not want to preach theology here, but with reference to those who try to promote the question of peace apart from Christianity I have patience towards them and I do not pronounce upon them, but I only claim the right of giving my own opinion. Any one trying to gain the object we are aiming at apart from Christianity is like a number of astronomers lecturing on astronomy whilst ignoring the law of gravitation. I say as a professed Christian man that I have no faith in these societies apart from Christianity. Those ministers who are listening to me, will bear with me when I say that it is one of the rarest things to find this question mooted. Some twenty years ago I happened to stand in a drawing-room where there were forty or fifty people, and I dared to moot the proposition that war was incompatible with Christianity. They looked upon me as an arrant fanatic. The idea that we could get on without war was regarded as unmitigated weakness and folly. Let us go home, and see first that our preachers speak out *rotundo ore* on this question, and secondly, that our schools be presided over in as many cases as we can by men who try to impress these principles upon the children.

Mr. LEVI K. JOSLIN (U.S.A.) : All teachers of morality are invited to teach peace, and we must remember that the Buddhist religion embraces

more than half of the human race, and then there is the Catholic religion, and the Mahomedan religion, and we want the Buddhist, the Mahomedan, and the Protestant, or otherwise we can never secure the world's peace.

The resolution was then put and carried in its amended form, as moved by M. Morin, which was as follows :—

RESOLUTION II.

(ENGLISH.)

“The Congress recognises the important influence which Christianity exercises upon the moral and political progress of mankind, and earnestly urges upon ministers of the Gospel and other teachers of religion and morality, the duty of setting forth those principles of Peace and Goodwill, which occupy such a central place in the teaching of Jesus Christ, of Philosophers, and of Moralists, and it recommends that the third Sunday in December, in each year, be set apart for that purpose.”

(FRENCH.)

“Le Congrès reconnaît l'influence importante que le Christianisme exerce sur le progrès moral et politique de l'humanité, et rappelle avec instance aux ministres de l'Évangile et autres personnes s'occupant d'éducation religieuse la nécessité de répandre ces principes de paix et de bonne volonté qui sont la base des enseignements de Jésus-Christ, des philosophes, et des moralistes ; et le Congrès recommande que chaque année on fasse choix du troisième Dimanche du mois de Décembre pour une déclaration spéciale de ces principes.”

The meeting then adjourned.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON, 15TH JULY.

The afternoon session was devoted to the consideration of the educational aspects of the question, M. Frédéric Passy in the chair.

Mr. W. E. DARBY read the minutes of Monday afternoon's and Tuesday morning's meetings.

CHAIRMAN'S ADDRESS.

The CHAIRMAN: It is a great honour for me to preside over this sitting. I must rely on the kind indulgence and benevolence of my fellow-labourers, who will help me to discharge my duties as well as possible. There can be no difference of opinion amongst us as to the subject with which we have to deal. We all know that the greatest evil of mankind comes from ignorance of moral and intellectual truth, and if men knew what Sir Wilfrid Lawson was saying this morning, how much war and animosity inflict pain upon mankind—if they knew something of the burden which is imposed on the shoulders of humanity—certainly the people would not countenance war. One of the greatest warriors—I dare to say one of the greatest men—Frederick of Prussia, said “If my soldiers were philosophers they would never fight.” If the people knew a little more of philosophy, and the consequence of things, they would not allow their Governments to make them fight against each other. I know that the question that we have to consider will be considered in a very earnest manner, and believe you will approve of the conclusions proposed in the name of the committee.

En prenant possession du fauteuil M. Passy, a remercié l'assemblée de la marque d'estime et de sympathie qu'elle lui donnait. “Entre nous, a-t-il ajouté, il n'y a aucune divergence de vues quant à la question qui est soumise à nos délibérations. Nous savons tous que les plus grands maux de l'humanité proviennent de l'ignorance des vérités intellectuelles et morales. Si les hommes connaissaient mieux, comme l'a dit Sir Wilfrid Lawson, combien la guerre est terrible; s'ils se rendaient un compte plus exact du lourd fardeau qu'elle met sur leurs épaules, personne ne voudrait en être responsable. L'un des plus grands capitaines, je dirai même des plus grands hommes qui aient existé,—Frédéric de Prusse ne craignait pas de faire l'aveu suivant :

“Si nos soldats étaient des philosophes, ils ne voudraient jamais se battre.

“Oui si les peuples étaient un peu plus philosophes, s'ils pesaient mieux les conséquences de toutes choses, ils ne permettraient jamais à leurs gouvernements de les forcer à s'égorger les uns les autres.”

EXPLANATION BY SIGNOR MONETA.

Signor E. T. MONETA addressed the meeting in French, and said :—

Il a, en particulier, attiré l'attention du Congrès sur cette pensée du célèbre écrivain italien : Ce qu'il faut souhaiter par-dessus tout c'est de voir bientôt une seule religion régner sur le monde—la religion d'amour et d'union. Pour le moment, ne nous appuyons que sur les idées admises par tous, autrement nous souleverions des difficultés qui empêcheraient notre mission d'aboutir.

Mr. HODGSON PRATT gave the substance in English of Signor Moneta's address as follows :—

There is a sentence in the printed *précis* of his paper, which leads to a wrong impression as to what he wished to say this morning. The phrase is : " It would be suicidal to do anything that would deprive the cause of Peace of their aid," and Signor Moneta wishes to remark that this is calculated to lead to a wrong impression of what his view is. In his remarks he says he looks forward to the day when there will only be one religion in the world—the religion of love and concord. At present there are many different forms of religion which are opposed by man, the one to the other, and make us lose sight of the great central aim, and we must work for that day when these differences shall be cleared away, and there shall be but one religion. At present that is impossible to hope for, and therefore our true aim should be to seek that which is common to all forms of religion, and rely upon that as the basis of our work. We must chose the points which are common to all religions, and thus ultimately we shall arrive at one. At present the differences which exist prevent us from attaining our aim. Let us rest upon those ideas and truths which are common to all.

BARONESS VON SUTTNER.

Mr. HODGSON PRATT: I have a letter from the Baroness Von Suttner, of Austria, who hoped to have been present. She begs to state her great regret at being unable through unexpected circumstances, to attend this meeting. She desires to express her strong and deep feeling of sympathy with our work. Perhaps some of you are aware that she has lately written, under the form of a novel, a very remarkable work, entitled " Down with Arms!" (" Die Waffen nieder"), and in this work of modern life special reference is made to the need for looking for peace and for altering the present military dispositions of mankind. I may mention that some of us are very desirous of seeing a translation into English of this book, which is reported in the German and Austrian Press as being extremely attractive and forcible, and we hope it may be possible to find some London publisher who will undertake to publish a translation of it, for a translation has already been offered. The Baroness further says that she is anxious to do all she can to diffuse throughout Continental Europe a knowledge of the proceedings of this Congress, and that she will do what she can through the medium of the Press, and in various ways, provided we give her the necessary materials, which I am sure we shall do our best to furnish.

Mr. HODGSON PRATT also read a telegram from " our earnest and excellent friends, the Roman Committee, signed by the distinguished President, Signor Bonghi, and by the Secretary, Signor Facelli," wishing success to the Congress.

MEMORIAL TO THE HEADS OF CIVILIZED STATES.

Mr. W. E. DARBY: A resolution was remitted to the Committee of Procedure this morning, or, rather, to the Bureau, that it should nominate certain persons to draw up a memorial to the heads of the civilized States. The report of the Bureau is, that the following gentlemen be asked to undertake that duty :—Mr. Augustine Jones (U.S.A.), Dr. Richet (France), Signor Moneta (Italy), Don Arturo di Marcoartu (Spain), H. Pratt (England).

Mr. DARBY announced that the subject for the afternoon's discussion was

SECTION I.

"EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF THE QUESTION."

and said that the committee had arranged two or three resolutions. The first is :—

RESOLUTION I.

(ENGLISH.)

"This Congress expresses its opinion that all teachers of history should call the attention of the young to the grave evils inflicted on mankind in all ages by war, and to the fact that such war has been waged, as a rule, for most inadequate causes."

(FRENCH.)

"Ce Congrès émet l'opinion que les professeurs d'histoire devraient appeler l'attention de la jeunesse sur les maux terribles infligés à l'humanité à toutes les époques par la guerre, et sur le fait que presque toutes les guerres ont été déchainées, en général, pour des raisons tout-à-fait insignifiantes."

This resolution will be moved by a paper which Mr. Graham will read.

Mr. J. W. GRAHAM, of Manchester, then read a paper on "War and Evolution," of which the following is an abstract :—

PRECIS AND EXTRACTS FROM "WAR AND EVOLUTION,"

By J. W. GRAHAM.

(Newland's, Grange, Carnforth.)

The writer shows in this paper that a true theory of evolution, as applied to the growth of man and society, points to the gradual disappearance of militancy. The doctrine of the survival of the fittest is not so unfavourable to the aspirations which seek man's highest destiny as might at first sight be supposed. He claims that in the works of Herbert Spencer, Darwin, Wallace, Bagehot, and David Ritchie may be found strong arguments for his thesis.

Man's development from the time when he first learned to stand erect, has been a mental development. His great cerebral growth has remarkably lengthened the period of adolescence in which the affections find their nursery—which is the source of the HOME, and of the light of human sympathy.

He finds in Wallace's work on Darwinism proof that our mental and moral attributes do not come from "natural selection," but from an influence on the human soul which comes from without. When man woke to self-consciousness, he was no longer a blind agent, or the victim of the process of selection, but, on certain conditions, became a co-worker with God. Hence there begins, far back, the gradual elimination of strife up to the present time, when we have "chronic peace broken only by occasional wars."

The writer then proceeds to show that war, in its origin, had its uses, prefacing his demonstration with the remark that "a thing not absolutely right, may, in its time and place, be relatively right." "No institution or sentiment but has its use at some time, or it could not have been established."

War has had a great place in the making of nations, in the absorption of villages under one control, and so forth, for union against external enemies. Civilised government had its origin in military organisation, and the first kings were necessarily leaders in battle. In warfare, too, were outlined our noblest qualities; and virtue meant courage.

It does not follow that war is of permanent value: the lessons it was intended to teach have been learned. The possibility of a high social state depends on the cessation of war, and persistent militancy will prevent or neutralise changes leading

to more equitable institutions or laws. In the militant type of society will be found the elements of stagnation and death.

The universal military service and strict discipline, found necessary for war, are insisted on in peace. Bismarck expressed this feeling when he said: "We must give the king the greatest possible power, in order that, in case of need, he may throw all the blood and iron into the scale." All individual liberty is crushed out: military organisation and government regulations prevail; and a "graded" society is established where no one can order his life as he wills; centralisation is the rule, and all are at the disposal of the Government. Reforms affecting individual happiness are neglected, and the nation must be economically independent, as it may starve in war time; while voluntary societies are disliked by a bureaucracy.

As to the moral qualities favoured by a military régime,—we have the so-called sense of "honour," under trilling affronts, and duelling takes the place of cricket. Ferocity is developed by battle; and the "wild beast" is developed in a man. Life is little regarded; labour and trade are looked down upon. With great dependence on Government, private enterprise dies. Such qualities hinder, not advance, the growth of a nation. Nations organised to subdue one another are not the best fitted to subdue the earth. "A single day of war may destroy the fruit of the labour of years. The merchant is insecure, and the mutual benefits of free trade are expressly avoided." "The best brains and most strenuous characters are absorbed in the army." "All men's efforts are weakened by a painful watch to keep themselves safe."

The militant formula runs thus:—"A militant society is weak for growth and expansion; therefore in competition with societies more industrially developed, it will not survive; therefore the future is not to the militant societies." "Those which are the earliest to shake off the militant habit will progress, grow rich, and enter into the unoccupied countries of the world." What does not England owe to her "silver streak"? Not more virtuous, but more fortunate have we been than our Continental neighbours.

"By the increase of the industrial races militancy decreases." "It also dies by the very industrialisation of the military nations." As agriculture and commerce develop, the inconvenience and loss caused by a campaign become more serious. "Society has become unfit for war and knows it."

The writer then refers to the "fatal perpetuity" of national quarrels, and to the deplorable condition of Europe in that respect; and concludes that it is ever true that "they that take the sword shall perish by the sword."

The writer then considers "whether industrial societies tend to survival." In these "the functions of government need not be more than to keep internal order. The whole will thrive if each be allowed to fulfil his own life according to his powers and his needs." "Voluntary co-operation and private organisation are the order of the day." "Every advantage that foreign trade can bring is made welcome."

"As to character, the citizens of an individual state respect themselves as free men, and this leads them to respect the lives and properties of others. Humane and amiable sentiments have room to thrive. Work is held to be honourable even in the second son of a duke."

"We are not bound to show that pure *laissez faire* individualism is likely to be the final form of society; but only that it is capable of supplanting militancy."

The writer then shews how the development of individual character (impossible under militancy) human sympathy develops and occupies itself with infinite zeal and intelligence to remedy human suffering. Instances are freely given. This means a growth in general happiness; more and more the pleasure of others becomes identified with our own; "and egoism will find its choicest fulfilment in altruism."

Even in international relations, it is shown that outrages once possible have disappeared: "We pension our defeated enemy in St. Helena or Ceylon, when Achilles would have dragged him thrice behind his chariot in the dust, or Cæsar have strangled him."

Mr. Graham concludes by expressing his confident belief in the approach of the day when, militancy having been extinguished, human sympathy shall rule in society, the qualities of peace shall give human happiness, and the teaching of Jesus Christ being wholly confirmed by science, it shall receive "the confirming homage which is its due."

The resolution was seconded in a paper, by Frau

FISCHER LETTE, of Frankfort, which was read by Miss PECK-OVER, as follows :—

TEACHING OF HISTORY IN SCHOOLS.

By FRAU FISCHER LETTE.

The invention of printing rendered thoughts more general and writers more numerous.

They rivalled each other to gain popularity with the masses and favour with the mighty, and praised *loudly* those who have slain the greatest number of enemies.

The good Samaritans are but humble figures compared with warriors in their gorgeous armour.

The deeds of the former are humble and full of pain, history does not think them worth relating, but dives its pen into the blood which flows on the battle-field. The milestones on the way which mankind travels are only wars and their results, viz., changes of frontiers, extermination of races, suppression of languages, religions, and even degradation of science. The causes of those disturbances are often very slight.

Louis XIV. remarked a small disproportion in one of the castle windows at Trianon.

The Minister of War, *Lanvois*, contradicted that remark, but *le Notre*, the architect, proved the king's observations to be right.

Lanvois, to regain favour, began a war.

Count Sellon says: "It is a kind of atheism to take the responsibility from a person and push him into his grave in the act of murdering and robbing people, who have been till now strangers to him."

Country-people who live and work on their soil do not mind to whom it belongs.

When, in 1870, the placards on the walls of French towns announced: "*La patrie est en danger*," peasants hurried in asking, what was the matter, a fire or an earthquake? On being told "*Les Prussians*" were marching on, they advised not to let them enter, as they—the country-folks—had more important work to do, harvest being at hand!

Their principle is to live and to let others live. They sell the fruit of their fields to the best buyer; they obey him who keeps order, and they submit to the strongest. That is not want of patriotism, nor the sign of a feeble character, but instinct of preservation and love of their native land, and their native tongue. They cannot rise to the notion of national honour, neither do they comprehend why all those expensive preparations are made.

Proofs of these remarks are the emigrants, who rather leave their home than exchange the plough for the sword.

But history does not think worth while to record the consequences of war, only spinning the red thread which runs through the deeds of mankind.

A child is forbidden to torment a beetle. As soon as he enters school and opens the book of history he reads of human beings dying on the battle-field with wounded and torn limbs. No one asks pity for them.

The numbers of these victims are stated not to appeal to the child's feelings, but to glorify the deeds of the victor.

Each party thinks itself to be in the right. They expect their priests to bless *their* weapons, to christen *their* men-of-war, and to pray *their* God to grant victory to *them*. To excuse those pretensions they cite texts.

If men harden their hearts and common sense against those simple teachings of humanity, *women* ought to throw themselves forward to separate armies, like the Sabine women preventing their fathers, husbands, brothers, and sons from murdering each other.

Are we not all children of one Father in heaven?

As the teaching and practice of Christianity are so contradictory, people say Christianity has lost influence. But a more attentive observer may well see that it is not yet fully understood. The disobeying of its principles are even felt as physical loss. In all countries, where conscription is introduced, that is where every male has to be enrolled and serve as a soldier, the measure of height and chest have to be reduced annually. The weaker mankind becomes the more it surrounds itself with iron spears like a porcupine.

In former years we walked quietly and cheerfully through fields and meadows; but now at each turning of the road stands a signboard—not to inform passers by what minister, what medical man, what school is in the village, how many children it numbers—but to what squadron men of the village belong, that they may enroll at a minute's notice. Children are told that they have hereditary enemies.

School patrons present guns and sabres for boys to be drilled as early as possible in the art of fighting.

Such is the material for history. Hume says, of a needless war (and which war does not deserve to be reckoned as needless, since each dispute might be solved by arbitration),

“ Nations engaged in war seem like drunken fellows, who fight in a porcelain shop. They smart not only under the wounds inflicted on each other, but besides, they have to pay the damage.”

It is true historians mention now and then a treaty of peace, but such is the wording as to allow of different explanations, therefore such treaty mostly lasts a few years only. We can not wonder then, that even facts are recorded, according to the peculiarities of the writers. For example, English historians give the credit of the success at Quatre-bras to the Duke of Wellington ; whilst the German recorders state that without the aid of Blucher the victory would have been doubtful. Many such examples could be cited. How differently are represented in German or French books those traces of wars in Alsace and Rhenish Pfalz during the 17th century.

At those times there were no phonographs to preserve any diplomatic discussions.

If they had existed and were used for that purpose, perhaps a stigma would replace many present decorations, and the gracious speeches which are now published would turn out to have been selfish.

Learned people examine conscientiously certain epochs of past history, but who can tell if those documents are not falsified !

When shall the day break that history and truth shall walk hand in hand ?

Why do we not give up those narrow worn out paths, in which history has trodden till now ?

Wicked deeds ought not to be passed over in silence, whether our own or another nation were the transgressor, but ought to be represented in a correct light. True patriotism is not stirred by triumphing over other people's misfortunes, and rejoicing where they suffer; such feelings should be unworthy of a great nation.

But does greatness only consists in conquests by sword ? Are inventions, discoveries, progress in art, in science, reckoned for nothing.

It is mostly in small circles that warm hearts beat for the need of their fellow men. It is even often from subjected nations, that greatness and energy springs.

The notion of what is true greatness had to be changed altogether and to be transferred to the spiritual domain. Industry and health raise a nation to strength and influence, whilst lawlessness and extravagance are its ruin.

The young mind which devotes itself to the study of history will, with enthusiasm, profit by examples of this sort. Therefore it would be worth the trouble of the most cultured minds to revise history, that it might become a warning and elevating example to mankind.

Let us make a beginning. Among the numerous friends gathered here, there will be some who have time, talent and intelligence enough to set to work. Let those who are willing give to their names, meet together to discuss I., the manner of conception, II., the way of representation, III., the age of the student to be addressed. Each may choose his favourite part of history, and work it out in his own native tongue. The essays may then be delivered in at a fixed time and submitted to suitable judges ; translated into the respective languages, and published.

Pray let us not separate without making a beginning. Now is the time, it is never too early.

M. J. R. De LASSASIE having spoken, the resolution was unanimously agreed to.

RESOLUTION II.

M. SARRAZIN (Guise) moved that :—

(ENGLISH.)

“ The Congress protests against the use of military exercises in connection with the physical exercises of school, and suggests the formation of brigades for saving life rather than of quasi-military character.”

(FRENCH.)

“ Le Congrès proteste contre l'emploi des exercices

militaires donnés comme exercices physiques dans les écoles et suggère la formation de brigades de sauvetage plutôt que de celles ayant un caractère quasi-militaire." (See page 94.)

He read a paper, which had been prepared by M. Doyen, of the Familistere de Guise, on "The Instruction of the Young." (See Addenda, page 224.)

Mr. W. E. DARBY, in seconding the resolution, after expressing his regret that both his paper and the *précis* of it had been lost, said :

I have to charge my memory as well as I can, and to give you in as few words as I am able, the sense of my paper.

The paper itself was as follows :—

MILITARY DRILL IN SCHOOLS.

That system of Education is most preferable which develops the greater number of faculties, and which does so most thoroughly. The aim of Education should be to make good and useful citizens. But a man is not a good citizen, who is only partially developed, who, whatever his intellectual powers may be, collapses in the midst of his labours for lack of bodily stamina, and gets thrust to the wall by stronger competitors because of his physical weakness. Success in life depends as much upon physical strength as intellectual force. The stability and strength of a nation depend as much upon the physical, as upon the mental condition of its people.

It is now generally recognised that no system of education is complete, unless it provides for the development of the bodily power as well as the mental faculties. Physical training is avowedly of as much importance as intellectual culture. For the real welfare and efficiency of the individual, the two should go hand in hand.

Impelled by the recognition of this fact, the ancient Greek sought strength as ardently as he strove for wisdom, and the Roman expressed his idea of human perfection in the phrase, "*mens sana in sano corpore*,"— "a sound mind in a sound body."

Not many generations ago the state of society was so essentially combative that men valued mere brute force far beyond the more ethereal qualities of the mind, and cultivated it accordingly. To train the body was the grand end of education and the best educated man was he who should strike the heaviest blows and endure the greatest labours. It sometimes happened that a knight and gentleman possessed the accomplishment of reading, and thereby acquired the character of a great scholar, while if he could also write sufficiently to sign his name, still more if he were addicted to study and mental pursuits, he was in some danger of being suspected as a wizard.

As civilisation developed, and society emerged from that state of semi-barbarism, men began to feel that learning did not really degrade human nature, and to perceive that a knight might chance to be a better gentleman if his mind were cultivated as well as his body. It was found, moreover that, the advantages really lay on the side of intellectual culture. Learning, as a matter of course, was confined to the cloister, and its inmates exercised a disproportionate influence over the strong handed but ignorant and uncultured people around them. Gradually, however, this condition of things was corrected. Education came to be recognised as a duty and necessity. The brains of the laymen, after having been for many generations systematically cramped, began to expand and develop themselves.

Then followed a reaction which has continued to the present day, and by the prevailing system of education, of payment by results and competitive examinations, has been carried to an abnormal and unhealthy degree. The brain is stimulated from early years, frequently forced like a cucumber under a glass shade, and the intellect is often cultivated at the expense of the body which is left to grow as it best can.

Not universally, however. People are awakening to the idea that the body is an important part of the human organisation, and that its health and proper development are most essential for the activity and proper use of the mind. There is in consequence, a general recognition of the fact that body and mind, if the individual is to reach his utmost development, must receive simultaneous culture. It is admitted that physical training should be included in the curriculum of elementary education.

In connection with the most modern and approved educational systems it is advocated that children should be instructed in the elements of physiology and

hygiene, and be taught the rules for the preservation of health, such as the use of fresh food, water, and air, proper exercise, sleep, and clothing; and that while they are taught these theoretically they should be made to understand them practically by having properly ventilated and sanitary class-rooms and schools, as well as by the attention given to the position and physical welfare of the children themselves during school hours, and in their school work. All this is as it should be, and such physical education could not fail to have a perceptible and beneficial influence upon the whole after life.

In addition to this it is maintained that the children should be taught a sound system of exercise; their muscles should be developed; their bodily functions stimulated; so as to result in health and vigour and the sound mind in a healthy body, which is the best equipment for life. It has been advocated that in order to secure adequate results, there should be a director of physical exercises who should inspect schools and report as to whether the system was being properly administered.

Excellent theory; and if nothing more were aimed at there could be nothing but general acquiescence and unqualified praise.

Unfortunately the practice is vitiated by the prevailing militarism, which is the most prominent feature of the times in which we live. Military ideas and requirements would make the elementary school a place of primary education for the army, and assume that for the desiderated physical culture military drill is indispensable.

In Germany, Austria, France, and Russia, a national system of physical culture has been adopted. That, however, is avowedly a part of the national system of military training even when it is itself least military in character. It is the result of cruel experiences gained in war, and of the continual rivalry and conflict of the nations which is maintained in the existing state of armed peace. It is a necessity of the constant preparations for fresh conflicts, which is the natural result of war, and the war spirit, and has, unfortunately, come to be the normal condition of the European nations.

M. Gambetta, in 1871, after the Franco-German war, attributed the defeat of France, and the loss of Alsace and Lorraine to the physical superiority of the German soldiery. A national system of physical training of the young—for it is in youth such training is most beneficial—followed as a matter of course from that belief.

In Great Britain, the assumption that military drill is the indispensable form of physical culture, appears to be as widespread as on the continent, although here it is not accompanied by a national system, for happily as yet, universal compulsory military service does not exist among us.

It is well known that in the large public schools cadet corps are enrolled, with officers regularly appointed by Government authority. And though, theoretically, service in these corps is not compulsory, practically it is; and parents have had to face the alternative of allowing their boys to learn the art of soldiery or to withdraw them altogether from the school. Last year a number of these cadet corps from well-known public schools took part in the Aldershot manœuvres, and the public press was jubilant over the fact that the boys conducted themselves almost as well as the regulars. Parish authorities, and a quasi-Christian philanthropy, in its homes, training ships, and other institutions, frequently train young lads directly for army or navy; but pauper boys can hardly help themselves, and the naval and military training is a part of the philanthropy. Besides all this however, there is an almost universal idea that the military drill instructor is indispensable in every school curriculum. In elementary schools, even in ladies' and private seminaries, the drill sergeant, generally an old soldier or the local Government official, is as much a part of the teaching staff as the head master or mistress. The Government, astute enough in taking care of its military establishments, has stationed a number of drill instructors throughout the country, whose services are always available, and whose occupation oscillates between the training of the youth belonging to volunteer or military corps in the military art, and the education of the children in our day schools in the rudiments of the same art.

What the military authorities desiderate was indicated by General Lord Wolseley, from his position one of the most representative military officers of the day, in a recent speech which attracted some notice. According to the *Times*, 10th February, 1890, "he regretted that when universal education was started in England that every Board School had not had attached to it some sort of military organisation, or some military instructor entrusted with the duty of drilling, and thus foster amongst them a spirit of military discipline."

He was addressing a reputedly religious body, and this, probably, made him consider the drill sergeant a disguised missionary, for he is reported to have continued: "The essence and foundation of such discipline was obedience to those

placed in authority of whatever kind. Obedience to one to whom they could look as their commanding officer was the first step towards reverence, and reverence was the first step towards faith; and no country from which faith was eliminated could, in his opinion, be great, powerful, or even lasting." According to his lordship the greatness, power, and permanence of a nation, and in some sense its religious life, were enhanced by military drill—an hypothesis contradicted by the lessons of history and the essential nature of faith.

NOTE.—As an illustration of the way in which the military and parochial authorities work together, may be taken the following incident, which has occurred since this sentence was written.

At the weekly meeting of the Bath Board of Guardians, June 3rd last, Mr. R. O. Heyward, a well known local philanthropist in the chair, a letter was read from the Colonel commanding the 25th Regimental District, enquiring whether there were any boys in the workhouse who had been instructed in the cornet, and were desirous of enlisting in the 1st Battalion Scottish Borderers. The Master reported that there was one such boy in the house properly qualified, who accordingly was encouraged to enlist.—*Western Daily Press, 3rd July, 1890.*

Another military authority, Colonel G. M. Onslow, in a lecture delivered a short time ago in the offices of the London School Board, before a very different audience, on the necessity of Physical Culture and Recreation for Children in Elementary Schools, took a far more rational and tenable position, while, however, he showed that Lord Wolseley's desideratum was to a large extent actual fact. His words are important not merely from the military character and position of the lecturer, but because they go to the very heart of the question. In the course of an able discussion of his subject he said, that, "In the Elementary Education Act of 1870, he saw no mention of physical exercises, but provision was made for boys to have military drill two hours a week. But why should the drill be military? He looked upon this two hours a week as time wasted. There should be a general system of exercises. In the same Act the girls were not even allowed military drill, but practical cookery was mentioned. If it was thought that military drill would benefit the boys' physique, why were the girls left out, and made to put up with cookery? Physical instruction was quite as necessary for girls as for boys. The bodily strength of future generations of Englishmen depended as much upon the stamina of the women as upon that of the men, for if the boys were to become the fathers the girls were to become the mothers of the future generations."

The lecturer claimed that physical education, theoretical and practical, should be made compulsory throughout the country; that it should be State-directed, and conducted on a scientific and rational principle; that it should be recognised as an important part of a child's education; and showed how physical culture and recreation are essential for the physical and moral well being of the youth of both sexes, and what national benefits would accrue therefrom. But he, nevertheless, urged the very important and crucial question, Why should the drill be military?

Our reply, advisedly and emphatically is, that it should not be military, and for the following among other reasons:—

1. Because as a method of physical training, military drill is both inadequate and injurious.

Experiments, which were conducted in a public school with a view to ascertain the relative value of gymnastics and of mere drill, showed that the average results yielded by the former were more than three times as great as those yielded by drill alone. Relatively therefore, this method of physical culture is inferior. Military drill is defective, inasmuch as it does not to any extent meet the physiological demands of the body. Its effect upon boys is not salutary. It does not, as the community at large have believed, make a youth erect, or give him a graceful and manly bearing. On the contrary, it tends to make him stiff and angular in his movements, as well as to droop and round his shoulders.

This fact has been long recognised by the military authorities, and a set of calisthenic exercises or free gymnastics, known as the setting up drill, has been adopted to correct the tendency, and is incorporated in all treatises on military training. Upton, in his "Manual of United States Army Infantry Tactics," says, "As the importance of 'setting up' cannot be over-estimated, the exercises must be often recurred to, and all soldiers will be frequently practised therein."

This is not the only expedient adopted to give the soldier his smart appearance and military figure. There is another method, commonly known as "tailorizing," by which youthful soldiers may easily acquire a full chest, square shoulders, and a straight back.

Dr Dudley A. Sargeant, Director of the Hemenway Gymnasium, Harvard

University, who is an acknowledged authority, adds—"In reference to the gracefulness that is thought to characterize the movements of young cadets, I can only say it is not the outcome of drilling and marching. The soldier is trained to square corners, straight platoons, and angular movements. Curves and embellishments are not encouraged in speech or in action. If you would account for the graceful poise of our National Cadets you must see them from one to two hours a day in charge of the dancing master."

It may be an unwelcome task to explode a fallacy which has commended military drill to parents and teachers and which has given it the widespread popularity which attaches to it. But truth is always best, and this matter is so important that no part of the truth should be concealed.

Dr. Sargeant sums up his conclusions in an admirable little brochure on the subject in these striking words:—"After taking the most favourable view possible of military drill as a physical exercise, we are led to conclude that its constrained positions and closely localised movements do not afford the essential requisites for developing the muscles, and improving the respiration and circulation, and thereby improving the general health and condition of the system. We must further conclude that in case of any malformation, local weakness, or constitutional debility, the drill tends, by its strain upon the nerves and prolonged tension on the muscles, to increase the defects rather than to relieve them."

"Finally, if the ultimate object of the drill was to prepare young men for the life and duties of a soldier, we should be forced to conclude that the drill itself would still be defective as a means of developing the chief requisites for men in that profession.

"This defect, we are pleased to state, is recognised by the great military nations of Europe, and measures are taken to give all the recruits from three to twelve months' gymnastic training to develop them as *men*, before they are expected to conform to the requirements of the soldier."

2. Because the moral effects of the drill are not all that have been claimed for it.

The Boys' Brigade movement—the new military development in the Christian Churches of Great Britain, professes to use military organisation and drill as a means of moral culture. The profession challenges close investigation. In its constitution it states that "military organisation and drill shall be used as a means of securing the interest of the boys, binding them together in the work of the Brigade, and promoting among them such habits as the Brigade is designed to form." These habits are then defined to be "discipline and obedience," which shall be enforced by all "the officers." The result of "military organisation and drill" therefore is disciplined obedience. This may seem a good thing until it is asked, to what authority? To any authority whatsoever! It is assumed that obedience is in itself good without any regard to the kind of authority. That, however, is the convenient creed of the despot which has been always destructive of freedom. In moral culture it can have no place. For moral culture aims at making men self-disciplined, self-governed, not automata moved by the will of another. For a moral being the only obedience that is admissible and that can be aimed at in religious and moral culture is obedience to moral authority, to right, to conscience, to the divine imperative of duty, and, Christianity teaches, to Christ, the lord of the conscience, the true interpreter of duty. Military drill and discipline aim at producing flexible automata, obedient to the will of the commanding officer, and its success is measured by the flexibility of the machine. It is bondage not freedom. Even were the "obedience" all that is claimed for it, there are other attributes of character; and these are overlooked. Dr. Sargeant says again: "Coolness, courage, presence of mind, and that rapid and responsible exercise of judgment in emergencies, so valuable to the man of business as well as to the soldier, are not developed by the drill itself, though I will admit that other moral attributes, such as obedience, patience, fortitude, and forbearance," all passive in character, it will be perceived, "may be brought to a high degree of perfection."

As a means of moral culture, therefore, military drill is defective, for it develops some attributes of character to the neglect, if not actually at the expense of others equally necessary.

3. Because military drill is inseparable from its purpose and associations.

It is drill and discipline with a definite purpose, from which it cannot be dissociated. If it were possible to eliminate the purpose of the drill, which gives it character, and the associations which spring out of that purpose, the character of the drill would be changed. The definite object of the drill is to impart and develop skill and facility in slaying men. But killing one's fellow men is rightly considered

murder. The musket and sword, or its substitute, come to be necessary parts of the drill. The Boys' Brigade has its dummy or real rifles and military accoutrements, and these are purely instruments of killing. In drilling children by military discipline there is implanted in them the spirit born of the character and associations of the drill, the spirit of the soldier who is trained to kill and to destroy, there is developed in them the war spirit, the spirit of murder. It is vain to expect that the drill can be used and the moral influence of its associations be escaped. Military drill, therefore, of necessity favours and fosters ideas and practices, which belong to the brute and barbaric side of human nature, rather than to the cultured and civilised, the development of which is the object sought in the very existence of the school. It familiarises the young with the idea of the taking of human life. It takes for granted a series of terrible fallacies implying that war cannot be dispensed with, that the natural state of man is hostility to his fellow man. It sanctions and assumes the militarism of which it is a part, and for which it is a training. Disguise it as we may the simple fact is "that the primary object of establishing military drill in our schools and colleges is a professional one, that is, to give instruction in military tactics to educated young men in order that they might be of service to the country or community in case of war," and to prepare the rank and file of future armies in the primary and elementary schools of the land.

The end condemns the means.

4. Because military drill may be dispensed with in physical training. It is by no means necessary, its quality is doubtful, and, under the most favourable circumstances it has to be supplemented. "For the purpose of physical development there is no necessity to teach boys soldierly duties and the use of the rifle. There are all the appliances of calisthenics and gymnastics, and the proper use of them has been developed into a science; there are the various games which promote physical force and freedom, and there are the various industrial arts which are themselves a means of physical training." It is encouraging to observe that the Governments are awaking to a recognition of these facts. Only a few days ago a letter appeared in the leading London newspapers, signed by a score or more of the members of the London School Board, appealing for funds to encourage physical exercises in elementary schools. "The Education Department," they say, "by its Code of this year, at length recognises the need of physical exercises for the children in the public elementary schools, and allows instruction in swimming at the public baths to be counted as school attendance."

This is a step in the right direction. What is required is that physical training shall be free from all moral taint, and that it shall be adapted to its purpose.

The *Daily News*, commenting on the purpose of this appeal, intimates that one object of the promoters is to assist School clubs for cricket, football, tennis, and other invigorating games. It then continues:—

"It is in the comparative absence of regular organised play that our elementary schools, both Board and voluntary, are most seriously at fault. No higher kind of school is now considered complete without abundant provision for play, and in some great public schools the games are encouraged to an almost absurd extreme. Every one knows the famous saying, attributed to the Duke of Wellington, that his battles were won in the playing fields of Eton; but school games not only tend to develop the dash and vigour of our race, they are a great factor in the formation of that *esprit de corps*, without which a school is sadly incomplete.—*Daily News, July 4th, 1890.*"

By all means let mind and body be developed to the utmost, but let it never be forgotten that there is a higher purpose in all this culture than mere destruction: that the human race has richer possibilities than can be reached on fields of conquest, or by wasting its energies in mutual conflict: and that the dash and vigour and *esprit de corps* developed by school games and physical exercises may find sublimer spheres of action than the battlefield, and a fitter outlet and more beneficent achievements than any that can be covered by the term "MILITARY."

DISCUSSION.

Mr. JOSEPH STURGE, of Birmingham, said they were all agreed as to the value and importance of physical exercises; but the most valuable were the extension exercises, which were not strictly the military part of the drill.

Signor MONETA said that he was for peace above all things, but he thought military exercises in schools were not such an evil as had

been stated. We could not arrive at this great idea of disarmament all at once; there must be an intermediate time, during which a true society in Europe is being fitted for such a change, whereby it may become possible. That was their aim. Italy for centuries endured slavery, because it had quite forgotten all military usages and was unable to defend itself. The great distinction he urged upon the Congress was between permanent arms and arms for defence—citizen arms, such as were seen in Switzerland. The permanent army was, of course, an immense danger, because it was for offence, whereas an armed nation was exclusively for defence, and could not be used for offence. In Switzerland all were soldiers, but none there desired war, because all knew that they were armed simply for the independence of their own country, and never for leaving their own territory and attacking others. He wanted to abolish arms for ever, but no one proposed at the present moment in Europe to do that. We must take facts as they are, and until dangers of mutual invasion ceased we must train our youths to defend themselves in order that international independence might be secured. He hoped the day would come when all arms would be seen only in museums, and that their use would be forgotten; but he thought it was impossible in the actual condition of Europe to propose anything so extreme as some advocated.

Cependant, il faut bien admettre, comme le fait remarquer M. Moneta, que nous n'arriverons pas en une seule fois au désarmement complet: il faudra un certain temps pour former en Europe une société préparée à un événement aussi considérable. Le danger le plus grand réside surtout dans les armées permanentes préparées en vue de la guerre offensive.

“ En Suisse, a encore dit M. Moneta, tout le monde est soldat; cependant, personne ne veut la guerre. Chaque citoyen sait qu'il est armé seulement pour défendre son indépendance, et non pour porter atteinte à celle des autres. Sans doute, il faudrait abolir les armes et les reléguer dans les musées—j'espère qu'un jour il en sera ainsi—mais actuellement il faut voir les choses sous leur véritable jour et ce serait déjà un grand pas de fait que d'apprendre à nos enfants qu'ils ne devront plus se battre, si ce n'est pour défendre leur indépendance.”

Mr. T. CROSFIELD, of Liverpool, moved to amend by adding:

“ And urges the desirability of impressing on the Boards of Examiners who formulate the questions for examination the propriety of guiding the minds of children in the principles of Peace.”

“ Et il insiste sur l'utilité de faire sentir au Corps d'Examineurs qui sont chargés de formuler les questions pour les examens, la nécessité de diriger l'esprit des enfants vers les principes de Paix.”

The Resolution was adopted with this addition, and stood as follows:

(ENGLISH.)

“ The Congress protests against the use of military drill in connection with the physical exercises of schools, and suggests the formation of brigades for saving life rather than any of a quasi-military character; and it urges the desirability of impressing on the Board of Examiners, who

formulate the questions for examination, the propriety of guiding the minds of children into the principles of Peace."

(FRENCH.)

"Le Congrès proteste contre l'emploi des exercices militaires donnés comme exercices physiques dans les écoles et suggère la formation de brigades de sauvetage plutôt que de celles ayant un caractère quasi-militaire ; et il insiste sur l'utilité de faire sentir au Corps d'Examineurs qui sont chargés de formuler les questions pour les examens, la nécessité de diriger l'esprit des enfants vers les principes de Paix."

The following paper was presented :

GYMNASTIC EXERCISES IN GERMAN SCHOOLS.

By FRAU FISCHER LETTE.

Gymnastic exercises in Germany are of very ancient origin. In the earlier periods of history, and in a semi-savage condition of society, when every man was a warrior, and leaders were chosen because of their physical prowess, bodily strength was accounted of greatest value, and physical culture formed nearly the whole of education. Gymnastic exercises were then followed with assiduity, as a simple necessity, and their practice became an art, even though the principles which governed it and the method of its pursuit, could hardly claim the dignity of a science.

During the middle ages these exercises were the privilege of the aristocracy. Every youth had to pass through the prescribed forms and grades of chivalric training before he could wear his spurs and take his place as tried and trusty knight. Book-learning and study belonged only to the few, physical training formed still the staple of education, and the culture of brawn was far more general than that of brain. The flower of manhood displayed their strength and agility in the greatly celebrated tournaments both on horseback and on foot, and for the majority of the male members of society, life resolved itself into a perpetual training so that they might excel each other in the combat, or at least hold their own in the fray. Neglect of physical culture meant certain defeat. It was an epoch of fighting, which formed the main business of masculine existence, and fighting, especially with the weapons and military tactics which were then in vogue, demanded physical vigour.

Gymnastics in their present form were imported from Sweden, and brought into system by Ludwig Jahn—Father Jahn as he is called—(1778-1852).

About 1817 Jahn was appointed teacher of Gymnastics at Berlin. After 1848, the year of European revolutions, he had to suffer under the general political reaction, in which bodily exercises in suitable loose garments were looked upon as revolutionary, and even the infantile rhythmical movements of the kindergarten, invented by Froebel, were suppressed.

Drill in military orphan houses and cadet schools, where boys are dressed in uniform, practise with arms, and are taught by sub-officers, was always kept up. But boys in civil schools were left, during those years of reaction, without physical training ; whereas for girls it was thought wholly unbecoming. The time spent in school was considered to be required for mental improvement only.

These ideas were, in the course of time, carried to such an extreme as threatened the health of the whole nation. Shortsightedness, caused by the preparation of lessons at night, became so general that boys of 12 years of age with glasses were quite a common sight. Bodily development on the whole grew more and more defective. An outcry was then raised that physical exercises in schools ought to be re-established. This demand was made not merely by those who were anxious for the health of the child, but with even greater vigour by the military authorities. Physical proportions it was found were constantly decreasing, and the standard of height and measurement of chest had to be reduced annually.

As every boy in Germany is considered to belong to the army, the Government is naturally much interested in the physical perfection of children.

Gymnastics, therefore, are now a branch of school education, as that is determined by the special department of state which has the control of it. The method and system are the same all over Germany. The Leitfaden (guide or primer) is authorised, like all school books, by the Minister of Education. The aim and raison d'être of Turnen, or Gymnastics, is thus given in the preface.

"Exercises, free and on platforms, practised methodically, are meant to train the

body to a natural and graceful deportment and to develop health and strength in children and young people.

"They further promote and strengthen endurance and agility of the limbs ; they improve the health, awaken elasticity of mind, and impart quickness of resolution, and courage, and calmness in danger."

"Such training will greatly assist the educational influence of the school. To attain this end the gymnastic instruction has to be practised methodically according to a certain fixed plan, with energy and force. At the same time it must be made agreeable and attractive to the pupils. The course is divided into—

1. Free exercises : viz. movements of the head and the different limbs, marching, leaping, &c.

2. Practice on platforms, as the ladder, rope, wooden horse, &c.

The time fixed by the Education Department is at least one hour per week ; but most schools have lessons twice a week.

Though the general outline of the system is fixed by government authority, scope for further development in actual practice is left, according to the energy and talent of the teacher. In girls' schools, moreover, gymnastic lessons are obligatory.

Though it is only in military orphanages and cadet schools that boys wear uniform as their every day dress and learn to make use of arms, yet gymnastics, generally, are intended and arranged to lead up to subsequent military drill.

An attentive observer will not fail to notice that they have this character especially in North Germany where the commands are given in exactly the same form of expression as are used in drilling recruits, and these orders have to be executed as by a regiment *en masse* and with precision of motion and time. In South Germany the orders are less technical in form. They are worded as to be understood by everybody, and the scholars are exercised individually. Yet there is a common spirit, and the same purpose, running through them all. Their object is development for a military purpose, and the consciousness of that gives a similarity of tone and spirit to them everywhere.

Every school and college has now a turnhalle, or gymnasium, and every village its turn, or gymnastic club.

Yet, in spite of all regulations and a consequent universality of cultivation amounting almost to popularity, there are in Germany thinking people, who do not give their unqualified approval to the system. It seems to them that the military element is too prominent, and that this element interferes with the development of individuality. The body is trained at the expense of personal qualities such as independence of mind, free will, &c.

Accordingly some of the English games and physical exercises by land and water have been introduced into Germany and have met with high favour, especially among the elder boys. The playgrounds are full whenever these are in progress, and the rivers are covered with boats and canoes full of eager occupants.

These are encouraging signs. Physical culture is a necessity. No education is complete without it. No physical appliances are complete which do not contemplate such culture, and the freer and unrestrained it is the better, leaving room for individual assertion and growth, even when it promotes an *esprit de corps* and simultaneous action, but all such culture should be free from the fatal taint of militarism, for that by suggestion, the association of ideas, and its unconscious but mighty influence, means a moral training which is downward in the direction of brute instincts and barbaric passions and practices, and inimical to all that education really means and aims to secure—the development of the whole nature of the individual, the civilisation and culture of the whole community.

There was also contributed a paper on "Boy Soldiers," of which this summary is given here, the paper having been published in full by the Peace Society.

PRECIS OF PAPER ON BOY SOLDIERS.

By THE REV. J. P. GLEDSTONE, Streatham, London.

In this paper attention is called to a recent movement in favour of military training for boys : the origin of which is attributed to the military authorities, the object being to impose military training on all from fourteen to eighteen years of age. Companies have been formed at the great public schools, and they take part in the military manœuvres at Aldershot. Workhouse schools have also military drill, and many of the lads are thereby induced to enter the army ; while no less than 17,000 Sunday school boys are under military drill.

Mr. Gladstone first calls attention to the Cadet Corps, and to some very remarkable utterances by military men on this subject. One of these stated that of 500 boys—working class lads—who had passed through the ranks of the Warwick Cadet Corps, eighty per cent. have continued their career in the Line, Militia, or Volunteers. Another military man suggests that a cadet corps should be formed in every town and village district, and that all lads, on leaving school at fourteen, should serve until they are eighteen. Other military speakers, at a meeting held last year, expressed fear that it would be impossible to have compulsory military service in England, though they evidently desired it.

Mr. Gladstone then refers to the fact that Dr. R. W. Dale, of Birmingham, has given his name and influence to this movement, and he is quoted as saying that Cadet Corps would greatly add to the attractions of Continuation Schools, while the habits of discipline thus acquired would be of great value, to say nothing of physical improvement.

The rules for the Cadet Corps in Birmingham require "implicit obedience to superiors in rank," and Mr. Gladstone observes that boys are thus taught to render this obedience "without troubling themselves as to whether it is right to do what they are commanded." He proceeds to point out that the object in view is not their physical welfare, nor any real service to the nation, for that is not attained by training working men into soldiers. The true object is to introduce the military system of the continent. It is even proposed that boys should have free education, on condition of submitting to a military training.

As to Sunday Schools, in 1888, there were already upwards of 14,000 boys in the Boys' Brigade; and the object of the latter is stated to be as follows:—"The advancement of Christ's kingdom among boys, and the promotion of habits of reverence, discipline, self-respect, and all that tends towards a true Christian manhood."

The Brigade was originally formed in consequence of the need felt of improving the discipline of the Sunday School, and of keeping together the elder boys, in order to influence them not only on Sundays, but throughout the week. It is intended that the Brigade shall be composed of Companies to be connected with churches, missions, and other organisations. The proceedings are as follows:—"After drill, a service, consisting of a suitable hymn, such as "Soldiers of Christ," and closing with the Lord's Prayer and the National Anthem. The *Boys' Brigade Manual* states that its members will often be found to attend the Sunday school for no other reason than because it is connected with the Company. The report also speaks of the largely increased attendance at church and Sunday school among boys, in consequence of the formation of the Brigade, and the greater respect shown for superintendents, teachers, &c.

Mr. Gladstone gives every credit to the good intentions of those connected with the movement; but this only deepens his regret that such a method should have been adopted. He says that the soldier's life, which is as unlike the life of the Son of Man as any life can be, is extolled as the life which the boys should seek to attain. Emphasis is laid strongly upon obedience, order, and discipline, but there is no reference to honesty, truthfulness, and purity, to which the soldier's life is necessarily most unfavourable. Lord Wolseley is cited as saying in the "Soldiers' Pocket Book," that such virtues as these latter are incompatible with soldiering. Mr. GLADSTONE then refers to the vices which are inseparable from a military life.

With reference to the Brigade, it is stated by its founders that the proportion of boys entering the Army on leaving it is small, while as many as 150 from one Company have joined the Young Men's Christian Association. He thinks that when the enthusiasm for religion which formed the basis of the movement has declined, the military life will take its place, and thence will come the military spirit; so that it is most unwise to train these youths to the use of arms. He next refers to the fact that a Boys' Brigade has been formed at Cape Town, in connection with a Christian mission, whilst Canada and New Zealand are following the same example. Even the United States are not safe from this craze for boy-soldiering, and Companies have been formed in San Francisco and elsewhere. As to its connexion with religious institutions, the *raison d'être* is stated to be the retention of the Sunday scholars; but useful works which the boys might have been engaged in have been passed by. Mr. Gladstone, however, is of opinion that an earnest Christian spirit would have provided something of the kind—at once useful and unmilitary; and that such employment is favourably received by boys, as shown by the success of the Evening Recreation Movement. There is plenty to be done in the promotion of ambulance work, swimming, music, and physical drill.

Mr. Gladstone concludes by saying that all Christians should pray for a time

when men shall learn war no more ; and he strongly urges that all warlike teaching and use of weapons should be kept away from the church.

RESOLUTION III.

Mr. HODGSON PRATT moved :—

“ That this Congress believes that war is frequently represented in a false light in the education of youth, and desires to call the attention of teachers to their power, and therefore their responsibility, in this matter. It urges them to lead their pupils to honour deeds of peace and the doers of them, dwelling in terms of sorrow on the loss and misery caused by wars, whether successful or unsuccessful. It also commends to parents the consideration of the right education of their children on these points, and, believing that the rhymes and games of earliest years make deep impression on the plastic minds of children, implores them to exercise care in these matters.”

“ Ce Congrès croit que la guerre est souvent représentée aux yeux de la jeunesse sous un faux jour, et désire appeler l'attention des maîtres sur leur pouvoir, et par conséquent sur leur responsabilité, en cette matière. Il les engage à apprendre à leurs élèves à honorer les actions pacifiques et ceux qui les ont accomplies, s'étendant avec chagrin sur les pertes et les malheurs causés par les guerres, heureuses ou malheureuses.

“ Il recommande aussi aux parents de songer qu'elle est l'éducation vraie à donner à leurs enfants à ce sujet, et étant persuadé que les contes et les jeux des plus jeunes années font une impression profonde sur l'esprit de l'enfance, il adjure les parents de donner tous leurs soins à cet objet.”

In doing so he said :

It can hardly be necessary to urge the importance of giving right and just impressions to the youth of every country as to the duties which nations owe to each other : as to the benefits to be derived by each from a true appreciation of the nobler literature and the nobler aspects of the national life of every people.

All nations have special qualities and attainments, as they have special treasures of Art and Nature, from which results the fact that on the freest interchange of their products—moral, material, or intellectual—depends their growth and development. Each State may find in all the others, and all in each, something to value, to learn, to admire.

The time spent at school and at the University should be seized as the period for laying the foundation for the appreciation of what is noble and valuable in the history, literature, customs, and usages of other peoples.

Such mutual knowledge, so highly to be desired, may be promoted in many ways, and some of the following are, perhaps, worthy of consideration :—

1. The organization of arrangements whereby the young men of one country may pass the long vacation in the homes of teachers and professors of other countries.

2. The establishment of University courses of lectures on the national characteristics, institutions, literature, modes of thought, domestic and public usages, and the great public men of other countries.

3. The extension of the old system of “ Travelling Scholarships ” under conditions adapted to the present time : with provisions for the study, each year, of some special question, the facts connected with

which shall be studied in the case of some one particular country. Such questions might be taken as ;—the social legislation of a State ; its industrial organization : the condition of its working-classes ; its political and Parliamentary usages and character ; its educational institutions, of one class or another ; its criminal laws, with their results, &c.

Visits thus made by able and promising young men of the universities in each country to each other would produce most useful consequences, more especially if the visitors met the most enlightened men of the foreign State. Knowledge gained in this way of the citizens of other countries would do much towards evolving that mutual appreciation and esteem which it is our aim to evoke, and to abolish mischievous ignorance and prejudice. Men who have enjoyed these opportunities, and afterwards take a lead in public affairs and in forming the opinion of their country, will be true missionaries of that international co-operation in human progress which will be a great, though indirect, means of securing concord.

As regards the Special Division of the programme (Section I, subsection II) which deals with :—“ Instruction Relating to Arbitration and Cognate Matters ”—I desire to call the attention of the Congress to the excellent work done in this direction by the Department of Public Instruction in France.

Monsieur Henri Marion, Professor of the Philosophy of Education at the Faculté de Lettres at Paris, has recently called my attention to the fact that in the Normal Schools the “ Duties of Nations towards Each Other,” and “ The Law of Nations,” form part of all the courses on ethical instruction. The same provision is made in the Lycées, from which institutions for secondary education the great majority of the youths pass on to the University.

Monsieur Marion, at the same time, called my attention to a work from his pen, entitled, “ The Duties and Rights of Man,” prepared for primary schools—which is worthy of careful study.† I am further informed by Monsieur Marion that he has been a member of most of the commissions and councils charged with the duty of elaborating courses of instruction relating to the promotion of justice in international relations, and that this instruction has been the subject of earnest attention.

Has not France, in this matter set an example, possibly, to some nations represented at this Congress ? May I express the hope that every delegate will ask himself whether his country has done what is needed in this matter ? The Congress would, I think, do well to affirm the necessity of such instruction in all schools, colleges and universities : and should bring the matter to the notice of all educational institutions and Government Departments of Education.

Mr. THEODORE NEILD, of Manchester, seconded the resolution. He said that Mr. Herman Molkenboer (Amsterdam) had written to him that the Universal Peace Congress has for its object the furtherance of International Arbitration. The object is generous and important, and has his full sympathy. He is a Vice-president ; but he thought that the object of the Congress did not go directly to the root of wars. In the case of bodily health, we all recognise that prevention is better than cure. So in regard to international relations, whilst arbitration cures the malady of the war spirit, education alone prevents its rise. An education to be effective in preventing international disputes must teach history and morality, for example, from an international standpoint. To this end Mr. Molkenboer and his friends suggest the appointment of a temporary

† See *Addenda*, Page 226.

International Education Board, to be elected by the recognised educational bodies of the various nations, this Board to have as its object the discussion of educational questions from an international point of view, with a view to the dissemination, in all the countries so represented, of teaching with a tendency to bring nations to a good understanding. Mr. Molkenboer has already secured the adherence of over 1,900 friends in 18 countries of America and Europe. He would be glad if the Universal Peace Congress would accord not only the first place in its programme to Education, but also give encouragement to the effort to establish a Permanent International Council of Education, and therefore he would be glad if greater prominence might be given by the Congress to Education than to Arbitration.

The resolution was agreed to.

The following paper on this section was presented by
LEVI K. JOSLIN, of Providence R.I., U.S.A.

SOME HISTORICAL, ECONOMICAL, AND SOCIAL RESULTS OF WAR
ON THE AMERICAN CONTINENT.

BEING SUCH FACTS AS SHOULD BE INCORPORATED IN HISTORICAL TEXT BOOKS.

THE INVASION OF AMERICA.

The invasion of America by the Spanish and the Puritans, and the attempt to introduce civilization and Christianity by subjugation and the sword, destroyed all that the original children of America had accomplished in centuries. And millions of these unfortunates were driven from their soil, their country and their home, and destroyed by cruelty. This was the war method of the world, and is extolled in history. May it never be repeated in Africa.

WILLIAM PENN.

Utterly opposed to the War system was the Peace method of William Penn, as illustrated by his dealings with the American Indians. In 1682 William Penn met the savages on the Delaware river. They were as warlike as the Indians of the other colonies. Under a large elm, and without arms of any kind, he told them he "would not call them brothers, for brothers sometimes will differ. He would consider them as of the same flesh and blood."

The whole conduct of Penn towards the Indians was founded in justice and love. The treaty of peace and good will which he made was never broken with him. Thus was founded one of the great cities of the world, Philadelphia, now containing over 1,000,000 of people, and properly called the "City of Brotherly Love." In the whole history of the country Indian warfare can show no such illustrious victory as this. William Penn may be considered the great exemplar of the world.

REVOLUTIONARY WAR WITH ENGLAND.

To most of my countrymen the struggle of 1776 with Great Britain for independence is considered a full justification of war. But the great Franklin shortly after that war said, "There never was a good war, or a bad peace." Humanity is one—American, English, French, German. The loss of England is the loss of America. And in this war she lost all that she risked. Lives of thousands of innocent men. More than £100,000,000 in money. And her colonies. The loss to the colonies, whose soil was drenched with human blood, was as great, only that the states gained the territory on which to live and to grow great.

BUT THERE IS A BETTER WAY FOR TERRITORIAL ACQUISITION.

By peaceable negotiation with Napoleon, France in 1803 ceded Louisiana to the United States. A territory larger than the thirteen original states for \$16,000,000, while the war of the revolution cost \$135,000,000. In 1819 Spain ceded to the United States the great territory of Florida peaceably for \$5,000,000. In 1867 Russia ceded Alaska to the United States for \$7,000,000. In 1848 and 1854 Mexico ceded California, New Mexico and other territory to the United States for \$23,000,000, while the war of the United States with Mexico, in 1846-48, waged largely for the extension of the slave territory, cost the United States \$166,000,000, and 25,000 men. The kindly dealing of the United States with France, Spain and Russia shames the settlement by battle of territorial questions between great peoples.

THE WAR OF 1812-14.

with England was waged by the United States because of the search of her vessels by England on the high seas, and the impressment of American seamen. The British orders in council, which partly caused the war, were revoked five days after the declaration of war. And the battle of New Orleans, in which more than 2000 men were killed or wounded, was fought after peace had been declared. The cost to the two countries for this war was more than \$200,000,000, and thousands of human beings put to torturous death. At its close a treaty of peace was negotiated without any reference to the original causes of dispute.

IN STRIKING CONTRAST

to this useless war, the absolute and permanent settlement of questions somewhat similar to those involved in the war of 1812-14, was secured by the Geneva arbitration of 1872, whereby Great Britain paid to the United States \$15,500,000; and later, the payment of \$5,000,000 by the United States, under the decision of the Halifax fishery commission, settled other dangerous questions.

THE SLAVEHOLDERS' REBELLION.

This war in the United States from 1861 to 1865 was fought because of contention on the question of slavery, and secured its abolition. The lucrative African slave trade had previously been peaceably abolished, and also slavery itself in more than one-half of the United States, with little pecuniary cost, and none of life. Without war slavery has been abolished in the British West Indies, in Brazil and the South American Republics. The United States secured emancipation by the war method.

AT WHAT COST!

Statistical estimates show a cost, direct and indirect, of more than \$10,000,000,000, and the end is not yet. The whole expenditures of the United States for 1890 were \$341,000,000, of which only \$82,000,000 was for the peace establishment, the balance being for war, navy, pensions, war debt, interest, &c.

The emancipation of 3,000,000 slaves could have been secured by purchase for less than one-tenth of this amount had north and south assented to the method of peace, without the killing or wounding of 1,000,000 men in battle. This cost approaches the infinite; for what estimate can be placed on the value of human life? Or what can be put in the balance as compensation for human torture? The wealth of the world could not compensate a single victim.

THE WAR BETWEEN PARAGUAY, BRAZIL AND HER ALLIES

occurred between 1864 and 1870. Paraguay was nearly annihilated. Four-fifths of her male population were destroyed by the war, and 50,000 women and children perished in her forests. As near as ascertainable the dispute was about the navigation of her rivers by the other countries: one that could have been easily settled by arbitration. We may expect no more of these horrible wars in South America since there has this year been enacted at Washington

ONE OF THE GREATEST HISTORICAL EVENTS

of the centuries by the negotiation of an Arbitration treaty securing peace to the American continent, with a cordial invitation to all other nations to share in its beneficent results. Conquest is well declared "inadmissible under American public law." It matters little to what country a people belong; the greater question is, Are they moral, intellectual, prosperous and happy?

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF PEACE

in the United States has nearly paid the money costs of five years of war. Here, as everywhere, naval and military men call for large expenditure. The naval board of the United States senate recommended an extra expenditure of some \$25,000,000 per annum, for fourteen years, to build a great navy. Vigorous protest was made to this proposition, and Congress appropriated only \$2,000,000 more for the ensuing than in previous years. With a population above 60,000,000 the army remains as for fifteen years at about 25,000 men in number.

WASHINGTON WARNED HIS COUNTRY

against great standing armies. And to the fact that we have none may be largely attributed a great progress in invention, democratic progress, and material wealth. American inventive genius has been directed to economise and save rather than to destroy and kill, as illustrated by the steamboat of Fulton, the telegraph by Morse, and the new electrical appliances of Bell and Edison, and the application of anesthesia by Morton: a blessing to millions, in peace and war. The mileage of railroads in the United States equals that of all Europe. Our industrial armies have builded railroads

while yours of Europe have been watching for opportunities to destroy both man and his work.

THE GOOD OF MAN UNIVERSAL

is promoted by peace. In Europe, millions of men, deprived of family, tread the barren rounds of the camp, and live in miserable barracks or the tent, while women toil in the fields. In America, millions of working men own homes, commodious and beautiful, blessed with home love, wife and children. Unto children is given the best of educational facilities. And they may grow up the peers of any in the land. But our country is the world. And no other enemy so much threatens it as war.

WAR IS HELL HERE AND NOW.

Into it are thrust the best of youth and manhood. By it, millions are killed. But less merciful to the living, other millions are turned upon the earth maimed and crippled. Eyeless, earless, armless, legless, they suffer such misery that death would be a glad release. Let working men, who are its chief victims, strike against it! Let the pulpit denounce it, as by the voice of God. Let statesmen curb it by arbitration. And throttle it by a Court of Nations, a Parliament of Man, and the Federation of the world.

Signor. A. MAZZOLENI (Milan) sent the following communication on this section :—

Education is the greatest factor of civilization, and to it as to arbitration I give prominence in the practical realization of our programme.

"Suffer the little children to come unto me," said Christ, the greatest of Reformers and the Redeemer of peoples. It is in the early prime of their life that we must teach the young the love of mankind and the equality of men. We must teach them to look beyond the borders of their own country, to conceive the political family and see other countries deserving love and esteem—all competing towards a common aim; moral and material progress.

If education is good, good generations will be produced, if bad we shall have men unable to conceive the great ideals of life, and unable to struggle and endure the least sacrifice in order to attain them.

The consequence will be petty politics, intrigues, deceptions, half consciences, the absence of character.

The greatest efforts of the Peace Societies must then be towards improving education by giving it a more humane direction, from the primary schools to the highest institutions.

Peace Societies ought to encourage the publication of books and pamphlets having a pacific tendency, and their introduction into all schools, in order to correct the prejudices, errors, and sophistries of those who represent wars as necessary, useful, and moral (Paris Congress, 1889).

A moral revolution needs to be accomplished. So long as our gentlewomen take pride in their boys being dressed up as *soldiers*, and our fair ladies feel an attraction for the brilliant accoutrements of officers, the cause of Peace will meet with a great obstacle. So long as warlike exploits from remote antiquity to our own times hold a prominent place in literature and art, these, instead of being the hand-maidens of Peace and Love, will incite to bloody enterprises and national enmities.

Classicism, founded mostly on prejudices and ancient rivalries, national, social, or religious, is to be ranked as another obstacle to the triumph of the humanitarian idea, and must be with scientific courage put aside. It must no more form the basis of study in the higher schools.

As supporters of the principle "*Mens sana in corpore sano*," we advocate education based on culture both of the mind and the body. We appeal therefore in favour of bodily exercise in all its branches.

Labour and manly exercise, combined with the sentiments of liberty and duty and directed to the good ends of social equity, are the foundation of the greatness of a people.

A nation physically developed, and at the same time energetic in the attainment of its social ends, acquires such force as to stand against any violence and to be impervious to bad influences.

With stalwart men strong characters will follow, and when a whole generation will be strongly educated the territorial integrity of the country can be deemed ensured without the aid of permanent armies.

We must consider *our* life in its reality, not through a lens formed of

prejudices induced by an education based on conceptions at variance with modern ideas.

These ideas, as they cannot be imposed by law, must issue from education and be kept in full force by political liberty.

The matter of education is of vital importance to the future of nations, and requires to be kept in constant evidence.

SUGGESTION AS TO READING OF PAPERS.

Mr. WILLIAM POLLARD, of Manchester, said that a number of eminent men had come together from different countries who had scarcely any chance of speaking on the great subjects that were being discussed. The time was almost wholly occupied by the reading of papers. Besides that, a great deal of time might be saved by the use of print instead of verbal translations. All the delegates could read, and when a paper was read in French, if they could have a printed summary of it in English there would be no need for valuable time to be spent in translating it; and so with their French friends. He believed they would be able to spend their time together much more profitably if the Committee would consider his suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN: There is much truth in what you say; but there is nothing to prevent those who want to speak from asking for the opportunity. Nobody has been refused permission to speak when he has asked for it.

Mr. W. E. DARBY: I should like to add a word or two to what the Chairman has said. Of course the Committee will endeavour to meet the wishes of the Congress as far as possible; but I should like to point out that to-day has been very exceptional. I think that will at once commend itself to your thought. This morning we had a very large subject, which we had to crowd into three hours. The committee had received a great number of communications on that subject, which happens to be the popular subject on the programme. We in England can well understand that it should be so. It is the subject that English people, at any rate, are most interested in, and we felt what I think I stated on behalf of the Committee this morning, that if persons had gone to the trouble and labour of preparing papers, it was due to them they should be, in some form, as briefly as possible, submitted to the Congress. Therefore *précis* of the papers that had been submitted were read, which consumed a great deal of time. So I ask the members of the Congress kindly to remember that to-day's work has on that account been thoroughly exceptional. During the remainder of the week we shall take up special questions that are more or less of a technical character, and I do not think the difficulty will occur again that has occurred to-day. Meanwhile, as the Chairman has said, the Bureau will endeavour to do all it can. There is an old Latin saying that "We cannot all do everything." I think in actual practice we find that we cannot do even what we would like to do; but so far as we can we will carry out the very excellent suggestion of our friend for which we thank him.

THANKS TO THE CHAIRMAN.

Mr. HODGSON PRATT: I think we should offer to M. Frédéric. Passy, to this distinguished apostle of peace in France, a hearty vote of thanks for having honoured us by presiding over this meeting to-day. There may be some here who have no idea of the devotion of many years, of the high intelligence and high moral character on the part of M. Passy, and which have been brought by him to this great cause. During the debates on the Tonquin war he went contrary to the feeling of the majority of the Chamber, and it was often difficult for him to gain a hearing; but he showed no flinching whatever, upholding eternal

principles of right and justice amidst the opposition which he then encountered. Since that time, owing greatly to his teaching through the Press and by his lips, there has been a very great change of feeling in France, and for the last two years M. Passy has been listened to with greater attention, and greater and greater applause by his countrymen. That is an indirect proof, I think, of two things—of the great strength of the Peace movement in France, and of the great influence which M. Passy has obtained by his honest, his enlightened, and his courageous attitude.

A la fin de la séance M. Hodgson Pratt a demandé à tous les congressistes présents de voter des remerciements chaleureux à M. Frédéric Passy pour l'honneur qu'il avait bien voulu leur faire en acceptant d'occuper le fauteuil présidentiel.

“ Il y en a, peut-être, beaucoup parmi nous, a dit l'orateur, qui ignorent jusqu'à quel point M. Frédéric Passy a consacré son intelligence et apporté la puissance de sa grande autorité morale à la cause que nous défendons. Pendant les débats qui eurent lieu au Parlement français au sujet de la guerre du Tonkin, il n'a jamais hésité, malgré son isolement, à soutenir les grands principes de droit et de justice, que malheureusement ses collègues ne semblaient pas disposés à entendre.

Depuis cette époque grâce aux écrits et aux paroles de M. Frédéric Passy, un grand changement est survenu en France sous le rapport des idées : en ce moment notre président est écouté avec une attention sans cesse croissante, et ses compatriotes ne lui ménagent plus leurs applaudissements. Ceci prouve indirectement deux choses, d'abord la force du mouvement en faveur de la Paix en France, et ensuite la grande influence exercée par M. Passy, grâce à son honnêteté, à son talent et à sa conduite courageuse.

Mr. CHARLES THOMPSON, in seconding the resolution, said that M. Passy's name was becoming very popular in England as the apostle of peace in France, and they were all very glad to make his acquaintance.

The resolution having been carried with acclamation, and acknowledged by the CHAIRMAN, the session closed.

TUESDAY EVENING, 15TH JULY.

BANQUET AT THE NATIONAL LIBERAL CLUB.

In the evening, Mr. J. PASSMORE EDWARDS, the proprietor of the *Echo* newspaper entertained the foreign Delegates and some of the English visitors at dinner at the National Liberal Club.

Mr. EDWARDS, after proposing the health of the "Queen," which was enthusiastically received, introduced the toast of the "Universal Peace Congress," saying :—

I have to propose the toast of the "Congress" (a voice : "The Congress of the United States"). Dr. Grammer, filled with enthusiasm for his country says, "The Congress of the United States," but the Congress of the United States is one thing, the Congress in England is another thing, and the Congress of the World is a greater assemblage still. Our object is not the elevation of an individual nation, but the elevation of humanity. The late Chevalier Bunsen, who represented Prussia in this country, once stated that this is an age of Associations. I should rather call it an age of Congresses. We have artistic Congresses, we have scientific Congresses, we have humanitarian Congresses, and here we have another Congress. I have been in conversation with your President, the Hon. D. D. Field, during the last few minutes, and I asked him which country was having the greatest influence on human destiny—whether it was England or America. We were not able to decide this point, but this I do know, that American ideas and American influences are to a great extent moulding our life in England. In 1848 there was started the idea of a Peace Congress by Henry Richard. That noblest of Englishmen, Richard Cobden, responded to the idea, and it was decided that we should hold the Congress in the first place at Paris. But it had its inspiration from America. I am not sure, therefore, whether England or America is dominating the world at the present time to the greater extent. Since then, we have had many Congresses—I am not going over the list—and now to-day, in London, we have the Universal Peace Congress. We have had great facts in this world of ours—Babylonia was a great fact, Greece was a great fact, Rome was a great fact, America is a great fact, but England is a greater fact than all. I do not say that from any egotism, but it is the glorious position of England in the world, our language, our literature, our law, our constitutional system, and our Colonies which make England a greater fact than these. To me it seems that the English language is one of the greatest factors in the civilization and the redemption of the world. I believe that this language of ours will in the course of ages be the language of universal mankind (a voice "Good"). Good, says Dr. Grammer, good, because it is great. In every quarter of the globe, wherever the ocean washes the shore, wherever a ship sails o'er the sea, the English language becomes a factor in the civilization of mankind. And if England, by its geographical position, its language, its magnificent daughters, is thus placed in a position of eminence, it is to England that I look for the realization of the great programme of this Congress, the idea of universal brotherhood. This Congress is held to celebrate and consummate this idea, and therefore I have the greatest pleasure in proposing this toast, associating with it the names of the Hon. D. D. Field, M. Frederic Passy, and Don Arturo di Marcoartu.

After paying graceful compliments to each of these gentlemen, Mr. Edwards concluded his eloquent speech thus :—

“ Can we appreciate at the present day how we stand ? I fear not, for if we did we should see unfolded before the nations of this earth a more magnificent future than Dante ever dreamed of or Milton ever sung. Peace is a possibility. Don't tell me that it is impossible. Nothing is impossible but what is falling and doomed. The dream of to-day may become the reality of the future. I beg to propose the toast of the Universal Peace Congress.

The Hon. DAVID DUDLEY FIELD, as President of the Congress, was the first to respond. He said they were fighting the battle of the human race. People laughed at them. Did they ? Well they did at the beginning, and if he might judge from what he heard and saw, they were inclined to rather laugh at them now, but he told them they were counting big numbers in the minority. If they could not claim on their side the majority of thinking people—that was of the people who made themselves heard in literature and the papers—he was sure they had the sympathy of the immense mass, the armies of working men throughout the world. They felt the burden of conscription and taxation, and they would help on the peace movement among nations until victory was attained. Let them not be discouraged because men sneered and derided. Was ever any great cause carried yet which was not thought to be visionary at the beginning ? They were aiming at a good thing. They might not get it themselves, but in the long procession of ages what did it matter to them whether they, or their children, or their grandchildren had it ? It would come at last, of this they might be sure. No cause could fail which had for its motto, and emblazoned on its banners, the words, “ The fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.”

M. FRED. PASSY, ex-member of the *Chambre des Députés*, responded for France, and DON ARTURO DI MARCOARTU for Spain. Other toasts followed, including, “ Our foreign guests,” for whom Mr. JAMES WOOD, of New York, and Chevalier VLADIMIR DE BOLESTA-KOZLOWSKI, of Austria, responded, Mr. Wood saying that the Peace Congress was appropriately held in London as the heart of the world, and whatever affected the heart affected the whole extremities of the body.

The toast of the Press was responded to by M. AUGUSTE DESMOULINS for France, and Signor E. T. MONETA, Editor of *Il Secolo*, for Italy.

“ The Health of the Host ” was proposed by Mr. JAMES WOOD, supported by Mr. THOMAS SNAPE, C.C., of Liverpool, and the toast was most cordially received.

Mr. EDWARDS said he hoped that gathering would be the first of a series of similar meetings all the world over. Frequently foreigners came to London and saw the outside only and returned to their native countries without being brought into contact with the people. The same remark applied to other cities. He should like to see Welcome Committees formed in every capital so that men of mark when they visited foreign countries might be invited to mingle at social meetings with some of the leading minds of each capital. A Welcome Committee

in London would give opportunities for Englishmen to show hospitality to foreign visitors, and when Englishmen went abroad, such hospitality would be repaid with interest. A network of Welcome Committees might be formed with comparative ease and thus a new agency would be put in motion for promoting better understanding and kindly international sentiments. Such committees multiplied throughout the world would give a new impulse to civilisation and furnish additional guarantees for peace.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, 16TH JULY.

The subject of consideration at the Wednesday Morning Session was

SECTION F.

"NATIONAL CONTROL OVER DECLARATION OF WAR."

The PRESIDENT of the Congress having declared the Session open, Mr. W. E. DARBY read the minutes of the previous meeting which were confirmed.

The PRESIDENT : Ladies and Gentlemen, — The question of National Control over Declaration of War is not one into which I can enter, because it is settled with us in America. We should no more think of allowing our President to declare war than we should think of allowing him to declare the country submitted to an Emperor. The control over war is not in the hands of the Executive, I think, in any part of the two American Continents. I am not quite sure as to some of the South American Republics, but in our own it is Congress only that can declare war. The discussion, however, is of great interest to all Europeans, because, with perhaps the exception of France and Switzerland, I do not know of any Government in Europe which does not vest in the Sovereign the power to declare war. Now whether that should or should not be so, or, rather, whether you should not do all you can to influence public opinion to bring about a change, if change is needed, is the question for this morning.

M. le Président a commencé par déclarer que le problème soumis à l'assemblée était de ceux qu'il pouvait traiter avec impartialité, puisque les Américains dont il était le délégué l'avaient résolu depuis longtemps.

"Nous ne pensons pas plus, a-t-il dit, à accorder à notre Président le droit de déclarer la guerre, que nous ne lui reconnaissons celui de soumettre notre pays à un empereur. Le contrôle pour les déclarations de guerre n'est, nulle part, je crois, entre les mains du pouvoir exécutif sur les deux continents américains. Je ne l'affirmerais pas avec une certitude absolue pour toutes les Républiques de l'Amérique du Sud, mais dans la nôtre, c'est le Congrès seul qui peut déclarer la guerre. La discussion, cependant, intéresse au plus haut point les Européens, parce que, en dehors de la France et de la Suisse, je ne connais aucun gouvernement de l'ancien Continent qui ne confie au chef de l'État le pouvoir de déclarer la guerre. Le devoir des membres du Congrès est d'essayer de tout leur pouvoir d'amener un changement complet dans l'opinion publique, sous ce rapport."

The Committee submits the following resolution, namely :—

That there should be instituted in connection with the Government of each nation a Juridical Court upon the following bases :—

1. *There shall be established in connection with such Government a Juridical Court for examining and judging the justice of causes of war. All the documents relating to the International dispute shall be communicated to it by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.*
2. *The Executive Power shall neither be able to declare a war nor to announce the commencement of hostilities until the Juridical*

Court has been seized of the question, and has given its considered judgment affirming the justice of the case of war.

3. *Before any hostilities are commenced, the considered judgment of the Juridical Court—with a summons requiring reparation of, or satisfaction for, the wrong committed, as stated in the said judgment—shall be notified by embassy to the offending nation and be communicated to the other nations and their inhabitants; and the offending nation shall only be proceeded against in case of its public refusal to make such reparation. †*

In proposing this resolution Mr. W. MARTIN WOOD read a paper on

DECLARATION OF WAR.

The following notes and queries on the question—Is a Declaration of War Obligatory on Civilised Nations? are offered as tentative and suggestive, rather than by way of consecutive argument or conclusive propositions.

It is a matter of surprise that such a question should be necessary; but so it is. Of late years some writers on International Law, including Professors and other publicists, have seemed to make it an object of anxious care to dispute the necessity of any formal and authoritative proclamation to the effect that, war having been resolved upon by the Sovereign executive of any nation, the securities and immunities of peace are suspended, so far as the two belligerent nations and their subjects are concerned.

As one example of the laxity of counsel and limpness of argument regarding this—one of the foremost institutions of the Law of Nations—Professor W. E. Hall may be cited. In his *Treatise on International Law*, Part III., Chap. I., p. 342, *et seq.*, he struggles against the consensus amongst leading jurists regarding the necessity and duty of making formal declaration of war before hostilities commenced. He is, of course, far too well read and too impartial a writer not to admit that such consensus has obtained amongst all the principal authorities; so that his pages and footnotes bristle with references to Vattel, Pufendorf, and later followers of the ever-to-be-revered Grotius on this vital topic. Yet under the influence, apparently, of what we must consider as degenerate modern sentiments that have overlaid this great question, the Professor struggles against settled juridical axioms, and seeks to palliate their evasion by temporising politicians and irresponsible executive agents. He indirectly endeavours to lessen respect for those axioms by suggesting that they rest mainly on tradition, and alludes to the “fecial example” of ancient Rome as if it were some worn out superstition. He also relies, as do many other modern apologists for the anarchy that has gradually crept into this branch of the Law of Nations, in the numerous instances—several of which he industriously sets out—of disregard of the duty of issuing Declarations of War; as if the inherent force of a law or primary juridical principle were in any sense vitiated by its transgression, or by the notorious neglect of those whose duty it was to obey and carry out such principle. It will be found that similar weak and vicious evasion of the points at issue pervade the apologies of many writers and politicians who are more or less responsible for the reactionary policy and precepts that have come into vogue during the last half century, and more especially during the last decade or two. But Professor Hall retains sufficient of the juridical spirit to compel him to admit that, at least, all the old and established authorities are unanimous in affirming and vindicating this invaluable restraint on lawless strife, this safeguard against rapacity and bloodshed. Incidentally he mentions that Grotius puts the argument on behalf of Declarations, on the ground of a demand for reparation, coupled with notice of war in case of non-compliance with some duly authorised and formulated demands. This, as we may subsequently try to show, is a very imperfect statement of the bases on which the great jurist and his followers found themselves.

He draws a distinction between a manifesto and a declaration, and admits that for convenience of subjects of the declaring State, and the duty of neutrals, a manifesto or notice should be given; and adds—“the moment at which war begins is fixed, as between belligerents, by direct notice given by one to the other when such notice is given before any acts of hostility are done; and, when notice is not given, by the commission of the first act of hostility on the part of the belligerent who takes the initiative.”

† See page 188 for final resolution.

Here, in passing, reference may be made to Colonel Maurice's work on "Hostilities without Declaration of War." While the historical interest attaching to this compilation may be admitted, it cannot be accepted as any argument on the question of whether formal and duly authorised Declarations are obligatory or not. The very occasion of this work, prepared at the instance of the Intelligence Department of the War Office, affords a striking illustration of the confusion of thought amongst public men, and the condition of illegality into which we have drifted. The glaring instance of the bombardment of Alexandria under the orders of executive officials, the origin of which it is even yet almost impossible to trace; and the subsequent atrocities in the Soudan, directed by military authorities apparently without any consultation with the political executive officers, who are really responsible, had shocked the sleeping conscience of the more thoughtful portion of the public. It appeared to be thought by the departmental actors in these outrages that censure might be blunted and some quasi-condonation obtained by citation of a score or two of instances when hostilities have been entered upon without any public announcement or justification made out beforehand. It is difficult to find terms in which sufficiently to condemn the audacity of such a superficial plea. Never yet was it known that the multiplicity of transgressions could make law of none effect. The unjust judge may disgrace himself, but not the tribunal; wrong and rapine may ravage the earth, but Justice reigns supreme, and mankind will ever own fealty to her dictates. "Let them throw millions of cases on us" of instances of public law defied and legal restraints neglected, there yet remains appeal to that law and to those restraints. So that while Colonel Maurice's work may serve its turn as a record of transgressions and a symptom of degeneracy amongst statesmen and politicians of the modern world, it only renders more urgent the need to rouse the public conscience in this regard, and to restore the sense of responsibility amongst those executive authorities who have power to "let slip the dogs of war" without restraint from those whose resources are squandered, whose lives are destroyed, and whose country may be disgraced.

To American jurists (as abundantly shown in the letters of "Historiens," and by other witnesses) belongs the honour of having vindicated many of the leading principles of International Law which had been transgressed or neglected by European statesmen and executive authorities. And yet the dry rot that has encroached on that branch of the Law of Nations we are considering, seems to have found entrance amongst transatlantic jurists. At least we infer this from the loose way in which it is treated in Professor G. B. Davies's *Outlines of International Law* (p. 292), which is, we believe, used as a text book or "coach" in many of the United States colleges. His line of apology for the disuse of Declarations of War is one of the sort that is readily accepted by "The Man in the Street." As the Professor puts it, such Declarations are not now necessary, because the means of publicity are so facile and prompt that all parties concerned have time to order themselves accordingly: then, as to formal notice, the suspension of diplomatic intercourse is sufficient notification. But Professor Davies does admit that States making war are bound to give notice to their own subjects and to neutrals, so that they may avoid attack or capture. These methods it will be seen merely touch the surface of the subject, and go without saying.

If digression may be permitted for a moment there is a passage in Professor Davies's work that refers to another subject which may be noted here. He points out that violation of any sovereign right is just cause for war, because there is no other settled method of redress as between nations; but the responsible authorities are bound to consider whether such violation is sufficient to warrant the risks and losses of war. This is supported by an eloquent passage from Mackintosh in which he enforces the responsibility of rulers who, in even a just cause, make war without considering whether the losses and suffering that will result from hostilities may not outweigh the injury received or threatened.

Let us now turn to British jurists for the accepted and settled doctrine on this subject. In the *Students' Blackstone* (by R. M. Kerr, LL.D.), at p. 61, on the Royal Prerogative, we find this passage:—

"It is also the prerogative of the Crown to make treaties and alliances with foreign States. For it is essential to the goodness of a league, that it may be made by the sovereign power, and then it is binding upon the whole community. * * * * Upon the same principle also the sole prerogative of making war and peace is vested in the Crown. For the right of making war, which by nature subsisted in every individual, is given up by all private persons that enter into society, and is vested in the sovereign power. Whatever hostilities, therefore, may be committed by private citizens the State is not affected thereby, * * * such * * * (are) properly

treated like pirates and robbers. And the reason why a Denunciation of War ought always to precede the actual commencement of hostilities, is not so much that the enemy may be put upon his guard (which is matter rather of magnanimity than right), but that it may be certainly clear that the war is not undertaken by private persons, but by the community. Wherever the right resides of beginning a war, there also must reside the right of ending it, or the power of making peace."

The matter is more concisely stated in Stephen's Commentaries, Vol. II., p. 520, thus:—"Accordingly with us in England in order to make a war completely effectual it is necessary that it be publicly declared and duly proclaimed by the sovereign authority: and then all parts of both the contending nations from the highest to the lowest are bound by it."

These authorities should suffice to prove that it is part of the ancient and settled constitutional practice of Great Britain that before hostilities commence—and, by inference, we might say before diplomatic intercourse is broken off—it is essential that there must be a "Denunciation of War" and a public declaration of an intention of resort to arms, it being implied that the reasons for this step are comprised in such declaration. This course is prescribed by our jurists, from Blackstone forwards, as being necessary to give the solemn sanction of the community to the capture of the enemy's property and the destruction of his armed forces: so that without such sanction those who enter on hostilities are outside the law and should be treated as pirates and robbers, the enemies of mankind. And this applies alike to those who perpetrate, as to those who permit warlike operations; to our military officers who invade others' territory, to naval commanders who bombard foreign ports, or to Ministers or heads of departments who may have permitted or condoned such lawless proceedings. This must apply just the same when they happen to be "weaker nations," or people whom we style barbarous that are attacked, as if it were some European nations which may have more chance of resenting the injury or enforcing redress.

It will be observed that the succinct statements of the law just quoted do not include, or even imply, any assertion of principle underlying the dictum beyond that of ample publicity being the one essential requirement. But how much is comprised in that! The cause must be stated in clear and concise terms, so that all men may know that the claim put forward is one that is essentially just, that the wrong suffered is so certain and weighty that the whole power and resources of the community should be engaged for its redress. Moreover, it is the avowed object of such public proclamation that the nation against which our authorities invoke the "last argument of kings" the dire and destructive process of war, may have one more opportunity to undo the alleged wrong, to offer redress for the injuries we may have received. We need not stop to enquire how many of the destructive wars of the last hundred years—to say nothing of our own attacks on semi-barbarous nations where we could have things very much our own way—would have been averted, if the deliberate consideration, the public appeal, and solemn judicial formality, all of which are comprised under the full conception of Declaration before Hostilities had been duly followed according to law and the Constitution.

Emerson, speaking of the English and their "passion for utility," says "They are impious in their scepticism of theory, and in their high departments they are cramped and sterile." Some might apply this criticism alike to the "sterile" statement of the jurists just cited, also to the "cramped" and low utilitarian excuses and explanations given by Professor Hall and our modern publicists for disuse of Proclamation of War and neglect of the high juridical principles comprised in that course of procedure. Possibly there might be found amongst British writers on International Law luminous exceptions whose utterances on this subject would be as large and comprehensive as those of Continental or American jurists. We have already referred to Mackintosh, and in this appeal that I am making from modern professors, with their scepticism and deference to mere usage, to their predecessors and exemplars, it is appropriate to quote a sentence from one of Mackintosh's contemporaries, Francis Horner. It is taken as the motto for Professor Lawrence's lectures, entitled *Some Disputed Questions of International Law*, which, by the way, is well worthy of notice, if only for the effective vindication it contains of the character and genius of Grotius. Horner's suggestive remark is as follows:—"So many encroachments have recently been made on the ancient cause and maxim of the law of nations that the primary object of importance now is to re-inspire a deference to solemn precedent and established rules." As to encroachments, it is difficult to imagine what this thoughtful jurist would have said if he could have foreseen how publicists of later decades would extend their reactionary methods to the verge of subversion of "the ancient cause and maxim of the law of nations," more especially

in that branch of it with which we are now concerned. How to re-inspire a just deference to these solemn precedents it is not for me to say ; but I trust that one or other of the rising jurists of the day may take up that noble task. For the present there does not seem much to be hoped for amongst our English publicists, and we must try to pique them into a new departure by an appeal to Continental writers. Yet we need not despair of England ; and I take the opportunity of referring to light on this subject arising in an unexpected quarter, that is the centre of military thought and traditions, "The United Service Institute," where the walls bristle with lethal weapons.

In April, 1887, a paper was laid before that body (Lord Thring presiding) by Captain John Ross of Bladensberg, an officer of the Coldstream Guards, entitled "Belligerent Rights; and What is Lawful in War-time." Only a small portion of this, in many respects remarkable essay, dealt with our present subject ; but Captain Ross's utterance on it was complete and emphatic as one quotation will show:—He states "As a fundamental principle that war is a solemn act which the people must only allow to be undertaken *after the cause for which it is proposed has been made known, has been considered with due dispassionate deliberation, and has been proved to be just.* It is the blind drift towards war that needs to be restrained." Here in those three propositions is a text for the rising jurists whose aid has already been invoked. One of the excuses to which we have referred as put forward by superficial objectors to Declarations, namely, that in these days "wars are begun with great facility," is taken up by Captain Ross and urged as one of the strongest reasons why publicists should insist on prompt, formal deliberation and public responsible decision *before* hostilities can be entered upon. On every ground—including those of humanity, of the people's control over the Executive, and of justice—it is not less, but far more needful that precautions should be taken lest the nation's hands be forced, and all its resources staked on the hazard of war by its commanders or Executive officers, into whose hands modern science has put so many facilities for sudden, and it may be irreparable mischief. So surely as mind must maintain its supremacy over matter, so determinedly must law and reason maintain their control over impulse and irresponsible personal action. As to the method of securing this rational control—a branch of our subject yet to be considered—Captain Ross urges that decisions involving "the terrible and ghastly results of War" (his own words) shall be the act of some National Court uninfluenced by the strife of parties, before which any dispute with an opposing nation shall be thoroughly examined, and the justice of the case for which, after due deliberation, war may be declared, has been clearly established.

Thus, we have at least one English authority on the side of our contention, that not only should hostilities be preceded by public proclamation, which shall comprise justification of the war ; but that such declaration shall be the outcome and final result of full information, and careful dispassionate deliberation by prescribed responsible authorities. But in order to do something towards restoring that "deference to solemn precedents and established rules," which Horner demanded fifty years ago, its seems necessary to take some new departure and approach the subject from other than our insular and traditional standpoint. For this procedure I am happy to say that (apart from other Continental authorities) ample material is provided in a little work of large design by the Abbé M. P. Defourny in his *La Déclaration de Guerre, Projet de Loi* (Paris, Retaux-Bray, 1887). In this essay he finds himself on broad foundations and on ancient precedent, from which this self-complacent modern generation has much to learn ; but in this he only follows Vattel and other medieval writers who revived respect for Public Law. He appeals to the *Fœcial* College of Ancient Rome, an institution which exhibited alike the intellectual vigour and the sense of moral rectitude which characterised that people before their Leaders, Generals, and Consuls had been corrupted by conquest and carnage. The twenty *Fœcials* who were chosen from the most experienced and trustworthy citizens were also designated "Preservers of the Peace," or "Justices of the Peace," names which Plutarch used in describing their office as that of seeking peace and justice. They were chosen for life, so that they should be secure from partisanship and miswayed by the factions of the time. Vacancies by death were filled up by the vote of surviving members, thus further ensuring their independence of the Military or Executive authorities. Members might concurrently fulfil the duties of other civic, but no military offices. The procedure, to state it very briefly, was on this wise : when cause of dispute arose the *Fœcials* deputed a group of their members who proceeded to the State against which the Romans had complaint (or who had complaints against them). After crossing the frontier the nature of their errand was stated to such of the inhabitants whom they might meet, who then conducted

them to the capital or other seat of Government ; the *Fecials* repeated their message at the gate, and then went into the forum or other open public assembly, where everyone could become aware of their complaint, argument, and demand ; the leader and spokesman was always a *Pater patratus* (i.e., a citizen, whose father was still living, and was himself a father, thus embodying the past and future of his country) ; he was clad in a robe adorned with symbols of peace ; he always began with an invocation to " God, the Father of Life," adding " May Eternal Justice hear me." His message was usually couched in three formulas asking for restitution of persons, cattle, or goods wrongly taken ; punishment of the guilty persons (presumably by their own Government) ; or reparation of any alleged wrong or breach of treaty. Here it should be said that the treaty making power was also vested in the *Fecials*. After delivering their message, and making their demands, the proceedings terminated with an appeal to heaven, and that is peculiarly significant of the high ground on which the institution rested, thus :—" If against equity and right I make these demands for redress, forbid me (ye heavenly powers) ever again to behold my country." The Embassy then (if it were found needful) took up their abode in the foreign city for the space of one month, during which the authorities of the alleged offending state might decide how far they would meet the demands made on behalf of the Romans. If redress were then refused the Embassy made a public accusation that the State in default was unjust, and refuses to do right ; adding that they should report to the Roman Senators, so that they might consider how justice could be obtained. On their return to Rome the *Fecials* (probably the whole body as well as the Embassy) reported, confirming their finding with solemn oaths to the effect that they had followed strictly the ordained prescribed forms. To complete the statement of *Fecial* procedure—though we here leave for the moment an all-important gap—if and when the Senate decreed war, the Embassy went again to the adverse State and made this formal declaration in the hearing of the people by the mouth of the *Pater patratus*, " Since this nation has violated the laws in regard to the Roman people, and since in consequence our Senate and people have so decided, I declare war, I and the Roman people, and I make it against you." Thereupon he cast a javelin into the soil, signifying that the offending State was henceforth hostile ground, and all its people and goods confiscate to the accusing State.

The gap, or interval, that followed between the accusation and the final declaration of hostility, just described, relates to the most important distinction between this open impartial proceeding in the earlier world, and the secretive, irresponsible action of modern Governments in these days of sophisticated degenerate international polity. It will be observed that the whole object and proceeding of the *Fecials*—raised, as they were, by their eminent judicial position, above all party passions, even over Nationalism itself, though retaining their pure patriotic sentiments—was directed to examination of the causes of dispute, and setting them forth before the foreign State in the light of day, and subject to the judgment of all men. It was only after the *Fecials* had fully considered the subject matter of the quarrel, and had themselves come to a judgment on the merits of the case, that the issue was placed before the Senate and the people, who then had to decide whether the wrong that Roman citizens had received, or the claim that Rome was making, was sufficiently weighty to warrant them in resorting to the arbitrament of war. Just observe how entirely separate, but in proper sequence, were the two wholly dissimilar functions of judicial deliberation and executive action.

It is difficult to set out in adequate terms the contrast that this presents to our modern system. With us we have unrecorded *pour parlors*, between diplomatists, secret correspondence conducted by officials, in whose own hands lie the power of eventually committing the country to war before any appeal to Parliament or the public is made ; all these fateful proceedings resolutely kept back from the nation whose good name and fortune are at the mercy of these secret, and, therefore, irresponsible agents, until territory shall have been pledged, treaties, possibly involving interminable obligations made, or all the materials piled up for the conflagration of war, waiting only the torch to fire it, comprised in the tardy announcement by executive officers, or perchance the despatch of an expedition equipped for bombardment or invasion. In these circumstances, it is then far too late for deliberation or remonstrance within the nation itself. Those with whom " loyalty " is a form of morbid, unreasoning compliance, or blind consent to support their party leaders, throw their weight into the scale, and thus the country and its enemy alike are involved in a catastrophe which it may take half a century to repair.

Compare with this saturnalia of our modern diplomatic and departmental

rivalry of ambitions, and the passions of irresponsible, though officially protected, politicians, the calm, dignified, humane, and rational proceeding of ancient Rome, as characterised by two or three authorities, for citation from whom I am mainly indebted to the Abbe Defourny's invaluable essay. These testimonies of modern writers are backed by references to Varro, Cicero, and Plutarch. Vattel thus summarises the effect and bearing of the Roman proceedings :—

"The nation or its ruler, having not only to observe justice in all proceedings, but also to regulate them constantly by the welfare of the State, honest and praiseworthy motives must concur with the justificatory reasons to induce him to undertake a war. These reasons show that the Sovereign is within his right in taking up arms; that he has a just cause; honest motives show that it is expedient, that it is suitable, in the case in hand, to make use of his right: these refer to prudence, while the justificatory reasons belong to justice."

Bossuet, in his eloquent fashion, thus restores to our perception the grandeur and wisdom of the ancient institution :—

"What is there more beautiful, more holy, than the College of the Fecials? This Council was established to judge if a war was just. Before the Senate could propose, or the People decree it, this examination into its equity always took place. When the justice of the war was recognised, the Senate took measures to undertake it. But it was accounted a duty above all to ask back in due forms from the aggressor things unjustly taken, and they came to extremities only after having exhausted the paths of moderation.

"A holy institution if there ever was one, and which should cover Christians with shame."

There remains a modern witness to whose intelligent research in this direction we ought ere this to have drawn attention—that is, the Professor of the Faculty of Law in the College of Dijon, Mons. A. Weiss, whose complete treatise on this subject should be studied. It is entitled "*Le Droit fécial et les Féciaux à Rome*" (Paris: Durand et Pedone, 1883). Doctor Weiss thus writes :—

"It is not uninteresting, at a moment when Europe is multiplying its armaments and its means of destruction, to show, by the study of the formalities and of the guarantees, which at Rome surrounded the declaration of war, and the conclusion of treaties, that this people had conceived of the Law of Nations an idea more pure and refined than we could have expected from the state of its civility. More than one modern nation might envy those times, which we call barbarous, an institution so wise, so moral, as was under the Roman Republic the College of Fecials, that respected tribunal which, according to Varro, presided over the loyalty of international relations."

Now remains the practical question, how under modern forms can the principles of this ancient institution be restored? The Abbé Defourny, on behalf of France, provides the answer in the shape of a draft law, which is so short that it may be quoted here, and this is the more desirable as it supplies a conspectus alike of theory and procedure :—

"There shall be instituted by the side of the French Government a Grand Council of the Law of Nations, acting in the same manner as a High Court of Law, for the examination and judging of the justice of causes of war. Despatches, reports, correspondence, and generally all documents relating to international conflicts shall be communicated to it by the Foreign Office.

"Article 2. The President of the Republic is judge, with Parliament, of State reasons, in the matter of a war to be undertaken, and he disposes of the armed force against other nations with the assent of the Chambers. But the President shall not be able to ask for this assent, nor the Parliament be able to give it, and neither the one nor the other shall be able to decree a war, without the Grand Council of the Law of Nations having previously been put in possession of the matter, and without the Council assembled as a High Court having given its judgment with reasons establishing the justice of the *casus belli*.

"Article 3. Neither before nor after the assent of the Chambers shall the President of the Republic be able to proclaim war, nor the Ministers be able to order any act of hostility whatsoever against a foreign nation, or tribe, before having declared to it the *casus belli*—that is to say, having notified to it by embassy the judgment, accompanied by reasons, of the Grand Council, and having called upon it to repair the injury committed against the French nation described in the said judgment, and having certain knowledge of its refusal to do justice.

"Article 4. In case of a declaration and proclamation of war at the same time that the order to commence hostilities is transmitted, the judgment of the High Court, or

summary declaration of the just causes of the war, extracted from the said judgment, shall be publicly read at the head of each squadron and battalion of the French armies, and placarded in all the communes of France."

As to our United Kingdom, the programme of this Congress raises the question whether that "organisation of responsible and permanent functionaries, to consider and report on any international dispute," which is one of the special needs of our time, cannot be founded upon the existing institution of the Privy Council, or that some such "permanent and independent body" should be created by Statute. There is much to be said for either course, but is it not better to stand in the old ways, and restore the Privy Council to its ancient functions of giving personal and responsible advice to the Sovereign in all matters of International relations? It is true, the Council, as a whole, has become a sort of medley of unattached politicians and hereditary dignitaries, many of whom are more ornamental than useful; but it also comprises most of the experienced Statesmen and judicial authorities of the day, many of whom, though withdrawn from active life, retain their intellectual vigour, and are ripe with the experience that comes with "the years that bring the philosophic mind." Here, then, we have ample material from which could be formed within the elastic roll of the Privy Council itself, the very ideal of such an institution as the Law of Nations demands, for its clear and independent exercise and application.

The members of this Council or High Court of International Causes, solemnly invested with the highest responsibilities that pertain to the juridical attributes of sovereign authority, far removed from partisan bias, and free from the anxieties that beset executive politicians, having power to obtain evidence of all the facts relating to any cause at issue between their own and other nations, would be enabled to pronounce clear and impartial judgment, and would commend itself to the common sense of most, and command the homage alike of friend or foe. If such High Council of juridical authorities should find and decide that the true interests of the Empire, or that national honour and sense of justice—which is the soul of the State—say on behalf of weaker races under its protection, or in virtue of some pledge given to a confiding ally—demanded that the terrible sacrifices of war should be incurred, then the national conscience would be clear. But, even then, the time for final declaration of war would not have come. There would remain, as described in Art. 3 of the draft law cited above, all the procedure of the Parliamentary and executive functionaries in formal demand for reparation for the wrong done or threatened, with ample time allowed for the aggressive or defaulting nation to make reparation. Only in the event of that, or offers of compromise, being finally refused—a result scarcely possible in the face of such impartial and unimpassioned judgment of the Juridical Court or Council as above described—would the irrevocable Proclamation of War be issued, such solemn document comprising a concise but complete exposition of the justice of the cause. Is it to be admitted that in these modern days international rivalries are too strong, that the spirit of aggression and over-reaching is too eager to permit of the voice of wisdom being listened to: or that, after all these centuries of civilisation, this two thousand years of Christian propaganda, the nations cannot exercise the virtue of restraint on behalf of what is just, honourable, and true? Before such humiliating confession is made, let us turn aside and take counsel of barbaric Rome in its pristine days of simplicity, piety, and moral grandeur. If this be too great a demand on modern pride, let us, at least, consider the example given by that simple, courageous soul which dwelt in Joan of Arc, who, before leading the armies of France in vindication of one of the noblest causes ever associated with war, addressed herself to the English commander, made an offer of peace on condition of justice being done and redress rendered for the miseries inflicted by the invaders on France. This appeal was addressed to the rank and file, "To you all, archers, nobles, free companions, and others," that they would "go away to their own country," as well as to the Duke of Bedford, whom "the Maid prays and entreats you not to work your own destruction": and not until this adjuration in the name of reason and all that was held sacred was rejected with abuse and scorn, again and again, did this inspired leader marshal the forces of France, and, as we know, "laid the proud usurper low," though she herself fell a noble sacrifice to the intrigues of faithless priests and paltering, ignoble politicians.

(1). Let us now briefly summarise our plea: British constitutional authorities insist that a public declaration of the causes and objects involved in any international dispute, shall precede the action of the Executive in taking hostile measures: and that hostilities, without such previous sanction, come under the class of piracy and brigandage, amenable to the penal municipal laws of all civilised peoples.

(2). Referring to Grotius, Vattel, and other masters of the Law of Nations,

such public proclamation of the occasion and objects of any war is essentially necessary (*a*) in order that the citizens of the attacking nation, may be themselves assured that their resources and the lives of their soldiers and sailors will only be sacrificed for a worthy cause, and not for selfish and unjust demands; (*b*) that the defendants or nations attacked may have full opportunity to state their case, to make reparation, to offer terms, or prepare for defence; (*c*) that neutrals may have time to minimise the loss they must suffer when two great nations, especially maritime states, are at war; (*d*) that the public opinion of mankind, the ultimate court of appeal, may have formal cognisance of the issues at stake, and be prepared to judge impartial and righteous judgment thereon.

(3). Though the obligation to issue formal declarations of war has in several instances been disregarded during the last fifty years or more, by England as much as by other nations, no sound reason has been given for such omission, but only plausible excuses, indicative of encroachments of executive authorities, also flaccidity of political fibre amongst publicists and other leaders of public opinion.

(4). Therefore, not only the advocates of peace, but citizens of all parties and countries are called upon to unite in demanding the full restoration of this essential part of the procedure under the Law of Nations as a safeguard of international justice, and a defence of the rights of citizens.

(5). The expedient of making the issue of a declaration of war depend on the vote of parliamentary assemblies is futile: (*a*) because the Executive being at the time the dominant party, can always count on a majority to support or condone its hostile action; (*b*) the debate preceding such vote would seldom be based on full information, there being no authority above the Executive to compel the production of all documents and State papers bearing on the points at issue.

(6). That independent, impartial, and responsible deliberation which should precede any Declaration of War or hostile acts can only be conducted by some permanent Council of State above the Executive of the day, as are all our Courts of Law (especially the Judicial Committee of H.M. Privy Council).

(7). The principles of such an institution, representing the highest juridical attributes and International functions of sovereignty are embodied, in almost ideal form, in the constitution and procedure of the Pæcial College of ancient Rome; and the materials for adaptation of these principles to modern conditions exist in the Privy Council of this United Kingdom, certain members of which body, as the independent but responsible assessors of the issues of Peace and War, should be organised as soon as demanded by the public voice.

M. l'ABBE DEFOURNY, in seconding the resolution, instead of reading the paper he had prepared, addressed the meeting in French, in order to save the time of the Congress. The paper itself was as follows:—

CONTRÔLE DE LA VOLONTÉ NATIONALE COMME CONDITION NÉCESSAIRE DE LA DÉCLARATION DE GUERRE.

I.—L'expression de la volonté nationale comme condition nécessaire à la déclaration de guerre.

II.—Moyens à prendre pour assurer ce résultat. (*a*) Est-il possible de créer une autorité permanente ayant puissance, avant toute dénonciation d'hostilités, d'instruire et de rapporter sur toute querelle qui viendrait à s'élever entre des gouvernements? (*b*) Comment constituer cette autorité? Quels seraient ses pouvoirs? Aurait-elle l'organisation du Conseil Privé d'Angleterre? Serait-ce un corps permanent et indépendant créé par les Parlements? (*c*) Quelles sont les difficultés que présente cette organisation, et comment y faire face?

L'institution proposée et soumise à vos délibérations, est à mon sentiment l'acte le plus salutaire et le seul actuellement efficace pour combattre sûrement le crime et le fléau de la guerre. Lorsqu'une Cour composée d'hommes respectables et intègres, aura rendu une sentence ou un avis,—mais il faudra que ce soit une sentence, nous le verrons,—une sentence publique, consciencieuse et motivée sur la justice d'une guerre, il sera très-difficile de la faire. Un Jurisconsulte qui n'a pas toujours raison peut-être, à émis cette proposition que personne d'entre vous ne contestera: Les causes d'une guerre doivent être *claires et évidentes*, et tellement, qu'elles puissent être reconnues pour telles par le monde entier: c'est pourquoi l'usage de tous les peuples exige qu'elles soient au préalable publiquement déclarées, c'est-à-dire énoncées. Si donc la magistrature proposée vient à être établie et à fonctionner dans chaque nation.

l'arbitrage que vous poursuivez sera obtenu plus aisément, non seulement pour les conflits secondaires, mais pour ceux qui menaceraient de devenir sanglants. Qui voudrait en effet assumer la responsabilité d'un e guerre à l'encontre de raisons juridiques claires et évidentes, et grâce au progrès matériel moderne, mises sous les yeux du monde entier par la presse qui reproduirait le jugement ? Ceux qui voudraient la guerre dans de telles conditions seraient moralement contraints de demander l'arrangement, et même physiquement amenés à le faire, de peur de rencontrer devant eux non pas seulement l'adversaire qui aurait clairement et évidemment raison, mais des alliés qui se joindraient à lui pour exercer la vindicte de la Loi éternelle violée. L'éducation morale au point de vue de la paix et de la guerre, second objet que vous réclamez, serait faite du même coup. Par la seule institution de cette magistrature, et la presse qui la publierait, les hommes de toutes les nations recouvreraient le sens du juste, et sauraient de nouveau ce que nos pères du Régime municipal inséraient dans des centaines de chartes et faisaient jurer à leurs seigneurs, souverains ou suzerains: Vous n'avez pas le droit de nous appeler à la guerre, sinon sous la pression d'une cause juste, et très-manifestement reconnue pour telle. *Nisi causa justa et manifestissima incumbente*. Un troisième objet que vous poursuivez est la rédaction, et surtout, n'est-ce pas ? l'adoption, d'une chose plus difficile, un Code commun du droit des Gens par toutes les nations. Vous l'aurez encore obtenu, cet objet, par l'institution de la magistrature proposée, et à cause des principes très simples sur lesquels elle motivera ses sentences, savoir, ce que vous appelez en Angleterre la *Common Law*, dont le droit des Gens fait partie. Le droit ou *Loi universelle* des nations, dit admirablement votre grand Juriste Lord Mansfield, doit avoir en Angleterre une portée aussi grande que partout ailleurs. "Il est réputé partie intégrante de la Loi anglaise elle-même." Et quelle est cette *Common Law*, l'honneur de ce pays, sinon la Loi éternelle, les préceptes du Decalogue sur l'effusion du sang humain, que nous avons eu le grand honneur d'exposer ici lundi dernier. C'est pour cela que vous aurez encore atteint un quatrième objet que vous poursuivez : l'éloignement de ces causes indirectes, ténébreuses, ou plutôt de ces prétextes fictifs d'effusion du sang, que le programme énumère: *préjugés, traditions vicieuses, fautes épousées, exagérations de la Presse, des Assemblées législatives, des réunions publiques, influence prétendue des droits protecteurs et des tarifs, etc., etc.* Tout cela fondra comme la neige aux rayons du soleil, je veux dire de la *Common Law*, lumineuse, sans ombre, accessible à tous, qui donne la sagesse même aux petits enfants. *Lex Domini immaculata, illuminans animas, sapientiam præstans parvulis*. Ah ! qui nous rendra la simplicité et la droiture, au tant que l'infirmité humaine les comporte ? Ce sera cette magistrature.

Ces considérations préliminaires émises, je vais en démontrer la vérité, en entrant dans le cœur du sujet.

En méditant sur ce texte du programme : l'expression de la volonté nationale comme condition nécessaire de la dénonciation des hostilités, je me suis demandé quelle en était la signification, ou plutôt la pensée qu'il recouvre. Car je ferais injure aux rédacteurs de leur supposer même un instant d'avoir eu la pensée qu'il suffit de la volonté nationale pour qu'une guerre soit juste ou licite. Toutes les volontés nationales de toutes les nations, c'est-à-dire de tous les hommes du monde, sont impuissantes à rendre juste ou licite une guerre qui serait criminelle. Telle n'a donc pu être l'idée de la rédaction. Ce qui était au fond de leur pensée ne peut-être que ceci. Les guerres de ce temps sont injustes et inutiles ; si l'on pouvait, de façon ou d'autre, rendre obligatoire l'expression de la volonté nationale préalablement à toute hostilité, nous y échapperions ; car il n'est pas possible que les habitants d'un pays, consultés ainsi se déclarent pour le crime et la ruine. Très-bien. Mais approfondissons la situation que cette pensée révèle.

Un des premiers préceptes de cette Loi éternelle brillant dans la conscience est celui qui défend d'ôter la vie à son semblable, de verser le sang humain sans juste cause et sans y être contraint par la nécessité. C'est un de ceux qui sont gravés le plus avant dans le cœur de l'homme. Comme aux jours antiques sur le front de Caïn, un signe de réprobation nous apparaît toujours marquant le front de l'homicide, du meurtrier privé

Mais s'il s'agit de guerre, c'est-à-dire de l'effusion du sang humain par torrents, les hommes d'à présent ne s'inquiètent plus de la juste cause. Ceux qui y prennent part ne songent plus à se demander si ces meurtres innombrables sont justifiés ou non, c'est-à-dire si les guerres, ou ce qu'on appelle de ce nom, sont justes ou iniques, légales ou illégales, licites ou criminelles ; si, en maniant le feu qui dévore les biens et l'arme qui détruit les vies humaines, ils violent ou non cette loi primordiale qui défend l'homicide et le meurtre, le pillage et l'incendie sans juste cause.

Leur conscience est muette là-dessus, elle est ténébreuse de ce côté, comme une lune tronquée à son déclin ou à l'état d'éclipse partielle. La guerre pour eux a cessé d'être un acte relevant de la morale. Ils n'ont pas d'autre joie, dans les fatigues et

les perils des camps, que celle d'être vainqueurs, pas d'autre tristesse que celle d'être vaincus. En un mot, ils tuent, pillent et brûlent sans conscience.

Ne m'objectez pas qu'ils servent leur pays. Il y a longtemps qu'un puissant génie vous a répondu par ces paroles devenues proverbiales : "Otez la justice, que sont les empires, sinon de grandes sociétés de brigands ? Et les compagnies de brigands ne sont-elles pas elles-mêmes de petits empires ? Les brigands aussi ont certaines lois ou conventions d'après lesquelles ils se régissent. Là aussi on se bat pour la conquête du butin et pour le point d'honneur de la bande."

Un membre de l'ancienne Chambre française, disait à la tribune il y a sept ans, le 31 Octobre, 1883 :

" Il s'est introduit en Europe une politique, que M. Thiers définissait la politique du *Prenez et je prendrai*. On peut la formuler encore ainsi : *Je vous donne ce que je n'ai pas, donnez-moi ce que vous n'avez pas*... Chacun prend son morceau : et ceux qui n'ont rien se préparent à prendre."

Et encore, dans la même séance, s'adressant au ministre des affaires étrangères, président du comité :

" L'occasion était bonne, dites-vous ?—Oui, l'occasion fait le *larrou*. Et moi j'estime... qu'une nation doit se conduire en honnête homme."

Voilà une belle parole, Messieurs : et je ne doute pas que vous partagiez tous l'avis de M. Clémenceau (car c'est lui qui l'a dite), et l'avis de M. Thiers, qui est l'avis de Saint Augustin.

A M. Clémenceau et à M. Thiers témoignant sur l'état de brigandage de l'Europe contemporaine, je n'offenserai personne en ajoutant le témoignage de Pie IX. Il écrivait, il y a treize ans, dans un Bref adressé à M. Lucien Brun et à plusieurs membres de l'Assemblée nationale : " La plupart des maux présents ont pour cause l'emploi pervers du pouvoir et des armées." Et il disait à un protestant qui le pressait dans une audience sur le même sujet : " Un chrétien doit se laisser tuer lui-même plutôt que de verser le sang sans juste cause."

Remarquez, Messieurs, cet accord, cette unanimité vraiment merveilleuse en ce temps de divisions et de discords multiples et profondes dans notre pays. C'est, pour me servir de certains termes à la mode, c'est la République conservatrice ayant pour organe M. Thiers, la République radicale par la bouche de M. Clémenceau, l'Église avec Pie IX, les monarchistes avec M. Lucien Brun et ses collègues, qui tiennent le même langage et disent en appliquant la maxime de Saint Augustin à l'Europe contemporaine : " Ce sont des nations de brigands."

Aussi, Messieurs, ma confiance est grande, en vous demandant d'adopter le principe de l'institution proposée, afin que les nations Européennes cessent d'être des nations de larrons, et les armées, des troupes de brigands et de pirates : je dois ajouter, et d'esclaves.

Où, dans ces conditions, les armées sont des troupeaux d'esclaves, esclaves d'un ou deux gouvernants, d'un ou deux ministres, qui disposent d'eux tyranniquement, sans autre garantie qu'une responsabilité purement nominale, nous le savons. Pour le dire en passant, ces deux ou trois hommes, ou cet unique ministre est ordinairement lui-même, conscient ou non, désintéressé ou non,—on ne peut pas le savoir au juste,—l'exécuteur des volontés et des desseins habiles et cachés d'une diplomatie étrangère, toujours secrète tant que le coup n'est pas fait, encore noire et indéchiffrable, même après que le coup est fait.

Ce qui caractérise l'esclave, c'est qu'il est entre les mains de son maître comme une chose, un outil, et non plus un homme. Ainsi en est-il du soldat, de l'officier, du général, marchant au feu et au sang sans souci de la justice, par la volonté arbitraire des ministres, dans les conditions exposées. Ainsi l'esclavage militaire existe, et c'est le pire des esclavages, aujourd'hui surtout qu'il met, par la conscription forcée, la chaire au cou à tous les hommes libres et forts des nations, pour en faire des outils de meurtre, des tueurs de profession, des bouchers de chair humaine : car tel est le seul *opus servile* en vue duquel ils sont enchaînés et dressés.

Pendant la décadence romaine, ce peuple qui avait été plusieurs siècles durant le plus austère, le plus sobre, le plus juste envers les autres peuples, en vint, dans sa corruption pleine de soifs dépravées, de voluptés cruelles et bestiales, à instituer des régiments d'hommes qui s'exerçaient au parfait maniement des armes, pour, en un jour de spectacle, s'assassiner entre eux selon certaines règles, et reparaître ainsi de leur sang les regards de ceux dont les pères s'étaient appelés de ce grand nom : *Senatus Populusque romanus*. Voilà où en est l'Europe moderne avec cette aggravation que ce sont tous les hommes libres et valides qui sont enrôlés : tout le monde y est gladiateur.

Pensez-vous, Messieurs, que cela serait possible si la parole de l'ouvrier anglais n'était vraie, c'est-à-dire si la conscience n'était pas éteinte ? Cela serait-il possible

• si les hommes d'à présent voyaient dans la guerre une œuvre de justice nécessaire, à laquelle ils se voueraient en vertu d'une juste sentence dûment rendue, dont ils seraient, cette fois vraiment pour la juste défense et l'honneur de la patrie, les nobles et héroïques exécuteurs ? Des gouvernants, au nombre de deux ou trois, un peu plus, un peu moins, réunis dans un cabinet secret, délibérant sans registre et sans procès-verbal destiné à la publicité, partant sans responsabilité possible, sans frein ! selon l'énergique expression de l'ouvrier anglais, sans garantie aucune, par conséquent, pour la conscience de ceux qu'ils envoient tuer, pourrai-nt-ils ordonner ainsi des massacres, si la conscience n'était pas éteinte ? — Au contraire, que les citoyens des nations européennes rapprennent et professent qu'il n'est pas plus permis de tuer dix ou cent mille hommes des nations étrangères qu'un seul particulier de leur pays sans juste cause et sans jugement préalable ; que de prétendues guerres ainsi faites ne sont que des brigandages et des entassements de meurtres sur une échelle colossale ; et ces monstruosité s cessent d'être possibles.

La conscience est éteinte. Il vous appartient, Messieurs, d'en rallumer le flambeau, en restaurant la Loi. Et la Loi, ce sera le frein. Et le frein ce sera la magistrature proposée, un tribunal qui déclare ouvertement la justice ou l'injustice de la cause.

Permettez-moi de vous soumettre encore une considération analogue aux précédentes. Pourquoi ravalent les soldats, les officiers, les généraux, au-dessous du bourreau ? Un fonctionnaire quelconque, après des correspondances et des manigances secrètes, ne vient pas dire au bourreau, en lui désignant un citoyen : " Prends-moi cet homme et coupe-lui la tête ou étrangle-le." Le citoyen le plus méprisable, fût-il chargé de vingt condamnations antérieures, est d'abord amené dans un édifice public, où il trouve douze jurés pour l'entendre, une cour très noble pour l'interroger et diriger impartialement les débats, garantir son droit de défense. S'il est condamné à la fin sans appel et sans recours, par une sentence publiquement et solennellement motivée et rendue, et que l'heure de mourir soit arrivée, on députe encore vers lui un homme public, qui lit la sentence définitive et irrévocable en présence de l'exécuteur des hautes œuvres ; et c'est alors seulement que l'exécuteur peut mettre la main sur lui. C'est ainsi, Messieurs, que les nations peuvent vivre, chez elles, à l'état de société. Les formes judiciaires, c'est la société ! Sans doute, avec elles, avec la justice régulièrement et publiquement rendue, il y a encore des scélérats, des hommes qui tuent et qu'il faut mettre justement à mort pour protéger la vie de tous. Mais essayez de laisser les particuliers d'une nation se faire justice entre eux, sans tribunal, sans les saintes formes de la justice, sans jugement régulier et solennel, vous aurez tout de suite un corps social condamné à mort, parce que ses membres s'entre-tueront comme des bêtes féroces. Les nations européennes n'en sont pas là chez elles, à l'intérieur. Au contraire, en omettant des exceptions douloureuses dont je n'ai pas à parler ici, on peut dire que la justice y est aussi parfaitement organisée que le comporte la condition humaine ; et c'est ce qui rend le contraste plus étrange. Elles en sont là entre elles !

On a publié, depuis quarante ans, depuis vingt ans surtout, un grand nombre d'écrits fort sérieux sur cette situation. J'ai lu dans un de ces écrits, dont l'auteur est celui qui l'a le plus et le mieux approfondie au point de vue du droit des gens et à tous les points de vue, que nous avons fait plus de guerres en trente ans que l'antique Syrie n'en avait vu durant une période de quinze cents ans de l'histoire ancienne. Cessons de faire la guerre sans jugement et sentence préalable, et les guerres seront beaucoup plus rares, comme dans chaque nation les meurtres privés sont relativement rares, parce que c'est la magistrature qui poursuit les crimes, et non chacun qui prétend se faire justice soi-même.

C'est ici la raison pour laquelle la proposition de votre comité ne laisse pas au seul pouvoir exécutif la fonction de décréter les guerres. Le pouvoir exécutif d'une nation se trouve, vis-à-vis des pouvoirs exécutifs ou gouvernements étrangers, comme dans une nation un citoyen vis-à-vis des autres citoyens. Ceux-ci ne se font pas justice entre eux, ne prononcent pas de jugement les uns contre les autres : c'est le magistrat. Qu'il en soit de même de chaque gouvernement à l'égard des autres gouvernements. D'autre part, le sage principe du partage des pouvoirs et des attributions exige qu'il en soit encore de même du Parlement. Les Chambres ont des attributions législatives, non judiciaires. Les Parlements ne sont pas des tribunaux, Messieurs, et leurs membres ne peuvent pas être des juges. Outre qu'ils sont trop nombreux pour faire un tribunal, ils sont trop divisés en partis ; partant incapables d'être impartiaux. Impartialité, intégrité, sont synonymes, et il n'y a pas de tribunal ordinaire possible, sans intégrité. L'intégrité, c'est la justice ; l'impartialité, c'est le juge. Je ne fais qu'indiquer ces raisons sans les développer parce que j'ai mieux à vous présenter que des déductions logiques, quelle qu'en soit la valeur.

La situation que nous venons de décrire et d'approfondir prendra fin le jour où les hommes d'aujourd'hui sauront qu'il est défendu à toute conscience honnête de verser le sang humain—non occides—sans justice, sans jugement, et hors le cas de nécessité. En d'autres termes, que pour faire la guerre on y participe sans être coupable de meurtre, il faut d'abord une juste cause, une cause juridique, tellement grave, qu'elle motive l'effusion du sang : c'est la justice ; qu'il faut ensuite la déclaration en forme de cette juste cause à l'adversaire avec offre de la paix moyennant satisfaction ; c'est le jugement, avec sa signification, ou la déclaration du cas de guerre ; qu'il faut enfin le refus de l'adversaire, et l'impossibilité de s'entendre avec lui, ou d'en sortir autrement :—c'est la nécessité. Et l'on saura ces trois choses le jour où une nation quelconque, aura fait ressortir ces trois points, en instituant chez elle une magistrature qui en fera l'application.—L'institution d'une telle magistrature est-elle possible ? Le programme le demande. Nous croyons déjà l'avoir démontré, en prouvant qu'elle est nécessaire, pour rendre aux hommes la conscience en affaires publiques et pour les arracher à l'esclavage militaire. Nous allons en fournir une démonstration sans réplique, en racontant l'institution et en exposant l'organisation et le fonctionnement d'une semblable magistrature qui a existé et fonctionné durant plusieurs siècles, chez la nation la plus en vue et la plus illustre du monde : la nation romaine. Nous aurions pu choisir d'autres types. Nous préférons celui-là, pour plusieurs raisons qu'il est inutile de fournir. Il s'agit du Collège Fécial de l'ancienne Rome.

LE COLLEGE FÉCIAL.

Un professeur de droit agrégé à la Faculté de Dijon, en parle en ces termes au début d'une remarquable étude publiée en 1883 :

« Il n'est pas sans intérêt, au moment où l'Europe multiplie ses armements et ses moyens de destruction. . . . de faire un retour en arrière, de montrer, par l'étude des formalités et des garanties qui entouraient à Rome la déclaration des guerres et la conclusion des traités, que ce peuple avait conçu du droit des gens une idée plus pure et plus raffinée qu'on n'aurait pu l'attendre de l'état de sa civilisation. Plus d'une nation moderne pourrait envier à ces temps, que nous appelons barbares, une institution aussi sage, aussi morale que l'était sous la république romaine le collège des Féciaux, ce tribunal respecté qui, au dire de Varron, présidait à la loyauté des relations internationales. »

L'idée que nous nous faisons, dans la dernière moitié de ce siècle, de la déclaration de guerre, est fort singulière et tout à fait inouïe. Si l'on demandait à nos contemporains quel sens ils attachent à cette locution, la réponse unanime, supposé qu'elle fût basée sur les faits récents les plus nombreux de notre époque, serait celle-ci : La déclaration de guerre est un avis écrit, verbal ou télégraphié au moyen duquel une nation, par l'organe de son gouvernement, dit à une autre : Nous allons nous battre ; ou encore : Nous allons demain chez vous, pour tuer, piller et brûler. Il y a quatre ans, c'est ainsi, à la lettre, qu'agissait Sa Majesté le roi de Serbie à l'égard de la Bulgarie. Sa dépêche, la première pièce officielle relative à la guerre, portait : *demain à six heures du matin*. Dix ans auparavant, le 11 juillet 1876, les mêmes Serbes ou Monténégrins, poussés en avant par la diplomatie pour amener le dernier grand conflit entre la Russie et la Turquie, déclaraient la guerre, ou plutôt annonçaient leur brigandage par télégramme ! Et la veille de l'envoi du télégramme, dans des dépêches écrites, ils protestaient contre la pensée qu'on leur attribuait de vouloir faire la guerre !

Bien autre était l'idée que se formaient de la déclaration de guerre diverses nations de l'antiquité, sans parler du peuple de Dieu, dont nous avons étudié les lois et la pratique dans la Ire séance, notamment les Pélasges et je citerai les cités qui occupaient le sol de l'Italie à l'époque de la fondation de Rome, Albains, Ardéates, Samnites, Falisques, Équicoles, à qui les Romains l'ont empruntée. Les magistrats chargés de cette grave et redoutable fonction de déclarer les guerres, de faire ou préparer les traités, portaient, outre le nom de Féciaux 2, ceux de gardiens ou *conservateurs de la paix*, et de *juges de la paix*, noms dont la signification était, dit Plutarque, qu'ils devaient, dans l'exercice de leur charge, rechercher la paix et la justice.

Les Romains, dit Vattel, reconnaissaient une loi (supérieure) qui oblige les nations entre elles, et ils rapportaient à cette loi le droit des ambassades. Ils avaient

Le Droit Fécial et les Féciaux à Rome. Paris, Durand et Pédone.

1. *L'Hérésie canonique et la constitution de l'Église*, par M. P. Defourny, page 22. — Voir le *Journal de Rome*, et les autres à ces dates.

2. De *fidex*, ou de *fidere*, peu importe.

aussi le Droit fécial, lequel n'était autre chose que le droit des gens par rapport aux traités et particulièrement à la guerre. Les Féciaux étaient les interprètes, les gardiens, et en quelque façon les prêtres de la foi publique 1.

On les appelait Féciaux, dit Varron, parce qu'ils présidaient à la Foi publique entre les peuples. En effet, c'est par leur autorité que se décidaient les justes guerres, qu'elles se terminaient, et que se faisaient ensuite les traités qui rétablissaient la paix sur la foi publique 2.

Le génie de Bossuet éclate en cris d'admiration, en voyant défilér, dans la procession de l'Histoire universelle, le vénérable Collège fécial de la Rome antique :

“ Qu'y a-t-il de plus beau, de plus saint que le collège des Féciaux ? Le Conseil était établi pour juger si une guerre était juste. Avant que le Sénat la proposât, et que le peuple la résolût, cet examen d'équité précédait toujours. Quand la justice de la guerre était reconnue, le Sénat prenait des mesures pour l'entreprendre. Mais on croyait devoir avant tout redemander dans les formes à l'usurpateur les choses injustement ravies, et l'on n'en venait aux extrémités qu'après avoir épuisé les voies de la douceur.

“ Sainte institution s'il en fut jamais, et qui fait honte aux chrétiens 3...” Aux chrétiens de son temps, qui n'était déjà plus l'âge chrétien, et du nôtre, qui l'est encore moins.

Venons à son organisation.

Le Collège fécial se composait de vingt membres pris parmi les citoyens les plus éminents de la République.

Ce nombre de vingt est sagement choisi. Ils ne sont pas trop nombreux pour former une cour de justice de cette importance. Car il s'agit d'une cour de justice, et si c'était une multitude, ce ne serait plus une cour de justice. Il ne faut pas non plus qu'ils soient en trop petit nombre. S'ils n'étaient que quatre ou cinq, ils pourraient dégénérer en cabale, ce qui est difficile avec un personnel de vingt membres d'une honorabilité notoire.

Ils sont à vie, pour n'être pas influencés dans leur jugement par la crainte d'être révoqués, ou de n'être pas réélus, ou par l'ambition de l'être, dans le cas où ils auraient rendu une sentence déplaisante aux partis ou aux entraînements populaires.

Pour la même raison, les Féciaux, une fois institués, ne furent plus élus ni par le Sénat ni par le peuple, souvent à Rome en désaccord et partagés en factions et partis opposés. C'est pourquoi le Collège fécial se recrutait par ce mode de suffrage appelé *cooptation* ; en d'autres termes, quand un des vingt mourait, ses collègues en élaient eux-mêmes un autre à sa place. Ce qui se passait ainsi : chacun présentait son candidat, en jurant qu'il était digne ; ensuite avait lieu la *cooptation* proprement dite, c'est-à-dire le choix du plus digne par tout le Collège réuni, parmi les candidats proposés. D'autres conditions étaient encore nécessaires. Plusieurs d'entre eux, au moins à l'époque de leur élection, devaient être ce qu'on appelait : “ Pères patris,” *Patres patrati* ; c'est-à-dire avoir leur père vivant et être eux-mêmes pères de famille, comme pour mieux offrir en leurs personnes la garantie de l'honneur passé et de l'honneur futur de la patrie. C'était toujours un père patré que les autres devaient élire pour chef d'ambassade en cas de plainte ou de conflit international.

Une fois revêtus de cette magistrature, les Féciaux pouvaient bien exercer concurremment d'autres charges dans l'ordre civil, mais non dans les armées de la République, et il ne leur était pas permis de prendre part personnellement à la guerre, de peur que leur valeur militaire, vertu si commune à Rome, ne fit pencher la balance de leur jugement du côté de la guerre ou de la prolongation de la guerre, au détriment de la justice et de la paix, dont ils avaient la garde.

Avec cette organisation et cette indépendance, les Féciaux n'ont pourtant dans les mains que les moyens d'être intègres, non celui de tyranniser la République en lui faisant faire la guerre selon leur bon plaisir. Car, et c'est peut-être ici le point culminant de la sagesse du législateur à qui l'on doit cette institution, les Féciaux n'ont pas la *décision de la guerre* ! En ce qui regarde une guerre à entreprendre, ils n'ont qu'une attribution, celle de *juger si elle est juste* oui ou non, en d'autres termes, s'il y a une juste cause. Lorsqu'ils ont jugé que la cause est juste, après informations et enquêtes, et d'autres solennités dont je parlerai tout à l'heure, leur rôle est fini, et il n'y a rien de fait, tout est encore à faire quant à la décision de la guerre. Alors

1. VATTEL, liv., III., ch. III.

2. Varro, *De ling. lat.*, lib. IV.

3. *Discours sur l'histoire universelle.*

intervient le Sénat, puis le peuple assemblé en comices. C'est de l'un et de l'autre que dépend la décision, non des Féciaux qui n'ont plus rien à dire. Si le Sénat la vote, et que le peuple l'ordonne, elle se fera, sinon, elle ne se fera pas ; et il arrivait qu'elle ne se faisait pas 1.

Vattel résume très clairement, en termes généraux, ce que les Romains pratiquaient : " Une nation ou son conducteur n'ayant pas seulement à garder la justice dans toutes ses démarches, mais encore à les régler sur le bien de l'État, il faut que des motifs honnêtes et louables concourent avec les raisons justificatives pour lui faire entreprendre la guerre. Ces raisons font voir que le gouvernement est en droit de prendre les armes, qu'il en a un juste sujet ; les motifs montrent qu'il est à propos, qu'il est convenable, dans le cas dont il s'agit, d'user de son droit : ceux-ci se rapportent à la prudence, comme les raisons justificatives se rapportent à la justice 2."

Il est donc avéré que ce peuple romain, naguère encore un ramassis de brigands, ravisseurs des femmes étrangères, sut se donner de bonne heure une telle institution, par amour de la justice, et comme un frein pour brider l'injustice de ses ardeurs belliqueuses. Autrement, à quoi bon ce Tribunal fécial si sagement organisé ? puisque le Sénat délibérait si sérieusement après la décision des Féciaux, puisque le peuple en comices délibérait à son tour avant d'acquiescer définitivement, et qu'il refusait parfois ? Ce tribunal eût été complètement inutile, s'il n'eût pas été établi avant tout et uniquement pour assurer le droit et le juste.

Le peuple romain s'était ôté à lui-même, en adoptant les institutions féciales, le pouvoir de faire des guerres criminelles et insensées, il avait abdiqué ses passions de violence entre les mains des Féciaux, comme nous abdiquons nos consciences entre les mains de nos cabinets, de nos ministres irresponsables.

Poursuivons. Il nous reste à achever la description du Tribunal fécial et son fonctionnement. C'est ici que nous allons voir ce que les Romains entendaient par la déclaration de guerre d'abord, la dénonciation des hostilités ensuite, et comment ils appliquaient la maxime citée tout à l'heure : Il faut que les causes d'une guerre soient claires et évidentes et qu'elles le soient si bien, qu'elles n'aient pas à redouter l'exposé public que l'on en doit faire. Car la coutume a toujours été de faire les publications d'une guerre en en articulant la cause, afin que le genre humain tout entier pour ainsi dire puisse connaître de la justice de cette cause.

Avant que le Sénat eût été saisi de l'affaire, non plus que le peuple en comices, le Collège des Féciaux, sa sentence rendue, députait à la nation dont le peuple romain avait à se plaindre une ambassade composée de plusieurs de ses membres, ayant à sa tête le *Pater patrulus*, orné extérieurement des symboles de la paix. Arrivé à la frontière, aux premières personnes qu'il rencontrait, il signifiait les justes griefs du peuple romain. Puis, s'avançant jusqu'au siège du gouvernement, il les répétait à la porte de la ville ; enfin il pénétrait dans le forum, et en présence de ce peuple et de ses chefs, il prenait la parole, toujours dans les mêmes termes, et énonçait les causes claires et positives qui pouvaient amener la guerre, demandant satisfaction pour le tort commis, l'énonçant non pas vaguement et obscurément, mais l'articulant nettement et au moyen de brèves formules que l'histoire nous a conservées.

Après avoir reçu la réponse de la nation ainsi mise en cause, l'ambassade revenait à Rome, et y attendait pendant un mois l'effet de sa démarche. Si, à l'expiration de ce délai, satisfaction n'était pas donnée au peuple romain, elle retournait une seconde fois au pays étranger, et le père patré dénonçait la guerre future en ces termes : " Je vous prends à témoin que tel peuple est injuste et qu'il refuse de faire le droit. C'est pourquoi nous allons en référer à nos sénateurs pour qu'ils avisent aux moyens de nous obtenir justice."

Telle est, Messieurs, la déclaration du cas de guerre avec la dénonciation des hostilités chez les Romains. C'est d'elle qu'il est écrit dans leur droit public : Nous ne considérons comme *enemis* que ceux qui nous font la guerre après nous l'avoir déclarée, ou à qui nous la faisons après la leur avoir déclarée nous-mêmes : les autres sont des *brigands* ou des *pirates* 3. Le procédé et la formule moderne : Nous allons nous battre, qui retient dans l'Europe contemporaine le nom de déclaration,

1. Tous ces détails sont extraits de divers auteurs latins et grecs. On les trouve presque tous dans M. Weiss, *op. cit.*

2. Vattel, *loc. cit.*

3. POMPONE. Ce texte, si clair pour qui a étudié le Droit fécial, est souvent cité, pas toujours compris. Le voici : *Hostes hi sunt, qui nobis aut quibus nos publice bellum decrevimus : ceteri latrones et piratas sunt.* Digeste, l. 118. *De verborum significatione.*

n'en est qu'une indigne parodie ; elle n'est pas même une dénonciation d'hostilités, faute d'avoir été précédée de la vraie déclaration du cas de guerre ; ce n'est qu'un cri de violence, donnant le signal du brigandage.

Nous n'avons plus qu'à conclure : toutes les solutions demandées par le programme ressortent de ce qui précède.

(a) Une telle magistrature est-elle possible ? Cette question est résolue. *Ab actu ul posse valet consecutio*. Elle est plus que possible ; elle est nécessaire pour restaurer la pratique de la Loi éternelle en matière d'effusion du sang, pour mettre fin à l'écrasement de la conscience chez ceux qui embrassent volontairement la carrière militaire, comme chez ceux qui y entrent forcément par la conscription. Une institution que pratiqua le peuple hébreu conformément à la Loi de Dieu, qui était établie et fonctionnait chez les Pélasges et d'autres peuples de l'antiquité, qui avait autrefois ses analogues chez les nations chrétiennes, en Angleterre, par exemple, dans le Conseil Privé, une telle institution, qui oserait soutenir que les nations modernes de l'Europe en sont incapables ? Les Romains sortant du banditisme se la sont bien donnée.

(b) Quels seraient ses pouvoirs ? Serait-ce un Corps permanent créé par les Parlements ?

Ses pouvoirs essentiels doivent être ceux du Collège fécial en ce qui regarde la justice, rien de plus, mais rien de moins. Il faut qu'elle soit un pouvoir judiciaire, et que ni les ministres, ni les Parlements, ni les Chefs d'État ne puissent même délibérer sur l'entreprise d'une guerre, tant que la cour féciale n'aura pas prononcé qu'elle est juste. Rien n'empêche de s'y préparer si on la redoute. Cela ne regarde plus la cour féciale, non plus que la décision même de la guerre, une fois déclarée juste par la Cour, et reconnue nécessaire par les autres pouvoirs.

Pour plus de clarté, j'ai rédigé quatre articles sur les pouvoirs de la cour féciale, à établir dans chaque nation :

ARTICLE PREMIER.—Il est institué un Grand Conseil du droit des gens, formé de magistrats spéciaux, et fonctionnant à l'instar d'une haute cour de justice, pour l'examen et le jugement des justes causes de guerre.—Les dépêches, rapports, correspondances, et généralement toutes les pièces relatives à des conflits internationaux lui sont communiqués par le ministre des affaires étrangères.

ART. 2.—Le Chef de l'État est juge, avec le Parlement, des raisons d'État en matière de guerre à entreprendre, et il dispose de la force armée vis-à-vis des autres nations avec l'assentiment des Chambres. Mais le Chef de l'État ne peut demander cet assentiment, ni le Parlement le donner, et ni l'un ni l'autre ne peuvent décréter une guerre, sans que préalablement le Grand Conseil du droit des gens ait été saisi de la cause, et que, réuni en haute cour, il ait rendu son jugement motivé, établissant la justice du cas de guerre.

ART. 3.—Ni avant, ni après l'assentiment des Chambres, le Chef de l'État ne peut dénoncer la guerre, ni les ministres ordonner aucun acte d'hostilité quelconque, contre une nation ou peuplade étrangère quelle qu'elle soit, avant de lui avoir déclaré le cas de guerre, c'est-à-dire de lui avoir notifié, par ambassade, le jugement motivé du Grand Conseil, de l'avoir mise en demeure de réparer le tort commis envers la nation, et énoncé audit jugement, et d'avoir eu connaissance certaine de son refus de faire droit.

ART. 4.—En cas de déclaration et de dénonciation de guerre, en même temps que sera transmis l'ordre d'ouvrir les hostilités, le jugement de la haute cour, ou l'énoncé sommaire des justes causes de la guerre, extrait dudit jugement, sera lu publiquement à l'ordre en tête de chaque escadron, bataillon des armées et équipage de la marine et affiché dans toutes les paroisses ou communes du territoire national.

(c) Comment constituer cette autorité, ou plutôt cette magistrature ? Aurait-elle l'organisation du Conseil Privé d'Angleterre ? Serait-ce un corps permanent et indépendant créé par les Parlements.

Comment constituer cette Magistrature ?—Chaque nation la constituerait dans l'esprit le plus conforme à sa propre constitution, pourvu qu'on ne s'écarte pas des principes de l'organisation du Collège Fécial : et cela suffira.

Serait-ce un corps permanent et indépendant créé par les Parlements ?

Il ne m'appartient pas de prononcer sur ce point en ce qui regarde la nation anglaise. Il suffit que le principe et l'institution de cette magistrature soit admis, le reste viendra facilement de soi-même. En ce qui regarde la création de ces magistrats par les Parlements, j'avoue que j'ai une crainte, celle de leur donner l'idée de croire qu'ils sont une espèce de commission ou de dépendance du parlement. Cette seule idée suffirait pour leur ôter la conviction qu'ils sont des juges—juges de la justice des causes des guerres. Et il faut qu'ils soient des juges, ou ils n'ont plus de raison d'être. Je ne m'avance pas néanmoins jusqu'à dire qu'ils ne devraient pas, pour la première fois,

mais pour la première fois seulement, être désignés par le Parlement.

Cette magistrature aurait-elle l'organisation du Conseil-privé d'Angleterre. Je me déclare de nouveau incompetent. Cependant au cours de mes études sur ce sujet de premier ordre, j'ai trouvé des choses merveilleuses sur le *Privy Council*, et vous m'accorderez encore deux minutes pour que j'aie l'honneur de vous les rappeler.

Le Roi et son Conseil-privé, dit Coke, formaient une très-noble, digne et honorable réunion qui se tenait au Palais du Souverain. Celui-ci allait y siéger en personne. Les Conseillers-privés avaient, comme de fidèles sentinelles, à veiller et pourvoir à la défense, à la sûreté et à l'intérêt du Royaume (1). Lords, évêques, justiciers, hommes jouissant de la considération et de l'estime publique, choisis librement par la Couronne parmi tous les sujets anglais, ils prêtaient un serment très-solennel et très-étendu. Ils juraient de conseiller le Souverain avec toute l'habileté et le discernement dont ils étaient capables, d'avoir constamment en vue dans leurs conseils, l'honneur de la Couronne et le bien public, sans se laisser influencer par l'esprit de parti, leurs affections particulières, l'amour des présents ou la crainte; d'éviter la corruption; en un mot d'observer, de mettre en œuvre et de faire tout ce qu'un loyal conseiller doit à son Souverain (2). La Couronne était obligée de prendre leur avis pour exercer sa prérogative; et bien qu'elle eût seule la décision, cette décision n'était obligatoire qu'autant qu'elle réunissait la pluralité des suffrages du Conseil (3). Chaque conseiller était personnellement responsable de son avis consigné au Registre et signé par lui. Et cette responsabilité n'était pas un vain mot. Le cas échéant, les Communes pouvaient par l'Impeachment, mettre en jugement les Conseillers privés, et les Pairs les condamner, s'ils avaient émis un avis déshonorant pour le nom anglais, contraire à la Common-Law, ou pernicieux au pays (4).

C'était une belle institution. Il paraît qu'elle est tombée en désuétude comme l'Impeachment.—Rien n'empêcherait, dit un autre de vos compatriotes, de former la magistrature dont nous parlons, non du Conseil privé tout entier qui aujourd'hui est trop nombreux pour faire un tribunal, mais d'un Comité du Conseil privé, dont les membres devraient être nommés à vie comme les juges, ou pour le temps de la vie du Souverain, comme les membres du Conseil privé.

Quoi qu'il en soit, peu importe, Messieurs. Encore une fois, il sera facile de constituer cette magistrature dans chaque nation, dès que le principe sera admis. La dernière question du Programme est celle-ci: Quelles sont les difficultés que présente cette organisation, et comment y faire face? Il me semble que vous répondez avec moi: il n'y en a pas; il n'y en a pas d'autres assurément que la routine, et, si elle existe, la résistance des passions qui sont, au fond, parfois avec la maladresse de ceux qui mènent les affaires, la vraie cause des guerres. Mais ces difficultés n'en sont pas, puisqu'on les rencontre toujours dans la vie, chaque fois qu'on veut le bien, et surtout le bien public. Elles ne sont donc pas, si elles existent, insurmontables. Permettez-moi d'emprunter le langage du patriarche Abraham priant pour Sodome et Gomorre: Qu'il se trouve cinquante membres d'un Parlement quelconque de l'Europe, quarante, s'il n'y en a pas cinquante, trente, vingt, dix, s'il n'y en a que dix, et qu'ils présentent solennellement un Projet de Loi ou d'acte de Parlement avec exposé de motifs pour l'institution d'une cour féodale à l'effet de sortir leur nation, et les autres peuples de l'Europe avec elle, du crime, du danger et de la ruine. S'il n'est pas accueilli d'emblée, qu'ils le présentent de nouveau. A la troisième fois leur projet sera adopté: la pression du sentiment public réveillé sur les vérités les plus primordiales et les devoirs les plus impératifs des hommes entre eux, se fera sentir aux législateurs.

Un homme revêtu des plus hautes fonctions publiques, à qui je faisais part récemment de mes vues sur ce sujet, me disait: L'Angleterre est la nation la mieux préparée pour faire revivre cette institution salutaire, et peut-être, par elle, sauver l'Europe. Je suis heureux de rendre ce témoignage au pays qui m'accueille et à l'assemblée qui m'a entendu avec tant de bienveillance.

DISCUSSION.

On the suggestion of Mr. JOSEPH STURGE the word "direct" was substituted for the word "announce" in the second section of the resolution.

(1) Coke, Institute iv., c. ii. (2) Bowyer, 128. (3) Id. Ibid. 216. (4) R. Discours sur l'Effusion du sang des hommes et le Droit de Guerre, page 110-111.

M. VASSEUR, Agent in Paris of the Peace Society, speaking in French, called in question the efficiency of the Fecial Tribunal ; doubted very much whether it had the influence ascribed to it ; called attention to the bad working of the Amphictyonic Council, and showed that the town of Delphi, which refused to follow its behests, was attacked by Alexander the Great and destroyed. They did not come there to regulate war, but to declare absolutely against it.

M. EMILE ARNAUD, who also spoke in French, condemned the proposal for a juridical court if that court had the power of declaring war, the object of the Congress being not to consider conditions under which war can be declared, but to deny the right of war in all cases. A court of the kind might be necessary, but simply for the purpose of leading to arbitration. He dwelt upon the mischief that would follow the institution of such a court, as rather a prolongation of the actual state of things than a permanent remedy, and proposed the following amendment :—

Whereas the very principle and reason for the existence of the Universal Congress of Peace are the establishment of the juridical order (or state of law) among nations, and consequently the negation of the right of war ; whereas any investigation by this Congress of the conditions necessary for the declaration of war, and of the functions of the various authorities in this matter, would be a recognition of the right of war ; whereas the only case where a people can enter into acts of war is that of legitimate defence, in which case no declaration of war by such people is necessary: therefore this Congress declares the negation of the right of war, denies to all authorities and powers the right of declaring war, declares its belief in the pacific solution of the international differences which form obstacles to the establishment of a universal state of law ; and further resolves that it will give its attention and efforts exclusively to the investigation of all measures necessary for the establishment of a state of law, and for the discovery of the laws of peace, and not to the discussion of the code of war.

(See page 188 for final form of resolution.)

Mr. COLLET said that for thirty-six years he had been endeavouring to bring forward the proposal which was now being submitted to the Congress for the first time—namely, that the question of the justice of a war should be decided beforehand by a judicial tribunal, and not by parliament or people. In the case of war the same plan should be adopted as in domestic relations, where a murderer has to be tried, convicted, and sentenced before he can be hanged ; but in cases of war the whole matter in this country for the last fifty years had been left to the Foreign Secretary and the Prime Minister, who made wars without a declaration, knowing that if they declared the causes of any particular war they would lay themselves open to future inquiry as to whether the ground upon which they acted was right or wrong. There could be no doubt as to the injustice of the Burmese war, because it was manifested in the declaration which demanded that the Indian Viceroy should appoint the Arbitrator. In the case of the wars with China nobody knew what the wars were for. Both in the case of Britain and the United States it was supposed that the Legislature had the power of vetoing a war because the right to refuse supplies rested in their hands ; but as a matter of fact wars were commenced before the people's representatives had a voice in the matter, and when once the country had undertaken certain measures Parliament was sure to grant supplies. It should not be deemed sufficient for the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to be consulted before war was declared. They must also have a Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Lords and of the House of Commons, such as existed in the

United States, in Hungary, and in Austria. Mr. Urquhart formed, thirty-six years ago, at the time of the Crimean War, a number of committees throughout the country, who made it their business to inquire and understand the proceedings of government, and to do everything they could to stop whatever was illegal. He was one of the few surviving members of those committees. They would have to revive that system. He complained that peace advocates did not take sufficient trouble to ascertain the previous history of wars. In regard to the amendment, it was impossible to abolish war without first regularising it; and if they attempted to proscribe war altogether, their attitude would be regarded as a wholly impracticable one.

The PRESIDENT having to leave at this point, the chair was taken by Mr. HODGSON PRATT.

Baron DE ST. GEORGES ARMSTRONG proposed

“That six months should be allowed to elapse between any declaration of war and the commencement of hostilities, so that governments and peoples should have time for reflection.”

Mr. CHARLES THOMPSON, of Westmoreland, seconded this on the ground that every delay is a gain.

Mr. J. D. NIEASS, delegate from the International Arbitration League, seconded M. Arnaud's amendment. On principle he was totally opposed to war whether between individuals or nations. He looked upon all wars as fratricidal, because mankind was one brotherhood. Those who went forth to kill people in other lands were just as likely to kill friends as foes. The Egyptian war and the bombardment of Alexandria was one of the greatest blots in English history. He abhorred war, whether there was an apparent justification or a real necessity for it, believing that all international disputes could be settled without the destruction of human life if a proper court were established.

The CHAIRMAN announced that the mover of the original resolution and M. Arnaud, who moved the first amendment, had come to an understanding, and that a proposition would be made which the supporters both of the resolution and the amendment would be able to vote for. He then read the revised resolution, which was in the terms of M. Arnaud's amendment as far as the words *“obstacles to the establishment of a universal state of law,”* and continued, *“and the Congress declares that while waiting for the definite establishment of the juridical state or condition of law, the institution under all governments of a juridical court, like that explained in the paper by the Abbe Defourny, would be an excellent way of diminishing the chances of war”*; therefore the Congress adopts the following resolution: — *“While waiting for the establishment of international arbitration, the Congress desires that there may be established a juridical court under the following conditions.”* Then follow the words of the first resolution (clauses 1, 2, 3).

M. FREDERIC PASSY having explained in French the altered position,

Mr. AUGUSTINE JONES, of the United States, said he was sorry to speak in opposition to men working in the same cause as himself, and who had given their lives and deliberate thought to that question; but he deemed it his duty to speak for that portion of the country from which he came, and to present its thoughts and feelings as one phase of the question. From his standpoint the people themselves were the judges of whether there should or should not be a war. (Applause.)

What was called a court in the proposition before the Congress was not, as he understood it, a court at all, where opposing parties could bring forward their witnesses to testify; it was simply a Cabinet set apart to decide whether the country should enter upon a war ("No, no"). Those composing the Cabinet might have learning on matters of war, but the people had exactly the same means of studying and examining the question in the light of precedents.

The CHAIRMAN interposed with the remark that the proposed court would have nothing to do with the declaration of war; it simply had to give its opinion to the executive.

Mr. AUGUSTINE JONES said it came to the same thing.

The CHAIRMAN: No; this court is to examine and consider the causes of the war, and to submit the result of the examination to the Government.

M. AUGUSTINE JONES maintained that substantially it was the same thing. If the pulse of the people was in favour of war, they would sweep away the court like a cobweb if it opposed their wishes, because the people created the court, and they could take it to pieces and dissolve it. It seemed to him that it was far better for them not to be discussing what should be done with reference to war, but to be legislating for peace—(hear, hear)—not creating cobwebs which were for the hour, not anticipating these little matters, which were the mere beginning, as compared with that great question of seizing the people by their hearts, and affections, and judgment, and the moral forces of the age and of civilisation, in order to lift them to the plane of the peace movement. No form of legislation could do this thing; it was only to be done by moral forces, by religious forces, by appealing to the sweet reasonableness of a cause.

Rev. Mr. STANFORD, of Birmingham, thought that if the Congress gave way to any institution that would have for its object the support of war they would be committing themselves to war itself.

Miss FRANCES LORD, as the delegate of the Moral Reform Union, said she had no patience with any shades of wrong.

Miss ROBINSON moved an amendment, to omit the clause justifying defensive wars, namely:

"Inasmuch as the only one case where a people can enter into acts of war is that of legitimate defence; in which case no declaration of war is necessary."

This amendment having been seconded,

Mr. GEORGE GILLET desired to move that the part relating to the regulation of war should be struck out, namely:

"There shall be established, in connection with such Government, a Juridical Court for examining and judging the causes of war. All the documents relating to the international dispute shall be communicated to it by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs." Also

"The Executive Power shall neither be able to decree a war nor to announce the commencement of hostilities until the Juridical Court has been seized of the question, and has given its considered judgment affirming the justice of the case of war."

Mr. WRIGHT (Birmingham) suggested that the resolutions and amendments might be printed, and then voted on at another Session.

The CHAIRMAN thought the proper course would be to read what remained of the resolution if Mr. Gillett's amendment were adopted.

Mr. WRIGHT said that he would move that it be printed and put, without discussion, at the next Session.

The CHAIRMAN said that the resolution, as agreed to by the movers of the original resolution and the movers of the amendment, was as follows :

“ Inasmuch as the very principle and reason for the existence of the Universal Congress of Peace are to be found in the establishment of the juridical order (or state of law) among nations, and consequently the negation of the right of war ; inasmuch as any investigation by the Congress of the conditions necessary for the declaration of war, and of the powers of various authorities in this matter, would be a recognition of the right of war ; therefore this Congress affirms its negation of the right of war, denies to all authorities and powers the right of declaring war, and declares its belief in the pacific solution of international differences which at present form obstacles to the establishment of a universal state of law and this Congress resolves that we will wait for the definitive establishment of the juridical state above referred to.”

It was proposed that the resolution should be referred back to the Procedure Committee, so as to have something formulated which would be satisfactory to both sections of the meeting.

The CHAIRMAN then put it to the vote as to whether the meeting was in favour of such delay, when the numbers were found equal.

Whereupon it was moved that the question be referred back to the Committee to draw up a new resolution.

The CHAIRMAN said that, considering the equality of the vote, he thought it highly desirable that there should be a reference to the Committee, in order that the resolution might be put into a form more satisfactory to the meeting.

Accordingly it was moved that at the next sitting the resolution be read and voted upon, but not discussed by anyone.

The Congress then adjourned.

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON, 16TH JULY.

The chair this afternoon was taken by Sir JOSEPH W. PEASE, Bart., M.P.

After the minutes of the previous meeting had been read by Mr. W. E. DARBY, Secretary, and confirmed,

Mr. HODGSON PRATT announced that a telegram had been received from the Freemasons Lodge, "La Cisalpina," of Milan, expressing their wish that the Congress might have the effect of substituting International Arbitration for War.

Mr. Pratt was authorised by the meeting to send a suitable response to Milan.

CHAIRMAN'S ADDRESS.

The CHAIRMAN : Ladies and Gentlemen, I cannot take the chair this afternoon without apologising to you for my absence at previous meetings of this Congress, and as I have the honour, however unworthy, of being President of the old Pease Society of England—a position which I have already held for several years—I can assure you that it has been from no want of hearty sympathy that I have been obliged to be absent from these sittings. I rejoiced when I found that this Congress was about to be held, and although we may not be many in numbers, I believe that we are the representatives of a very large amount of feeling among the civilised nations of the world, and I think that we are, each of us, assured in our various countries that we are part of a number that daily—I might say hourly—is increasing. There are three positions from which we may look at the question of war and international armaments. I call the high point of view that of the standard of the Christian religion, whose principles are very far from—they are diametrically opposed to—war. But if we take it on the lower ground of political economy only, there is no political economist who for a moment can say a word in favour of the present condition of things. If we take it on the ground of morality, the dealings of man with man, the present condition of Europe could not for a moment be defended. I know that there are various modes of looking at the question of Peace, Arbitration, and Disarmament, but I am most anxious that if we are agreed that a thing is wrong, tried by a moral, political, economical, and Christian standard, we should at least endeavour to bring about a better state of things than that which now exists throughout the civilized world. The waste of property, the waste of life, the detriment to morals, all come home naturally to every lover of his country who looks at the condition of the land he loves, and the land he lives in. I hope we may all be able to encourage each other by efforts in our respective countries, and local centres ; and again I cannot help thinking, and I think you will agree with me in the view, that the harvest is daily getting riper ; that as education is spread, that as knowledge is spread, whether you speak of political or Christian knowledge, the feeling of the wickedness and evil of large armies both in time of peace—and that is very difficult to exaggerate—as well as in time of war—is getting stronger amongst the peoples of the civilized world.

It may be that the horizon is somewhat dark—and I dare say it is—because we still feel that our respective Governments seem to be running what the late Mr Disraeli called "a mad race one against the other,"

but there is evidently a great feeling amongst the peoples to check that mad race. I am afraid that check will not come from the Governments until they are made to feel that the peoples insist upon it. I cannot help thinking, from what I have seen of the working classes, that they are more and more indisposed to furnish the sinews of war, and more disposed to unite with other nations, separated in some instances by very narrow seas, and in another by the wide Atlantic, and to hold out to those other peoples the right hand of friendship.

In conclusion Sir Jos. W. Pease introduced the subject for discussion, saying that although at the first blush he thought that it came within the scope of the work of the Aborigines' Protection Society, it also had a great deal to do with the purposes of that Congress.

SECTION G.

RELATIONS OF CIVILISED STATES TOWARDS WEAKER RACES.

Mr. W. E. DARBY presented the report of the Sectional Committee on this section, as adopted by the Procedure Committee, which concluded with the following resolution.

“The Congress holds that the doctrine of the universal rights of man requires that aboriginal and weaker races shall be guarded from injustice and fraud when brought into contact with civilized peoples, alike as to their territories, their liberties and their property, and that they shall be shielded from the vices which are so prevalent among the so-called advanced races of men. It further expresses its conviction that there should be concert of action among the nations for the accomplishment of these ends. The Congress desires to express its hearty appreciation of the conclusions arrived at by the late Anti-Slavery Conference, held in Brussels, for the amelioration of the condition of the peoples of Africa.”

“Le Congrès est d'avis que la doctrine des droits imprescriptibles de l'homme exige que les races indigènes et faibles soient défendues dans leur territoire, leur liberté et leurs propriétés contre toute injustice ou abus lorsqu'elles se trouvent en contact avec les peuples civilisés, et qu'elles soient garanties contre les vices si prévalants chez les nations soi-disant avancées. Il affirme, en outre, sa conviction que les nations devraient agir de concert pour atteindre ce but. Le Congrès désire exprimer sa cordiale appréciation des conclusions de la Conférence Anti-esclavagiste, tenue récemment à Bruxelles, sur l'amélioration de la condition des populations africaines.”

In moving this resolution Mr. W. C. BRAITHWAITE gave the substance of the following paper which he had prepared.

THE TREATMENT OF WEAKER RACES.

By WM. C. BRAITHWAITE, of London.

The treatment of weaker races closely concerns the pacific development of the world and the good name of civilization and Christianity. Especially does it claim the earnest attention of England, the nursing mother of so many native peoples, who

finds herself charged with the imperial task of training them to take their proper place in the service of mankind.

REASONS FOR PRESERVING THE NATIVE RACES.

To those who view the extinction of native races with complacence, as a necessary result of the law of the survival of the fittest, it is sufficient answer to point out that strength is no longer the ideal of humanity, and that the social institutions which have developed the highest types of man exist for the purpose of controlling the crude operation of the struggle for life. Moreover, native races are presumably fitted for the region they occupy. Who would wish to repeat the enormous folly of the Spaniards in the West Indies, where we find the Indians, who were acclimatized to the conditions of tropical life, destroyed in thousands by the forced work in the silver mines, so that the islands became waste, and the lack of labour was only supplied by the African slave trade.¹ It would be worth our while to preserve native races if only to avoid this possibility of economic disturbance. But there are higher considerations which should weigh with us, for there are few races which have not in them a possibility of high service to the world, which it would be as wasteful to squander as for ancient civilization to have crushed out the strong life of the Teuton or the Kelt. Nor does the question rest here. All men are children of the one Father, and objects of the same grace of God. It has been well said² that we ought "to act towards man everywhere—however uncivilized or unenlightened—with that respect, with that consideration and love which are due to our common nature and to our common hopes. To treat man with disdain, because his colour or complexion differs from our own, is a reproach cast upon Him who made him." The preservation of physically or intellectually weaker races must rest ultimately upon the recognition of this common brotherhood. It was this which nerved Las Casas (the protector of the Indians) and the Spanish priests and statesmen who followed his example, to withstand the cruelty and recklessness of their countrymen; this which gave the abolitionists of England and America strength to overthrow slavery, which has sown the darkness of heathendom with the stars of missionary enterprise, and which, as it prevails among men, will solve the social problems of the world.

The destruction of aboriginal tribes that has attended the progress of colonization and of commerce is appalling. The Spanish conquest of America destroyed twelve million Indians within sixty years of the first voyage of Columbus; the slave trade has desolated vast regions in Africa, and has been followed on that dark continent by the not less murderous scourge of the liquor traffic; in Australia and New Zealand the native population is gradually dying off, and in Tasmania it has disappeared, while the Islands of the Pacific have in many instances been wasted by European adventurers. Civilization has swept over the globe with the destructiveness of a prairie fire, driving the native races before it like wild animals, and marking its course by devastation and death. We can only admire the policy which has enabled countries like China and Japan to stay for centuries the progress of the devouring element.

SCOPE OF THE PAPER.

I propose in the present paper, first to point out some of the causes which have led to the extinction of native races, then to refer to a few striking examples of a more successful treatment, and lastly to formulate, tentatively and subject to the disturbing elements which must enter into so wide a problem in each specific case, the policy which upon the evidence before us appears most likely to protect the weaker races in their contact with civilized life.

CAUSES OF THE DESTRUCTION OF WEAKER RACES.

First then, how comes it that man with his civilization and Christianity has so often destroyed weaker races—treating them sometimes as herfs subject to his exactions, sometimes as mere chattels, which may be destroyed or sold at pleasure, sometimes as cunning and dangerous animals, to be hunted and killed? With this is involved the further question, what causes in the natives themselves predispose them to extinction in the presence of civilization.

The causes may, I think, be reduced to the three following:—

1. The want of self-restraint found among colonists and traders.
2. The difficulty which races of different customs and civilizations experience in realising one another's habits of thought and life.
3. The weakness of moral stamina and the ignorance which are found in most native races.

¹ Upon this subject and upon the work of Las Casas see Sir Arthur Helps' "Spanish Conquest of America," to which I am indebted for some of the thoughts in this paper.

² Address by the Society of Friends on the conduct of Christians to the less civilized—1858.

Dwelling upon these in their order, we can trace much of the oppression of native races to the innate savagery and cupidity which break out amongst civilized men when the restraints of religion and society are weakened. These restraints have least force at the outskirts of civilization. The pioneer leaps forward to his adventure with a hot desire for wealth or fame, and, unless a man of high principle, allows no consideration of mercy or justice or good faith to thwart his purpose. His superior strength may dispossess the natives of their rights or force them to wear out their lives in gaining him wealth; or the cupidity of the trader may gain its ends by the sale of spirits or opium, or of guns and ammunition for intertribal wars. In his selfishness man forgets his brotherhood.

A sordid, solitary thing,
 'Mid countless brethren with a lonely heart
 Through courts and cities the smooth savage roams,
 Feeling himself, his own low self the whole;
 When he, by sacred sympathy, might make
 The whole one self! Self, that no alien knows,
 Self, far diffused as Fancy's wing can travel,
 Self, spreading still! Oblivious of its own,
 Yet all of all possessing! This is faith!
 This the Messiah's destined victory.

These fine lines of Coleridge³ allude not only to the selfish greed and the latent savagery of civilized man but also to that want of understanding and sympathy which has many a time prevented high-minded and well-meaning colonists from acting rightly towards native races. When we remember how easily misunderstandings arise between European nations of similar religion, culture, and customs, we need not be surprised at the fatal want of understanding which may exist between settlers and natives. With his own preconceived ideas of what is right and just and his own pressing burden of daily work, the colonist has little time or disposition for entering into the sphere of thought and habit in which the native moves; his want of sympathy rapidly hardens into prejudice; his prejudices produce too often, as their final outcome, a feeling that the native is of a different humanity to himself and ordained to be a hewer of wood and drawer of water. Man's view of life is so coloured by his own narrow experience, that if he had his will, he would probably cast all men in his own mould, and the infinite variety of character and temperament which gives vigour to the present and promise to the future would be lost.

The third, and in some ways, the gravest danger which threatens native races lies in their own ignorance and in their lack of moral stamina. The tide of civilization reaches them suddenly. Unprepared for its perils, unable to adapt themselves to its new conditions, they sicken and die as the fish do in a lake which is flooded by the salt water of the ocean. Civilization infects with its passions, such as gambling, spirit drinking, and the love of money, long before it gives the moral strength to resist them, and unless the native races are protected from indulgence in these acquired vices, they are almost certain to be degraded and destroyed by them.

The touch of civilization has often been the touch of death. Better that her course should be stayed than that her hand should be red with the blood of murder. The honour of our nation, and of every other Christian nation, forbids that its emigration and trade should be based on crime. It is difficult for a State to control the cupidity, brutality, and prejudice of its subjects in regions outside its empire or even in its own remote dependencies. Distance, the imperfect and probably one-sided character of information, and the apathy with which colonial affairs are generally regarded, have stood and still stand in the way. In the crown Colonies of the British Empire much must be left to the Governor, in the self-governing Colonies everything depends upon the public opinion of the Colonies themselves. But the work must be done and can be done.

In examining the subject, we shall find little profit from reviving the failures of the past, it will serve our purpose better to recall some of the examples which give earnest of a brighter future for the native races of the world.

JESUIT MISSION OF PARAGUAY.

Brief mention will suffice for the famous Jesuit Mission of Paraguay,⁴ which for generations preserved the Indians of the interior from destructive contact with the outer world, and trained them to a docile performance of the duties of the Christian religion as understood by the good Jesuit Fathers. The mission stands forth

³ Religious Musings.

⁴ See Southey's History of Brazil.

brightly upon the page of history, but it has little teaching for an age in which it seems no longer possible to seal a country against European civilization or govern by the law of a passive obedience.

WILLIAM PENN'S HOLY EXPERIMENT.

An example of more value is to be found in the policy of William Penn towards the Indians of Pennsylvania. ⁵ It is well known that during the seventy years during which the colony was governed upon the Christian principles of its founder, the friendship between the colonists and the Indians was unbroken. Penn's "Holy Experiment" proved indeed a precedent to the nations. "We have done better," said one of the settlers in 1684, "than if, with the proud Spaniards, we had gained the mines of Potosi. We may make the ambitious heroes, whom the world admires, blush for their shameful victories. To the poor dark souls round us, we teach their rights as men."

There were three distinguishing features of William Penn's policy :

1. Although he purchased the land from the Indians, he did not remove them from it, but left them at liberty to settle as his subjects in many parts of the province.
2. He gave them the full benefit and protection of the laws, enacting that in cases in which Whites and Indians were concerned they should sit in equal numbers on the juries.
3. He gave the conduct of the Indian trade to a company of men chosen for their integrity who bound themselves by certain regulations, especially in regard to fair dealing and to the sale of spirits to the natives.

William Penn won the hearts of the Indians by his justice, good faith and Christian consideration and by going in and out amongst them as their friend, and the celebrated treaty of 1682 which was again and again ratified breathes a spirit of brotherly confidence worthy of the religion of love which he professed, and of the Holy Spirit whose guidance he sought to follow even in secular affairs.

THE INDIANS OF THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

The secret of his success lay in his desire, amounting to a feeling of religious duty, to understand the Indians and to treat them as brethren. "Do not abuse them, but let them have justice and you win them," was his maxim. The same kind of conduct has been pursued by the Hudson's Bay Company and the Dominion of Canada. ⁶ Until the year 1870, the Hudson's Bay Company—founded 200 years previously—had control over the vast territories between Lake Superior and the Rocky Mountains, and derived a princely revenue from the trade in furs. The 45 or 50,000 Indians who hunted the buffalo and the moose in the Great North-West found in the Company a generous friend who watched over them like a father. Dr. Rae, who was long connected with the Company, gives some interesting details. "The white men," he says, "carry double the weight over the portages that the Indians do in the McKenzie River district, but the Hudson's Bay Company, out of kindness, pay the Indians as much for the voyage as they do the white men. They have nursed them in sickness. We never heard yet of a starving Indian but that we sent him food, or, if near, brought him to a house to be fed, and he is fed and nourished as long as he requires it, free of charge ; and to do that, the Hudson's Bay Company lay up nearly double the quantity of food they require otherwise to feed the Indians. The Indian is taught to speak the truth, so that if any of you were travelling through that country and you were starving and wanted food, if you met an Indian and obtained a supply of provisions from him and gave him a scrap of paper with some pencil marks upon it which he did not understand, telling him he would get a certain payment at his Fort he would take it as readily in payment as one of us would do a sovereign or a bank note—so accustomed are they to be fairly dealt with."

By a clean record of honourable dealing, the Company, and the Dominion Government which has succeeded them, have won the confidence of the Indians. The factors and traders of the Company were men of intelligence and integrity, very superior to the ordinary frontier pioneer. And the body of about 1,000 mounted police who now control the North West has succeeded more by moral influence than physical force in teaching the Indians to respect the law. Mission schools and farm instructors are beginning to wean them from their roving life and the absolute prohibition of the liquor traffic does much to save them from degradation and ruin. The Indians in the whole of British North America have increased from 108,000 in 1881 to 124,000 in 1888, which is perhaps the best proof of the success of

⁵ The "North American Indians and Friends," London, Edward Marsh, 1844.

⁶ Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute, vol. XIV, pp. 58-97, vol. XV, pp. 180-220.

the policy which has been pursued. It was said of the Indians by the Hon. A. G. Archibald, in words similar to those of William Penn, "There is one thing our people have learned with regard to the Indians, that is, if they suspect you, you can do nothing with them, but if they see you are in earnest to benefit them, they give you their entire confidence. I have been engaged with them in several treaties, and been constantly with them, and I can say that I always found them faithful and honest, I might almost say, native gentlemen."⁷

MISSIONARY EFFORT IN SOUTH AFRICA AND AUSTRALIA.

In South Africa and Australia the question has been dealt with less satisfactorily though there has been a growing disposition to act fairly towards the natives. Missionary effort, however, has in several places been most successful. One South African and one Australian instance will serve to show with what practical wisdom the civilizing influence of Christianity may be applied.

A well managed mission station such as Lovedale⁸ in the South Kafir district is an object lesson of good government to the natives. Upwards of 300 pupils from all parts of South Africa are here given a useful education. Dr. Stewart owes his success to the fact of trying to understand the natives thoroughly and working upon the good points of their character. The Kafirs, who number upwards of a million and a half in the Cape Colony and Natal, are strong in their class feeling and their devotion to a ruling power. The order and authority of a well appointed Mission Station are on this account well calculated to favourably impress them, and in point of fact a commanding influence has been exercised by such men as Dr. Stewart and the late Bishop Colenso, to whom the Zulus would appeal upon matters even of national importance.

My other example is the Spanish Mission of New Norcia in the Victoria plains of Western Australia. It was thus described by Sir Frederick Broome, the Governor of the Colony, in 1885.⁹ "Here you may see a mediæval monastery, with its religious and laborious life in chapel and in field. Wheat, grapes, olives, figs, and all manner of produce are cultivated on the extensive farms. Australian natives not only sing in church or study in school but are engaged side by side with the monks in agriculture and various industries. The philanthropic and practical work of the Mission among the aborigines of the colony has now been carried on for more than a generation. Year by year, with infinite pains, labour, and expense, it turns a number of the natives into Christian and civilized beings. The Australian aboriginal is a difficult, and, unless caught very young, is generally considered a hopeless subject for the missionary, but the good Bishop and his Benedictines persevere and succeed too in their devoted and admirable work. From what has been said it will be seen that they have accomplished much and certainly more than any other similar organisation in Australia. The first principle of the work in New Norcia is that it shall go beyond schooling and religious teaching. I have known a full-blooded, low type savage go out from this noble mission into civilized life, not only a good Christian, but an expert telegraphist."

THE PACIFIC.

Much has been done by missionaries in other parts of the Pacific; much more would have been done but for their inability to protect the natives from the filibustering expeditions of European adventurers. In order to prevent the terrible consequences that have resulted from the unrestricted admission of traders to the South Sea Islands, it seems necessary that the civilized states of the world should exercise jurisdiction in some way over the whole of the Pacific, and exclude the bands of lawless whites whose unscrupulous dealings have often made these Islands hells on earth. However averse we may be to the extension of colonial responsibilities, it is the duty of a nation to devise effectual means for controlling the rapacity and cruelty of its subjects. The High Commission for the Western Pacific, constituted by the Kidnapping Acts of 1872 and 1875,¹⁰ is an attempt by England, which has been partially successful, to regulate the Polynesian labour traffic and to protect the natives outside the limits of a British Colony or the jurisdiction of any civilized Power. It is much to be regretted that there has hitherto been no concerted action of the Powers on this subject.

⁷ Until recent years the policy of the United States towards the Indians was unworthy of so enlightened a country. Great changes, however, have taken place, largely as the result of Mrs. Helen H. Jackson's "Century of Dishonour."

⁸ *Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute*. Vol. xv., p. 68, &c.

⁹ *Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute*, Vol. xvi., p. 209.

¹⁰ Statutes 35, and 36 Vic., c. 19, and 38 and 39 Vic., c. 51.

THE FIJI ISLANDS.

More complete success has attended the annexation of the Fiji Islands in 1874.¹¹ Subjected from the year 1840 to the settlement of whites of the roughest class, and devastated by intertribal wars, the efforts of the missionaries alone saved the Islands from utter anarchy. As long ago as 1859 the native chiefs offered the sovereignty of the group to the Queen of England. This was declined, and a native government, assisted by Europeans, was established, which produced a state of things simply intolerable, involving the demoralization and ruin of the race, and their disappearance at the rate of from 3,000 to 5,000 a year. Since 1874 the story is a different one; the fightings of the past have been succeeded by unbroken peace, and the native population is now slowly growing. In 1888 there were among the native Fijians 4,386 births and 3,829 deaths, showing an increase of 450 in one year. This state of things is largely owing to the wisdom of the first Governor, Sir Arthur Gordon. He entered upon his duty in the true spirit. He enquired narrowly and minutely into the community system of the people, travelled through every part of the country, learned the language, sat in the chiefs' houses and heard alike the old songs of the people and the Christian hymns sung by the whole household at the close of the day. The result has been a peaceful acceptance of the British rule and a confidence in its justice and fair dealing which can only be lost by the most reckless government in the future. Sir Arthur Gordon traces this mainly to two things, the careful consideration and investigation of natives' claims to land and respect for their titles and the preservation and maintenance of the community system of the natives. If there were a sudden breaking up of this old social system, in a few months there would probably be fighting and bloodshed, and the native race would be doomed to absolute extinction in no long time. ¹²

PRINCIPLES OF A POLICY LIKELY TO PRESERVE NATIVE RACES.

It now only remains, upon the evidence before us—evidence which illustrates rather than exhausts the subject—to attempt to formulate some of the principles which appear likely to secure the preservation and the welfare of native races brought into contact with civilization. Anything like dogmatic assertion is out of place. The problem can only be solved by patient and unprejudiced examination. It varies widely even within the limits of the British Empire. The scattered Indians of Canada, with their independence, their chivalry, and their vindictiveness, are very different from the compact masses of Kafirs in South Africa, equally brave but submitting themselves to the most rigorous of despotisms. The low-type Aborigines of Australia are more difficult to civilize than the Maories or the South Sea Islanders. The question is of vast magnitude and complexity among the jarring nationalities of South Africa, while in the Fiji Islands it can be successfully treated by a single man. In some cases it is the roving disposition of the natives that has to be overcome, in others it is their apathy and self-indulgence. But nevertheless, the general conclusions may be given for what they are worth.

The dangers which threaten native races in contact with civilization, arise as we have seen from the following causes:—

1. The want of self-restraint found among colonists and traders.
2. The difficulty which races of different customs and civilizations experience in realising one another's habits of thought and life.
3. The weakness of moral stamina and the ignorance which are found in most native races.

Any policy, which is to prove successful, must meet these dangers with their appropriate remedies.

In the first place, it is obviously of great importance that as soon as native races come into contact with civilization, they should come under some civilized jurisdiction which will be exercised over them with absolute justice and an open-handed consideration, and will protect them from unprincipled traders and settlers. This may be secured in several ways. A well constituted court deriving its authority from the concert of civilized powers would probably be most effectual. Where the relations with civilization are mainly commercial, a Chartered Company, such as the Hudson's Bay Company or the Chartered Companies of Africa, appears likely under well-devised regulations to

¹¹ Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute, vol. xiv., p. 159, &c.

¹² In accordance with a promise made in the Congress, I now include the name of M. de Brazza, the distinguished French explorer, of whom an interesting notice is given in the "*Almanack de la Paix, 1889*," under the title "*M. le Brazza et la colonisation pacifique.*"

secure the welfare of the natives. ¹³ Where colonisation is taking place, a protectorate or a Crown Colony whose officers are more directly responsible to the Home Government is to be preferred. In certain cases, as in Canada, the protection of the natives may be safely left to a self-governing and old-established colony. But whatever the form of the jurisdiction, civilization must no longer tolerate the licence which has been allowed to traders and free-booters in the Pacific and on many parts of the African coast.

Secondly, the policy should be guided by an intimate knowledge of the habits and ways of thought of the natives, and be pursued with undeviating kindness. If natives are to be controlled without being exterminated, the control must rest mainly on moral influence—which will be quickly undermined by bad faith or by a policy which leaves out of sight the native side of the question or the native ideas of what is just and fair.

Thirdly, the government of native races must be in some measure paternal in its character. ¹⁴ Since they adopt our vices and are no match for our knowledge, it is necessary to protect them against the results of their own ignorance and want of self-control, sometimes against selling their lands and hunting grounds, sometimes against the allurements of unscrupulous traders, nearly always against the traffic in drink. It is also almost essential to adopt well-considered measures for educating them and improving their moral and material condition. ¹⁵ Under this head, again, concerted action is most desirable. The conclusions of the Brussels Anti-Slavery Conference, which owes so much to the untiring energy of men like King Leopold, Baron Lambertmont, Lord Vivian, and Sir John Kirk, show how large is the field to be covered and how fruitfully it may be occupied.

Upright and generous government, knowledge of the natives, and their protection against their own weaknesses, these are the main features of a successful native policy. I believe the outlook to be a hopeful one. The Brussels Anti-Slavery Conference is only one indication that civilized nations are feeling their moral responsibilities towards native races. Their subjects are no longer left at liberty to work the ruin of natives at their will. Civilized nations are waking up to the duty of freeing their name and their flag from the stain brought on them by the misdeeds of unpatriotic and self-seeking adventurers. And it would be ungenerous not to recognise that the principles which I have ventured to contend for are penetrating consciously or unconsciously into the councils of statesmen and training up a body of colonial administrators who will redeem the errors and crimes of the past. We cannot, if we would, stem the flow of civilization. It has devoured the earth like the raging tide of winter, breaking every barrier and scarring the shore with the marks of its untamed fury, but the time has come for the divine power of human brotherhood to calm this tumultuous sea of passion and greed so that its waves shall kiss the shores of distant continents and islands without disturbing the fragile shells of native life.

The Resolution was seconded by Mr. W. EVANS DARBY, who read *précis* of papers which had been prepared by Miss Ellen Robinson, of Liverpool, and by Mr. H. R. Fox Bourne, Secretary of the Aborigines' Protection Society. Miss Robinson's paper follows in full :—

IN WHAT MANNER CAN THE PROTECTION OF THE LATTER FROM AGGRESSION AND FROM AN INVASION OF THEIR RIGHTS BE BEST SECURED ?

At the root of all the wrongs, which have been, and are still being inflicted, upon weaker races, lies the fact that the maxim "Might is Right" is an accepted principle amongst Christian and civilised, as well as amongst heathen and barbarous nations. Those who are actuated by greed of gain or lust of power, and those who

¹³ As to the regulating of these Companies, see a valuable paper by Commander V. L. Cameron, in "The National Review, June, 1890.

¹⁴ This has always been the basis of the relation between the United States and the Indians. They have been in legal theory independent nations under the protection and in the tutelage of the United States.

¹⁵ In South Africa strenuous attempts have been made at educating the natives. See upon this subject a paper by Wm. Gresswell, Esq., in the Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute vol. xv. pp. 68-104.

are actuated by benevolent and philanthropic motives, are alike in this—their non-recognition of the truth, that the first and primary obligation resting on the stronger, is to treat the weaker with *justice*. No plea of our own interests, and no plea of civilising native races, or of delivering them from tyranny, or rescuing them from evils, justifies us in depriving them of life, liberty, or independence. "To proffer love, and to omit justice is folly and insult" (Professor Newman). Because justice has been omitted, what has been the effect of the intercourse of the stronger with weaker nations, notwithstanding the fervent desires for the welfare of the latter, expressed, and, no doubt, sometimes felt by the former? To quote the late Henry Richard, "Ever since Christendom began in the 13th and 14th centuries to overflow its ancient boundaries, by maritime adventure and colonization, there is scarcely an instance in which the conduct of the stronger, and what ought to have been the juster and wiser races, with those that were uncivilised or semi-civilised, has not been to the latter the source of unspeakable oppression and misery. Look at the Spaniards in Mexico, Paraguay, and Peru. Look at the Portugese in Brazil and India. Look at the Dutch in India and South Africa. Look at the French in Algeria. Look at the conduct of the United States towards the Indians, and England's conduct in India, in China, in the West Indies, and in South Africa. . . . In many instances, those who invaded their shores, and usurped possession of their lands, seem to have acted tacitly, if not avowedly, on the atrocious maxim laid down by one of the judges of the United States in regard to negroes, "that black men or coloured men have no rights which white men are bound to respect." This want of respect to the *rights* of native races is still a ruling principle in our treatment of them, and the peoples of Europe have yet to learn that aggression and oppression are just as much crimes against humanity in uncivilised as in civilised lands. If the principle of equal justice to strong and weak be acknowledged and accepted, we have still to consider in what manner the protection of the latter from aggression and from an invasion of their rights can best be secured.

For this purpose it is highly desirable that some of the Governments of Europe, or even one such, should issue a declaration inviting the adhesion of the other nations to it, which should declare :

1st.—That the acquirement of territory by force or by fraud is manifestly sheer robbery, and that civilised nations agree to no longer pursue these means of enlarging their possessions.

2nd.—That when members of uncivilized races, murder or otherwise injure white men, the brutal and barbarous method of punishing the innocent for the guilty by bombarding towns, and burning villages, should no longer be pursued.

3rd.—That Governments should agree to put a stop to all trade and commerce hurtful to the natives, such as that in intoxicants, weapons, and explosives.

It is altogether a monstrous thing that any nation with the least desire to act righteously, should be engaged in the courses condemned above, yet European nations are guilty of all three at the present hour. How are they dealing with Africa? How were the vast territories now claimed by the Germans and English in East Africa acquired from Sayyed Bargash, the Sultan of Zanzibar? He was by no means a barbarous ruler, but one who by the help of Sir John Kirk, had done much to civilize the country under his rule. Mr. Joseph Thompson points out, that, betrayed by the English and robbed by the Germans, helpless in the face of their superior strength, he surrendered his territory and lost his influence, and ruined and deserted, he died. Thus in the name of civilisation, every principle of law and equity was violated. That it is quite possible to acquire territory justly from native races, to make friends with them, to live at peace with them, and greatly to benefit them, was proved by William Penn in the colonization of Pennsylvania in the 17th century. He never forgot the oneness of humanity, he treated the savage Indians of North America as part of the great family of God. He gave them a fair equivalent for what they gave him. He made arrangements for the just settlement of disputes that might arise by appointing a joint Council of Indians and English. He showed himself their true friend. The consequence was, that surrounded by many tribes of wild Indians, who were constantly at war with other colonies, his colony lived in peace, without armies or armaments of any kind for three quarters of a century. Injustice is in the end as inexpedient as it is wrong.

If some or all civilized nations could be induced to sign and accept such a Declaration as the above, it would, no doubt, be wise to appoint a council consisting of representatives from those nations; this council to act as an official Aborigines

Protection Association, and to examine all treaties made with the nations, and secure to them just and equitable treatment.

As regards the punitive expeditions condemned in the above Declaration, it is no uncommon thing to read in our daily papers a paragraph such as the following extract:—"Lieutenant Stewart was fatally wounded, but the blue jackets had their revenge in shelling a native village near the spot." It would be quite as just to burn a street in Whitechapel because of the murders committed there.

And as regards the commerce, in behalf of which it is our great object to acquire fresh territory. (All our wars for the past 200 years have been for a market, says Professor Seeley). Mr. Joseph Thompson points out that because of the nature of this commerce, European intercourse with Africa has so far been an unmitigated curse, instead of a blessing. To the slave trade, carried on by Europeans till the beginning of this century, to the gin trade, and that in gunpowder and guns still being carried on by them, may be ascribed the frightful evils we have brought upon the negro race. "With weapons of destruction, and vile spirits, we have intensified every barbarous and bloodthirsty propensity in the negro's nature, while arousing in him new bestial appetites calculated to land him in a lower depth of squalor and degradation."

Then there is the question as to how justice is to be secured to those races which have already been subjected to stronger nations, and for whose good government, the latter have made themselves responsible. It is often overlooked by the peoples of Europe that officials entrusted with the government of these races have immense power given to them. They rule over territories larger than some of the countries of Europe with an absolute authority, greater than that of most European Sovereigns. Now, those in this position are sometimes wise and good men, but are not always such, nor is absolute power likely to develop the higher virtues. The power to oppress often leads directly to oppression. Again colonists almost invariably despise conquered races, and are overbearing in their treatment of them, whilst fear of their numbers not unfrequently inclines them to severity and cruelty. Seeing these things are so, it is evident that the rights and liberties of the natives are likely to be infringed upon, and that they are liable to be treated with gross injustice. This has certainly been so in many, if not in most cases, notoriously so in that of England and Zululand. How then is justice to be secured for subject native races? The old Romans, at one period of their history, had tribunes, chosen by the Plebeians, to watch over and protect the rights of the people; and, perhaps, a plan somewhat similar to this might answer now as regards the weaker peoples. The natives might themselves choose a small body of representatives, some from their own people, and some, in whom they had confidence, from the ruling race; and this body should watch over their interests, and endeavour to secure justice both for individuals and the whole native community. In colonies, where, as at the Cape, there is representative government, it is manifestly unjust to exclude any from the franchise on account merely of race or colour, but to prevent the danger of a horde of uncivilized and illiterate voters there might be an educational test of fitness applied to whites and natives alike. This plan would doubtless stimulate the latter to take advantage of the education which ought to be provided for them. It is surely not too much to hope that European and American nations with all their advantages, their privileges, and their high ideals will soon cease from the robbery and oppression of the weaker nations, their younger brothers. To stand aloof from injustice, says Professor Newman, is the motto and flag to which all the highest souls and intellects of mankind under every religion or no religion will enthusiastically rally.

An International Conference on this subject on similar lines to the Berlin and Brussels Conferences would probably do much to arouse general interest in the question, to establish a more righteous basis of action and to lead to some such practical measures as have been proposed above. Might not this present Peace Congress suggest to the Inter-Parliamentary Congress that the members of the latter should bring before their respective Parliaments a proposal that such a Conference be held at no very distant date?

Finally, let us all remember and let the thought urge us on in our efforts for justice and righteousness "that the cries of the oppressed have entered into the ears of the Most High. Such are the purity and certainty of His judgments that He cannot be partial in our favour. He hath opened our understandings concerning our duty towards these peoples, and it is not a time for delay. Should we now be sensible of what He requires of us, and neglect to do our duty in firmness and constancy, still waiting for some extraordinary means to bring about their deliverance, God may by terrible things in righteousness answer us in this matter." (Woolman).

Précis of Paper by H. R. FOX BOURNE.

Note.—The paper appears in the *Aborigines' Friend* No. 3. vol. iv. *New Series.*

The establishment of dominion by civilized States over weaker races, as in the case of the Colonial Empire of Great Britain, however faulty in some of its incidents, is inevitable, and in accordance with the law as to "the survival of the fittest." We cannot hope to prevent further extension both of colonising or, yet more, of trading enterprise, and all we can reasonably expect or effectually strive for, is that it shall be done under more philanthropic conditions than heretofore.

The "weaker races," with whom we have been brought in contact, may be grouped generally in two divisions, the one comprising the North American Indians, the Australians, and others, whose countries have already been to a large extent seized and colonised by white men, for whom all that can now be done to save them, as far as possible, from extermination, and to lighten, if we cannot repair, the injury brought upon them; the other, comprising especially the vast populations of India, already conquered by us, and of Africa, now being viciously "scrambled" for, who can never be ousted though they may be tyrannised over by Europeans.

The African problem is of the most present importance. In this Continent there is more opportunity and better warrant for trading than for colonising enterprise. This is so even in South Africa, yet more in other parts. Here large acquisitions of territory are especially to be deprecated. All we have any right to do, or can expect to do, with any credit or advantage to our rulers, or without injury to the natives, is to extend legitimate trade relations with them, which may probably lead to some sort of sovereignty over those with whom we deal. But to that end it is essential that we should keep within the narrowest limits of our territorial possessions, and require from the natives no more subjection to us than is involved in observance of the contracts freely made by their authorised chiefs and not extorted from them; that there should be no arbitrary interference with their institutions. Such progress in civilization as they may be capable of, being left to the unofficial guidance of missionaries and others, and not insisted on by European Governments; that, above all, such trade as is carried on by the natives shall be legitimate in itself, and not in such commodities, like poisonous liquors, as debase and ruin the natives; and that in International adjustments of "spheres of influence," and the like, the powers and checks agreed upon shall have for their object the prevention, not the organised development, of wrong-doing.

The following paper on this subject was prepared by M. De Montluc, Conseiller à la Cour d'Appel de Douai:—

RAPPORTS DES ÉTATS CIVILISÉS AVEC LES RACES INFÉRIEURES.

"That honesty is the best policy is a maxim which we firmly believe to be generally correct, even with respect to the temporal interest of individuals; but, with respect to societies, the rule is subject to still fewer exceptions, and that for this reason that the life of societies is longer than the life of individuals. It is possible to mention men who have owed great worldly prosperity to breaches of private faith; but we doubt whether it be possible to mention a state which has on the whole been a gainer by a breach of public faith."—Macaulay. *Essay on Clive.*

Nous aurions préféré voir cette intéressante question posée en termes plus irrécusables.

D'une part nous n'aimons pas cette locution: *nations civilisées*, à laquelle nous substituerons celle-ci: *nations policées*. La civilisation est toujours relative: c'est une affaire de "plus ou de moins"; souvent même c'est une question de point de

vue ; c'est ainsi que lorsque deux grandes puissances se partagent toute une vaste partie de continent par le seul droit de leur bon plaisir, on peut se demander si elles agissent en peuples civilisés, et si leurs victimes ne sont pas plus intéressantes et un peu moins barbares qu'elles-mêmes ; toute la différence c'est qu'elles jouissent des bienfaits d'un Gouvernement régulier, dont le mécanisme les met en mesure de satisfaire leur ambition ; tandis que les peuples assujettis à leur usurpation, manquent d'organisation politique et se trouvent par là-même hors d'état de résister.

Nous n'aimons pas davantage cette expression : *races inférieures* . Ne greffons pas les difficultés de l'anthropologie sur celles, déjà considérables, du problème qui nous est soumis ; nous ne pensons pas, d'ailleurs, que la considération des races doive entrer en ligne de compte en matière de droit des gens ; quiconque a face humaine peut se réclamer du *droit* ! Il n'y a pas d'aristocratie parmi les nations : les forts et les faibles sont égaux aux yeux de la loi et le droit des gens est à nos yeux une *loi éritable*.

Nous ne nous occuperons pas, en effet, des devoirs moraux des nations, mais de leurs devoirs juridiques : nous laisserons de côté les obligations qui ne sont que du domaine de la conscience.

Quand nous parlerons des droits et devoirs des nations, il s'agira des droits et obligations garanties par une sanction ou susceptibles de l'être. Quant aux autres obligations elles sont du domaine du moraliste, du philosophe, du prédicateur, ou du missionnaire.

Pour ne pas chicaner sur les mots, nous entendons par *nations civilisées* les nations *policiées*, c'est-à-dire organisées en sociétés, pourvues d'un gouvernement soumis à des lois ou coutumes établies. Car nous n'avons pas la sottise présomption d'établir une échelle de proportion entre telles ou telles civilisations, de déclarer, par exemple, que la Chine ou la Turquie sont moins civilisées que la Russie ou le Mexique, et de fixer le point exact où commence la civilisation et où elle finit.

I. DEVOIRS.

1er.—Le premier devoir d'une nation policiée est de respecter les principes du droit des gens vis-à-vis toutes les autres sans aucune distinction.

Elle doit par conséquent respecter le territoire des nations non policiées avec le même scrupule que celui des puissances européennes.

Et par territoire il faut entendre aussi bien les terres proprement dites (plaines, montagnes, côtes) que les fleuves, lacs, et leur rives, îles, îlots, mers territoriales golfes et baies.

Nous ne faisons pas d'exception pour les terres qui ne seraient pas l'objet d'appropriation privée ; qu'elles soient à un particulier, à une famille, à une tribu ou à l'État (à qui revient, en tous cas, le domaine éminent), elles doivent être sacrées pour tous.

2me.—Une seconde obligation est de respecter la vie, l'honneur, la liberté, et toutes les propriétés des nationaux de l'État non policié.

3me.—Une troisième obligation est de leur assurer, sur notre propre territoire, la jouissance des droits de l'homme : de les protéger dans leurs personnes et dans leurs biens, en leur prêtant à cet effet le concours de la police et de la justice.

On ne saurait admettre, par exemple ni la traite, ni les opérations de *louage forcé* équivalant à des contrats de servage : les victimes de ces ignobles spéculations ont droit à la protection des tribunaux, quelle que soit la nation à laquelle ils appartiennent.

4me.—La quatrième obligation consiste à respecter le droit de l'indépendance de la nation non policiée. S'il plaît à un peuple de vivre à l'état de communisme, de collectivisme ou d'anarchisme complet, ce n'est pas une raison pour qu'une nation policiée s'arroge le droit d'intervenir dans ses affaires intérieures sans motif spécial.

Le droit d'intervention ne peut s'exercer qu'en vertu d'un *traité* dont il s'agit d'exécuter une clause ou d'assurer l'exécution par équivalent.

Nous n'admettons aucune intervention en dehors de ce cas, étant entendu toutefois qu'il ne faut pas confondre le droit à une réparation avec le droit d'intervention.

Nous ne saurions multiplier davantage les obligations *juridiques* de la nation policiée à l'égard de celle qui ne l'est pas.

Nous ne sommes pas disposés notamment à admettre qu'une nation *avancée* ait la mission de communiquer à celles qui le sont moins quelque chose de sa supériorité. En fin de compte cela regarde chaque nation ! Est-il bien sûr que notre civilisation européenne soit, au point de vue de tel ou tel État de l'Afrique, quelque chose d'enviable ? Et si nous avons la prétention de civiliser les nègres, pourquoi des nègres ne passerions-nous pas ensuite aux Musulmans, de ceux-ci aux Chinois, dont la civilisation pontanaire est, ou, moins raffinée, sinon aussi indigne que la nôtre ?

Les libre-penseurs ont-ils le droit de se dire plus civilisés que les Catholiques? Les Catholiques à leur tour peuvent-ils se considérer comme plus civilisés que les Protestants et ceux-ci considérer les Musulmans comme des barbares? Où commence le barbare? Où finit le civilisé? Nous n'avons plus même aujourd'hui de ligne factice de délimitation pour établir le partage. Il fut un temps où tout ce qui ne parlait pas Grec était barbare; puis tout ce qui n'était pas englobé dans l'Empire Romain le devint; puis enfin tout ce qui n'était pas Chrétien le fut à son tour.

Aujourd'hui la langue n'est plus un diagnostic! On peut parler la langue de Shakespeare sans être exclu du monde poli! Quant au Christianisme, des hommes marquants dans les nations les plus avancées ont rompu avec lui plus ou moins ouvertement, et il faut bien le dire, parmi les nations dirigeantes du grand concert européen, une forte proportion des chefs politiques et le tiers au moins du peuple ne sont plus Chrétiens que de nom.

Laissons donc de côté l'étiquette de la religion. Est-ce la croyance en Dieu qui, abstraction faite de toute dénomination de secte, déterminera la civilisation? Moins encore. Les nations considérées comme les plus *cultivées*, marchent vers l'athéisme et ce sont les peuples envisagés comme retardataires qui conservent la foi en l'Être Suprême. La croyance au spirituel n'est donc pas plus l'indice de la civilisation que de la barbarie.

Pour être dans la vérité il faut dire que dans ce siècle de diffusion des lumières, de faciles communications de la pensée, de merveilleuse rapidité de transport, les rangs des nations sont un peu confondus! Dans tous les États il y a des individus extrêmement avancés et des masses retardataires; dans tous les États il y a des individus qui seraient capables d'instruire certains individus d'un autre État quelconque.

Nous n'admettons donc pas *en bloc* de pré-éminence absolue de culture!

Quelle branche d'ailleurs faudrait-il considérer? Les arts, les belles lettres, le droit, l'administration, ou le commerce, l'industrie, les sciences?

En résumé pas de pré-éminence pouvant engendrer l'obligation de communiquer sa supériorité matérielle ou intellectuelle aux nations non policées. Ces nations peuvent, à leur point de vue, se considérer comme plus heureuses que les peuples européens. La liberté, l'espace, la vie facile, le charme de la nature primitive, l'exemption d'impôts ne sont-ils pas des avantages à mettre en balance avec ceux résultant de la vie factice des centres urbanisés? L'habitude, et les besoins que l'habitude a créés en nous, constitue la vraie supériorité de la vie *cultivée*! Avons-nous une plus grande somme de jouissances que certains peuples nomades? C'est ce que ni eux ni nous ne pouvons déterminer faute d'une mesure commune!

Tout ce que nous pouvons constater c'est qu'au point de vue de nos habitudes et au regard de notre opinion publique notre condition sociale paraît supérieure.

Mais notre *opinion* n'est elle pas le résultat de nos habitudes et celles-ci ne sont-elles pas réciproquement dépendantes de notre opinion? Impossible de rien formuler d'absolu à cet égard. Il serait téméraire d'édifier sur le doute et sur le contingent l'obligation précise de faire participer à notre condition, ceux qui n'y sont pas associés par la destinée.

II. DROITS.

Quels sont nos droits vis-à-vis les nations non policées?

Pas un de plus que ceux que nous pouvons avoir vis-à-vis les nations policées.

La barbarie d'un état ne peut nous autoriser à sortir des règles du droit international.

Ir. Je viens de dire que nous n'avons pas le devoir de communiquer notre *culture* aux autres peuples. Je vais plus loin: nous n'avons pas le droit de prétendre les civiliser malgré eux

Nous devons respecter leur *liberté* jusqu'à son extrême limite. Nous n'avons que la faculté légitime de nous défendre contre l'abus que ces peuples pourraient en faire.

Nous nions absolument le droit de s'emparer d'un territoire sous prétexte qu'il est occupé par un peuple barbare.

Si ce peuple a insulté l'un de nos nationaux, nous pouvons en tirer satisfaction. Je comprends qu'un peuple policé aille exercer des actes de haute police dans un État sauvage, châtier les coupables, les capturer, exécuter les principaux complices, exiger une compensation pécuniaire, mais quant à s'emparer des territoires pour se les approprier, c'est un acte de brigandage international que nous ne saurions légitimer.

Les nations qui se disent civilisées, ne donnent, hélas! à cet égard que trop d'exemples de leur mépris de la justice! Elles ne savent même pas donner à leurs violations du droit l'apparence de la modération. Il appartient à la conscience des hommes de Droit de leur infliger un blâme autorisé!

La conquête ne doit plus figurer au nombre des moyens d'acquérir un territoire.

Il faut que le XIX^{me} siècle ose proclamer hautement et sans aucune restriction ce principe.

En ce qui nous concerne nous ne transigerons jamais sur ce point

Les violations qui y sont apportées tous les jours par les plus grandes nations du continent Européen sont à nos yeux autant de *voies de fait*, et ne constitueront jamais des *voies de droit*.

Est-ce à dire qu'il faille déranger la carte du monde, remonter en arrière et discuter les acquisitions ou annexions de provinces ou possessions qui se perdent dans la nuit des temps.

Ce serait chercher le pire sous prétexte de réparer le mal!

Ce qu'il faut c'est faire tous nos efforts pour que ce *desideratum* de la conscience des peuples, pour que ce *dire* des avocats de la philanthropie, devienne un jour une réalité dans le grand procès de l'histoire.

Il existe de nos jours un fort courant en ce sens! L'emportera-t-il sur le courant contraire? Ce n'est pas impossible!

Quand on se sera aperçu que la conquête occasionne plus de déboires qu'elle ne procure de profits, on finira peut-être par y renoncer.

Le siècle est un siècle positif. C'est le côté pratique qui seul peut faire triompher le côté idéal. Quand on constatera qu'il n'y a pas plus de bénéfice que de gloire à faire entrer notre culture à coups de canon et à coups de baïonettes dans la tête des nègres des jaunes ou des métis, on renoncera à faire de la propagande civilisatrice par les procédés de la plus pure barbarie. Nous ne nous faisons pas d'illusions: le droit dominera le jour où l'intérêt *bien compris* des nations policées les fera renoncer à le violer ouvertement en pure perte.

2^{me}. Faut-il reconnaître cependant aux nations policées le droit de faire disparaître un État sauvage dont l'existence est un danger et un dommage tous les jours pour les autres? Oui, tout comme nous reconnaitrions ce droit vis-à-vis une nation policée, mais pas *autrement* et pas davantage.

D'abord ce n'est qu'aux nations limitrophes ou voisines qu'il appartiendrait de soulever la question. Et pour la régler, il faudrait s'entendre et prendre des mesures concertées et exécutées d'un commun accord.

Dans aucun cas nous n'admettrions qu'une ou plusieurs des nations intéressées en profitassent pour accaparer le territoire du peuple à réduire ou le réduire en servitude sous une forme quelconque de domination bien ou mal dissimulée.

Nous reconnaissons seulement le droit de mettre ce peuple hors d'état de nuire; tout de le reconstituer sur des bases nouvelles, sans porter atteinte à son indépendance.

Nous n'admettons donc, même dans ce cas, qu'un simple droit de répression, et non d'intervention permanente.

3^{me}. Nous admettons la légitimité des traités avec les nations non policées; ces traités doivent être respectés comme les autres.

Ces traités peuvent être des traités de commerce, de navigation, des traités de paix, des traités d'alliance.

Mais ils peuvent être aussi des traités de cession de territoire ou de protectorat.

Ces derniers doivent être élaborés et conclus avec la plus grande circonspection.

Les pouvoirs des chefs ou députés étant toujours contestables et douteux chez les nations non policées il ne faut traiter avec elles qu'avec la dernière prudence et en parfaite connaissance de cause.

Tout traité fait sous l'influence de la contrainte, de la fraude, de l'erreur grave est illégal. Illégal aussi serait le traité déterminé par des promesses fallacieuses ou illicites.

Les nations policées doivent se garder d'employer aucun des moyens suivants:—

1^{re}. Intervenir entre deux factions ou tribus aux prises et assurer la pré-éminence de l'une en échange de l'abandon du territoire de l'autre.

2^{me} Renverser un chef pour le remplacer par un autre qui a préalablement promis ou auquel on arrache ultérieurement la promesse de céder tout ou partie de son pays:

3^{me} Venir en aide à une nation non policée dans ses démêlés avec un pays voisin, et échanger tout ou partie de son territoire contre celui de ce pays voisin qu'on l'aide à soumettre, ce qui n'est qu'un autre mode de spoliation déguisée sous l'apparence du service rendu:

4^{me} Se faire consentir le germe d'une cession de territoire en termes ambigus, qui n'indiquent *clairement* qu'une promesse de protection pour l'état faible, et impliquent en réalité un acheminement vers une *acquisition territoriale*, dans la langue volontairement obscure de la diplomatie.

5^{me} Mettre une nation non policée dans l'alternative entre la conquête et le

protectorat, c'est-à-dire arriver à quelque chose de légal en apparence par la menace de quelque chose qui ne l'est pas.

Ôme La mettre dans l'alternative entre la destruction et le protectorat, c'est-à-dire entre deux choses que nous admettons éventuellement l'une et l'autre, mais à la condition que par la menace ou l'offre de l'une, on n'arrive pas indirectement à l'autre.

Nous admettons la destruction d'un État criminel, violant habituellement les principes essentiels du Droit des gens, mais pour le reconstruire sur les bases d'une Société nouvelle, non pour usurper son territoire ou l'annexer à titre de protectorat imposé.

La plus grande réserve s'impose donc à l'égard des nations non policées.

Ajoutons cette considération, trop souvent négligée et capitale cependant.

La grande difficulté en matière internationale est celle de la *preuve*.

Entre nations policées on arrive presque toujours à se mettre d'accord sur les principes, mais le plus souvent on n'est pas d'accord *en fait*. Dans la plus petite affaire de parlementaires, de prisonniers, d'ambulances, chacun soutient que c'est l'ennemi qui a tiré le premier, violé la convention de Genève, armé des paysans, fusillé des réguliers. La même chose ne se passe-t-elle pas en temps de paix à chaque abordage de navires ?

Chacun rejette la faute sur le navire étranger, et, ce qu'il y a de plus curieux, c'est que chacun fournit des témoins catégoriques et des arguments péremptoirs.

Ne voit-on pas que la difficulté décuple lorsqu'on a affaire à des nations non policées ?

"Vous avez massacré nos commerçants, nos missionnaires, incendié leur demeure ! C'est le commerçant qui a commencé ! Il a battu ou fait battre tel ou tel des nôtres, l'a menacé de son *revolver*, il a séduit ou voulu séduire la fille d'un tel, la femme de tel autre ! Le feu ? C'est lui qui l'a mis étant ivre, ou l'un de ses domestiques ! ou bien : c'est un vagabond, un ivrogne, un fou qui a fait le coup ! Le missionnaire ? il a enlevé un enfant à ses parents ; nié nos Dieux, attaqué par ses prédications nos chefs, nos inoeurs, nos coutumes, qui sont nos lois à nous, insulté notre nation, nos ancêtres, profané notre culte !"

Comment savoir, et surtout *comment prouver* la vérité ?

4me.—Nous avons laissé de côté ce qui n'est que du domaine de la conscience. Les expéditions entreprises dans l'intérêt de la science, de la divulgation des connaissances humaines, de la conversion des païens, ne sauraient à nos yeux figurer au nombre des devoirs ou des droits juridiques internationaux.

Les particuliers ou les associations qui les entreprendront n'auront d'autres droits que les autres nationaux et par exemple que les entrepreneurs d'expéditions commerciales ou industrielles.

Les intentions des uns comme des autres seront souvent suspectées par les nations non policées. Ils courent de grands dangers. Ils savent à quoi ils s'exposent et s'exposent à ce qu'ils savent, c'est-à-dire en définitive à ce qu'ils veulent.

La nation à laquelle ils appartiennent aura le droit, le devoir même de les protéger, et de tirer satisfaction des offenses, dommages ou crimes dont ils seraient victimes.

Mais il ne faut pas oublier que jamais la satisfaction à retirer ne pourra être une acquisition de territoire et que la revanche, vindicte ou châtement, ne devra pas être proportionné à la cruauté, à la férocité des coupables ; leur ignorance, leur barbarie est une circonstance atténuante de leur faute : les peuples sauvages sont naturellement ombrageux et violents ; il est périlleux de s'aventurer au milieu d'eux, sage de n'y point aller, rationnel en tout cas de n'y aller qu'à ses risques et périls.

Le châtement ne doit donc atteindre que les coupables immédiats ; il serait inique de faire remonter la responsabilité de leur faute jusqu'à l'État ou à ses chefs, aucun bien de véritable responsabilité juridique ne pouvant être présumé dans les Sociétés non policées ; quant à la solidarité humaine, notion purement morale, elle ne peut avoir pour résultat de faire partager aux innocents la faute des coupables, ce qui serait la retourner contre son objectif manifeste.

III.—SANCTION.

L'accomplissement du *devoir moral* procure la satisfaction intime de la conscience : c'est là son unique sanction.

Quelle est la sanction du *devoir juridique* et de son corrélatif le *droit*, à l'égard d'une nation non policée, c'est-à-dire qui n'est pas présumée vivre dans le *status juridicus* ? Il semble qu'il n'en existe pas.

Si l'on y regarde de près, on voit qu'elle peut exister.

1r. D'abord la nation non policée peut exceptionnellement se trouver dans un rapport juridique avec tel ou tel État, policé ou non. Elle peut avoir contracté ou, sans contrat, réalisé une alliance, pacte d'amitié, de commerce, de navigation, de protectorat, etc., etc.—dans tous ces cas cette nation, dépourvue du *status juridicus* quant à son droit public interne, a momentanément au moins et *pour ce dont il s'agit* —ce qui est tout pratiquement—emprunté le *status jurisdictus* international.

Ici la *sanction* apparaît d'elle-même : elle est la même que dans les rapports entre États policés.

2me. Second cas. La nation non policée se trouve être mise en cause ou intervenir par le fait ou la volonté d'une ou plusieurs nations policées. Ici encore la notion de droit naît clairement : la sanction apparaît clairement aussi. Supposons, par exemple, deux puissances dont le territoire est séparé par un État non policé ; l'une d'elles passe par son territoire ou le force à concéder le passage ; ou au contraire l'État non policé mobilise spontanément des forces pour s'opposer à ce passage, ou bien est requis de le faire par une ou deux puissances voisines. Du *fait* naît un *droit*. L'autre puissance aura-t-elle le *droit* de résister à ce fait ? devra-t-elle le subir ? pourra-t-elle au moins traiter légitimement avec l'État non policé pour obtenir la concession d'un avantage pareil, ou le retrait, la suspension, la cessation de cet avantage ?

Il est visible que, quoi qu'il advienne, ce qui aura lieu sera pourvu d'une *sanction* au moins éventuelle. Nous retombons dans les termes du droit international ordinaire entre nations policées, avec ce SIMPLE ÉLÉMENT DE FAIT EN PLUS qu'un tiers État non policé est en cause.

Actuellement il arrive presque toujours qu'en pareil cas le droit international est violé au détriment de l'État non policé ; à la conclusion de la paix les deux nations policées se dédommagent des frais de la campagne au détriment du troisième État, sous un prétexte ou sous un autre, et se réconcilient à ses dépens ; on a même souvent l'impudence d'invoquer l'intérêt de la civilisation pour justifier une semblable violation du droit des gens. Ne voit-on pas en pleine paix de grandes puissances accaparer d'immenses territoires, sous l'euphémisme protectorat, neutralisation, voie de transit, pays d'influence ! (Qu'ont-à voir les tierces puissances ?). "Et quant à ce que nos évangélistes et leurs associés du Kulturkampf appellent les races inférieures, leur *partage* est d'être partagé ? Elles ne jouissent point du *status juridicus* : elles n'ont pas droit aux privilèges qui en dérivent !"

C'est tout le contraire qui doit avoir lieu. Le droit international doit être d'autant plus strictement observé qu'un État non policé est en cause. Le droit n'est point un privilège : les faibles, les incapables doivent compter sur sa protection plus rigoureusement encore que les autres.

D'ailleurs l'intérêt de tous les États policés est d'obtenir de ceux qui ne le sont pas leur adhésion aux règles du Droit Public, et cette adhésion ne s'obtiendra que par la mise en lumière de la supériorité du Droit sur la Force. Là est la seule propagande fructueuse.

C'est par les bienfaits inhérents à la condition de Société Policée qu'on pourra conquérir à ce système les Sociétés non policées. Ce n'est pas par les pratiques de la barbarie qui amènera les barbares à la civilisation.

Que se passera-t-il donc, d'après notre doctrine ? La puissance qui se plaint de ce que l'État non policé a, par exemple, accordé le passage à son ennemi, pourra lui demander des explications, et si elles sont refusées prendre ses mesures pour paralyser l'avantage concédé à son adversaire, par exemple à son tour certains points de l'État intermédiaire, un défilé, une embouchure de fleuve, une forêt, une montagne, etc., etc. Lorsque la paix se débattira, les deux puissances auront à stipuler les conditions de l'évacuation de l'État non policé, les réparations qui lui seront dues ou qu'il devra, les mesures à prendre pour que désormais sa frontière soit plus visible, plus facile à défendre, plus difficile à franchir ; tout cela pourra faire l'objet de traités de délimitation, de fortification ou de rectification de frontières, d'indemnités de guerre, de désarmement, de toutes sortes de conventions, en un mot, tout comme entre nations toutes policées.

Dans toutes les conventions les droits et devoirs que nous avons tracés ci-dessus doivent être inscrits, visés, ou tout au moins observés : ils passeront ainsi dans le domaine du *droit public positif*.

3me. Ce n'est pas tout.

La conduite d'un État policé vis-à-vis d'un non policé pourra être l'objet d'observations, de demandes d'explications, de pourparlers diplomatiques, de conflits, de suspension de relations, d'hostilités même entre deux ou plusieurs États policés.

Les exemples pourraient être infinis. Inutile d'en citer beaucoup. Supposons qu'un État policé soit devenu, par l'acquisition d'un non-policé, voisin limitrophe

d'une autre puissance policée, ou de ses possessions : il peut résulter de cet état de choses modifié un désavantage au moins apparent ou relatif pour cette puissance dont la frontière n'est en réalité plus dans la même condition. De là, demande d'explications, échange de notes, mobilisation peut-être, prise de gages, etc., etc. ; si l'on arrive à un arrangement, les clauses devront en être *basées* sur les principes que nous avons établis ci-dessus, et qui passeront ainsi du domaine de la théorie dans la pratique.

4me. D'une façon générale même la politique d'une puissance policée peut porter ombrage à une autre en raison de ses procédés à l'égard d'un ou de plusieurs États non-policés. Des critiques de toute nature (simples prétextes de chicane ou raisons vraies) peuvent être élevées à ce sujet. Ces critiques ne sauraient se fonder sur des raisons purement humanitaires : elles doivent avoir une assiette plus solide, le *droit*, constitué et compris tel que nous venons de l'indiquer, c'est-à-dire l'application aux peuples non policés, qui sont après tout des *gens* eux aussi, des règles générales du *droit des gens*.

Une puissance européenne, par exemple, pourra-t-elle demander légitimement des explications à une autre pour avoir bombardé un port d'un État non policé, sans déclaration préalable ni de guerre ni de bombardement ? Assurément non, à moins, 1r., que ce bombardement n'ait porté directement préjudice à ses propres vaisseaux, à ses agents militaires, consulaires ou autres fonctionnaires, à ses nationaux ou à leur propriété, ou 2me., qu'elle ne soit liée à cet État non policé par un traité d'alliance ou de protectorat.

Intervenir en dehors d'une raison légitime serait une offense, d'où naîtrait un droit, susceptible de *sanction*.

Intervenir légitimement donnerait également naissance à l'application du droit.

Nous pourrions en dire autant pour une annexion, une neutralisation de fleuve ou de territoire, pour un *blocus*, pour l'exercice des prises maritimes, de l'armement en course, de la traite ou de sa répression, etc.

Tout cela, pratiqué vis-à-vis un État non policé, peut donner naissance à la mise en pratique du *droit* entre nations policées.

Mais nous n'admettons pas le droit de remontrance prenant sa source en lui-même. Ce serait un mal pour un bien : il donnerait, sous prétexte de redresser les torts, naissance à plus de complications et à plus d'événements funestes qu'il n'accomplirait de réformes. Il faut à tout État interveneur un *locus standi* c'est-à-dire une *qualité* pour intervenir.

5me. Voilà comment nous comprenons la théorie et la mise en pratique des droits et devoirs à l'égard des États non policés.

La plus grande circonspection, les plus extrêmes scrupules, le plus minutieux attachement aux principes ; n'employer la force que pour le triomphe ou pour la revanche du droit et dans les strictes limites de sa vraie mesure.

Ne point prendre pour point de départ le point de vue de la supériorité des races, ou de la hiérarchie des civilisations, mais au contraire l'égalité des droits de tous les peuples sans distinction.

Pour cela, réfléchir à la composition monstrueusement mélangée des sociétés raffinées, qui présentent les plus sordides, à côté de couches superficiellement vernissées, mais non exemptes de tares elles-mêmes ; se demander s'il y a lieu de s'enorgueillir tant que ça de la condition du plus grand nombre, chez les peuples du grand concert européen ! et si l'on est en droit de se considérer comme assez parfait pour entreprendre de moraliser les peuplades lointaines.

Nous comprenons l'orgueil national, pour la défense du sol et la glorification du drapeau qui symbolise l'héroïsme de nos pères ; pour tout ce qui a trait à l'affermissement de cette trilogie fondamentale : terre, patrie, famille, triple terme, qui, à l'analyse ne représente qu'une seule et même idée, le foyer !

Nous comprenons aussi cet orgueil pour nous inspirer le désir d'améliorer la condition de cette chère patrie, qui n'est que la terre en petit, et la famille en grand ! que tous nos efforts tendent à la grandeur du pays natal, qu'il soit inexpugnable au-dedans, riche, calme, brillant, qu'il soit aimé, admiré, respecté, *redouté* même, dans le bon sens du mot, au dehors ! Tout cela est légitime, humain et vrai !

Mais qu'on n'aille pas dissiper les ressources vives, et le trésor de gloires de cette bien-aimée terre natale, sous prétexte de répandre aux quatre coins de l'Univers une *civilisation* dont nous avons grand besoin de ménager les bienfaits aux quatre-vingt-cinquièmes de nos compatriotes ignorants, vicieux, infirmes, indigents ou tout au moins gênés.

La philanthropie à nos yeux a pour véritable base la patrie. Elle est la *question sociale* de l'humanité ! Commençons d'abord par la résoudre en famille ! Quand nous aurons établi le véritable *status juridicus* à la maison, nous verrons s'il y a quelque chose à faire chez les autres. Restons chez nous en attendant.

Et quand la nécessité nous met en rapport avec les autres, que notre loi soit celle-ci :

Ne faites pas à autrui ce que vous ne voudriez pas qu'on vous fit à vous-mêmes !"

IV. OBJECTIONS.

On dira que nous restreignons considérablement la mission des peuples policés.

En tant que peuples, oui. Quant aux individus qui composent ces peuples, nul ne saurait chercher à comprimer leur force d'expansion ; le commerçant peut se lancer au loin dans toutes les spéculations et dans toutes les explorations qui n'auront rien de contraire à la loi des nations policées et au droit international public ou privé.

Il peut former à cet effet des associations commerciales ou civiles.

Les missionnaires peuvent sous le bénéfice des mêmes lois et sous les mêmes réserves, se livrer aux pacifiques campagnes de la propagation de leur foi.

Ils ont droit de leur côté à la protection nationale et à celle du droit général des gens.

Mais rien de plus ! On ne saurait leur attribuer ou leur laisser usurper aucun *droit de commander*, aucuns pouvoirs militaires, aucunes facultés législatives, judiciaires ou réglementaires dans des territoires habités.

Nous concéderons que leur nation soit autorisée à les secourir par des recommandations officielles ou même des subventions de toute nature. Toute œuvre, considérée comme utile ou bienfaisante, peut être encouragée et favorisée des deniers de l'État : c'est à une question de droit public absolument interne, dans laquelle aucun autre État n'a le droit de pénétrer.

Dans cette limite seulement, nous admettons l'ingérence de l'État dans ces entreprises particulières ; mais pas au-delà.

On nous dira peut-être, que nous voulons retarder la conquête du monde barbare à la civilisation. Nous ne voulons pas plus de conquête sociale, que de conquête militaire.

L'assimilation, si elle doit se faire, se fera lentement, progressivement, et mûrement.

Si elle ne s'opère de plein gré, en pleine connaissance de cause, elle ne saurait être durable ; car on ne viole pas impunément les droits de la liberté humaine.

Donc que la seule arme des missionnaires soit la persuasion, que la seule force des commerçants soit l'attrait de leurs échanges, et la loi de l'offre et de la demande !

Appuyés sur les Baïonettes, la foi devient intolérance et le commerce exploitation !

Comment admettre d'ailleurs que l'État se fasse apôtre au-delà des mers, à une époque où tous les gouvernements libéraux tendent à se limiter à l'intérieur ?

Alors qu'on décourage, qu'on neutralise, tout au moins, la foi en Europe, comment irait-on la subventionner en Afrique ou en Asie ?

Que le missionnaire, fidèle à ses principes, puise en lui-même et en sa foi les éléments de son inspiration ! Que son zèle s'échauffe au foyer de l'enthousiasme chrétien, que la grandeur et l'héroïsme de sa mission l'éleve à la hauteur d'âme nécessaire pour en affronter les périls ! qu'il soit martyr . . . mais pas fonctionnaire !

S'il est l'agent d'un gouvernement, il ne sera plus le représentant d'un Dieu ! Qu'il se dévoue en contemplation de la croix, son symbole, et non par la perspective d'un ruban de décoration, d'un titre honorifique ou d'un emploi salarié !

Restreinte dans ces termes, nous n'avons aucune objection à formuler contre la propagande des particuliers ! Mais nous ne voulons point qu'elle revête de caractère officiel.

Nous voulons moins encore que sous couleur d'exploration, une puissance tire parallèles pour l'acquisition ultérieure d'un pays, fonde des sociétés pour acheter des étendues de terrain à des possesseurs plus ou moins réels, se les fasse rétrocéder ensuite, et vienne s'y installer en maîtresse, étalant à la face du monde civilisé le produit de manœuvres qui constituent en somme une véritable escroquerie internationale.

Que les particuliers eux-mêmes (individus ou sociétés privées), se montrent donc extrêmement réservés dans leurs agissements en pays non policés !

Ils courent le risque d'être traités en martyrs ou en espions ; le moindre faux pas peut être interprété comme une provocation, le moindre mensonge comme une supercherie ! Qu'ils n'oublient pas qu'il faut peu de chose dans leur situation—toujours critique—pour allumer une irréparable conflagration ! Qu'ils songent à leur sécurité et aussi à la Paix du Monde ! Le plus grand service qu'ils rendront à

l'humanité sera de lui épargner toute occasion de conflits sanglants.

Une terrible responsabilité pèse sur leurs épaules ! Ils représentent la civilisation : ce n'est point par des massacres qu'on fera triompher la cause !

A paper was presented by Mrs. Richardson, of Bessbrook, Ireland, on the Peace policy of William Penn, printed copies of which were distributed among the members of the Congress. It has been published under the title, "A National Example of Peace Policy," and may be obtained from the Peace Society, 47, New Broad-street, E.C.

M. F. BAJER, of Copenhagen, communicated a scheme for an International Declaration upon the occupation of territory, taken from the *Revue de Droit International*, Bruxelles, &c., 1888, xx., pp. 605, 606. Also a scheme prepared by M. Engelhardt of rules to be followed in the occupation of territory, taken from *L'Annuaire de l'Institut de Droit International*—Bruxelles, 1887, 1888, pp. 254, 255.

Signor Mazzoleni, of Milan, also supplied the Congress with the following paper :—

RELATIONS OF CIVILIZED STATES TOWARDS WEAKER RACES.

In order to answer to the question put under this head we must before all well fix our ideas on civilization and on its ends.

Eminently learned men have on this delicate question widely different opinions, and consequent schemes at great variance on the application of the principle of colonisation.

Have the great European states the right to subjugate to their civilization—deemed superior—the deemed inferior races, and to annihilate them when refractory ?

It is answered on many sides a right to barbarity cannot be acknowledged, and that a better race must then by the selective law improve or disperse, if necessary, the weaker races.

We do not accept in its disheartening and barbarous application the principles of a scientific and political positivism, the direct consequence whereof would be to absolve any social crime in the name of civilization.

It is contended that civilization means just the expansion of the best races accompanied by the gradual extinction of the weaker ones.

The expansion, it is said, of civilised nations, is an historical fact, in all ages as exemplified by all great nations from Greece to Rome, from the maritime republics of the middle ages to England, to America.

The great States, add the supporters of Colonial politics, must continually enlarge the markets for their trade, thus relieving pauperism and smoothing the asperity of the social question.

Were these great diversions no longer to renovate the life of populations, civilisation would soon become corrupted just as land exhausted by continuous tilling, loses of its fertility.

Nations who do not expand grow weak, and losing the condition of possible conquerors, end, it is said, by becoming themselves conquered.

The right of conquest is thus sanctioned as the consequence of a natural law, and it is proclaimed that force is violence only in itself, whole force in the service of civilisation is *right*, a vivifying spark shot out in the collision with barbarity.

These principles, as we have stated, are not ours. We, who are democrats in the widest sense, want all democracies to be respected under any meridian, in any way governed, or to any degree civilised. The moral law, common to all peoples, demands respect to the liberty and independence of every country, and we cannot allow that the history of colonisation is the history of civilisation, nor that a people without colonies is a worthless people.

We let alone cant.

A true and healthy democracy does not approve of the extravagant policy leading to the great African undertakings.

Our *Erotrea* can inveigle minds easily kindled by the classical records of Scipio,

but it may conceal great dangers for our young nation, risen at the bidding of our poets and her literature, asserted by the martyrdom of the harbingers of her political unity, later on by the concord of the combatants for a common cause, and lastly by the plebiscites representing the triumph of the national idea strengthened by the will of all the citizens.

Perhaps we are single-minded, but of civilisation we entertain a more humane idea, and as we do not admit privileges for any caste, so we can neither approve of one race prevailing over another. Differences of colour do not legitimate oppression. The deemed superior races owe respect to the inferior ones, just as in a family the eldest son owes love and protection to the last born, and, in general, the strong to the feeble, the rich to the poor, the reveller to the dejected.

Discarding as immoral the theory by which civilisation should be imposed with the aid of gunshots, we put the following question : " Given the right, or at least the political opportunity of the great States to possess colonies in wild or semi-barbarous countries, how must such policy be internationally ruled ? "

The new colonial law cannot be that of ancient Rome : *propugnanda imperii et specula populi romani*, nor that of Venice which, though a monument of juridical and administrative wisdom, is not in accordance with the principles of modern civilisation.

Woe to Italy, if in following a fatal tradition she ought in order to defend Eritrea, to push on Abyssinia, and repeat the classical *delenda Carthago*.

African possessions, lay undoubtedly the seed of new causes of contests and wars between the great nations. Hence the necessity for Peace Societies to take precautions against these dangers by endeavouring to fix the rules of colonial law, not on behalf of the single states, but of European peace and true civilisation.

Admitting the principle of juridical equality between the states in the International Union, it may be asked, what ought to be the mission of the civilised states towards those populations who, while being self-governed, are considered less civilised and even barbarous. (1)

Civilised states must, for example, put down *piracy*, but taking for the purpose only measures agreeing with the *acknowledged* rules of international law, *modified* if necessary, with due regard to the special circumstances of the case, and to necessary defence against barbarous practices, but without ever losing sight of the high social aim that to these populations also, notwithstanding their low standard of culture, a humane treatment is due.

An outrage to human dignity going to the length of treating such populations as so many *piratical associations*, cannot be countenanced. A savage population settled on a bounded territory and possessing an established authority acting as the organ of their internal law, is to all intents and purposes a state, and must be considered such among the members of the international community, in spite of their customs and vices, which cannot evidently deprive these aggregations of the character of political units.

" Whenever an uncivilised community possesses an established government, it must be respected by the civilised governments, at least to such an extent that intercourse with such people must at first be opened with its government, and to the latter amends for outrages must be asked, when a right exists to exact amends from such people." (2)

A state may at times violate the fundamental principles of international law without forfeiting, by so doing, the rights pertaining to a state. International law must then take into account difference of culture and the different conditions in which states are progressing towards a more advanced stage of civilisation, and govern the intercourse between states as they exist with all their differences, in the same way as the internal law of a people must follow step by step the evolutionary progress of the same.

Therefore international law must not confine its action to draw up general rules of intercourse only between civilized States, but direct also *practically* the relation with less civilized States, or being in a stage of formation. International law must particularly take a keen interest in the social conditions (as they appear externally), the nature, life and present history of the populations.

It must govern social relations not by hard and fast rules, but with reference to their origins and surroundings, and allow for the natural and necessary development

(1) This question is discussed with much skill by Professor Francisco P. Contuzzi (Rassegna di Scienze Sociali e Politiche Anno III. Vol. II. Fasc. LXV.) from whom we borrow many of the arguments reported.

(2) Dudley Field. Outlines of an international code, p. 79.

of the States, and for the historical contingencies of the population striving to attain the rank of perfect political units.

As much respect is due to a State in a stage of incipient culture as to one in a more advanced stage. The not yet wholly civilized state coming into contact with another more civilized, will acquire the habit to observe treaties, seeing, that on them only it can rely for the defence of its persons, territory and property.

It may then be established as a principle of right that the civilized States are bound to respect the political individuality of the less civilized States, and to consider them in case of war, as belligerent parties protected by the same international Statutes governing now-a-days the right of war as it is called in common parlance.

Civilisation tending to assimilate barbarous populations to the civilized ones, and not to the destruction of the former, must, better than to the horrors of war, be entrusted to the beneficial work of *colonisation*.

Colonial policy is now taking a place among the great social functions of civilized nations, and upon it they ought to come to an international understanding, and feel that their interest in a common and truly civilising course of action is the same.

Colonisation in the modern sense must have in view only, as formerly, the good of the mother-countries, but a loftier social interest.

The principle affirmed in the proud phrase of Roman conceit *adversus hostem aeterna auctoritas*, can no more be in its absolute meaning, the basis of our public law.

New moral and political principles are now prevailing according to which all human communities are deemed equal to one another, so that the smallest or the youngest need not be sacrificed to the largest or the more ancient. Political economy has proved and continues to prove that even the financial interests both of the mother-countries and the colonies are the more furthered, the more right is substituted for violence, and the new Society is enabled to improve so as to take a place in the civil association of the other nations.

The differences between races will gradually lessen and die out, by their being progressively brought into closer intercourse, and the rather decayed Caucasian race will for its own part come out toughened again, and a *coetus hominum* and a *jus humanum* will be made if possible.

The necessity for a constant interchange of the products of economical activity as of moral life, is felt by all peoples, and the more this conviction makes its way the stronger grows the conviction, that in international society everybody lives for all and all for everybody, and that international relations must rest on the knowledge of our own rights tempered by that of the reciprocal duties. And this is precisely what constitutes the solidarity of nations in the development of right, and must guide them in their reciprocal intercourse.

Conquests of modern civilization, sanctioned also by treaties (1), are *freedom of worship, freedom of trade, free navigation of rivers, the abolition of the slave trade, the abolition of privateering, freedom of trade during hostilities, the obligation to try a friendly mediation before declaring war, the resort at last to arbitration, and the conclusion to this end of permanent treaties between two or more nations.*

International law must by degrees be taught to peoples outside the pale of our civilization or just now entering it.

We do not want the destruction of any civilization, but the co-existence of all, thinking that by this the advancement of international law towards its ultimate uniformity will not be furthered.

Respect to the independence and autonomy of the States and to their degree of culture, are the best means to attain gradually the expansion of International law.

To reach the universal acknowledgment of the fundamental principles of international law is no doubt our goal, but while aspiring to the realisation of such high conception, we must allow for juridical inequalities brought on by the special wants of certain peoples and by their peculiar surroundings, requiring peculiar institutions which would not be missed in other times and places.

For these inequalities, carrying with them strong differences in juridical notions among the different peoples, is to be found the greatest difficulty to a universally accepted solution of the great questions of international law.

There is no doubt that any accepted rule of international law supposes a previous concomitant, and in every case lasting community of interests, between the peoples who acknowledge such rule.

The supreme and final mission of international law consists in strongly organising the conciliation between the moral and material requirements of the

(1) Vienna, 1819; Aix-la-Chapelle, 1818; Paris, 1876; G n ve, 1864; St. Petersburg, 1868; Berlin, 1878.

community, consisting of all the peoples having reached the same stage of civilization, and the legitimate autonomy of each member of such community. In other words, the problem to be solved is that of satisfying at the same time, in accordance with reason and history, the wants of local life, with the fundamental aspirations of humanity.

International law, as the whole of the principles which govern international relations with the end of enabling society to attain higher stages of culture and welfare, cannot but represent the rules of those nations who have acquired the sense of solidarity and of the usefulness of their union in one society under the protection of the same principles of rights.

International law, as an aggregate of principles of right acknowledged by all States, and binding them in the sense of community and reciprocal defence, cannot be the privilege of any State, but must bear the character of universal and humanitarian solidarity, and stand above any conception peculiar to race or religion.

The more civilised peoples owe respect to the political and juridical individuality as their inferiors, and must exercise over them not the fierce sway of conquerors, but a civilising action of peace, liberty, and social well being, the goal of human civilisation.

From these lofty standpoints it is my opinion that the Congress ought to study the difficult problem of colonisation, and adopt resolutions determining a new current of opinion and a new and more humane policy.

DISCUSSION.

Miss COLENSO, in supporting the resolution, said she was afraid they were a long way off from the recognition of the rights of man in regard to what were called the weaker races. She could only speak from her own knowledge of what had been going on in her own corner of Africa as to the treatment which English people had been giving to the weaker races, and especially the Zulus. It was true, to a great extent, that there was a great want of self-restraint on that outside edge of civilisation among men who called themselves civilised; but the natives found themselves worse off when they found themselves protected by a mother, who behaved like the traditional step-mother, than they might be if they were admittedly orphans. She was sorry to say that their step-mother was the English Colonial Office. The Natal Colonists had a considerable sense of their duties towards their weaker brethren. The feeling had been growing in Natal—perhaps it was one result of her father's life there (applause)—that they would leave the natives in the hands of the Natal Colonists than in the hands of the English Colonial Office, because, for one thing, the Colonial Office was so far away. It was one thing to say, "I have got into a scrape, send me up English troops to fight it out," and another to say, "I have got into a scrape; send up your friends and brothers to fight it out." Then again, the sense of the Colonies being in command brought a sense of responsibility. The leading men in Natal were strongly with her in this matter, and had given her their time and money to help her in her appeal for the Zulus. One important thing in dealing with weaker races was that the truth should be spoken to them (applause). If they were going to be treated badly even, it was better to tell them so than to pretend that they were going to be treated well. It was impossible for Christian missionaries to make any way amongst them while the natives could point to dishonesty on the part of the Government of the nation whom those missionaries represented. In Matabele Land a chartered Company (the South African Company) was now engaged in advancing civilisation, and large parties of men, sometimes engineers or miners, were being sent up there, but they were all armed men, capable of being used as soldiers if so required. That was being done at the very time that the charter was signed in the sacred name of the Queen, and was being sent to the chief of the country, saying that she did not wish to

interfere with the management of this country. What must that chief think of this country who dealt with two different hands ?

M. DUMAS-FAUCHER thought that in the resolution expressing the gratitude of the Congress to those who were mentioned as taking part in the Brussels Conference, the services of Monsieur de Brazza should be recognised. He moved, as an amendment, that the following words be added to the resolution : “ *The Congress honours no less the mission pursued on the Congo by M. Savorgnan de Brazza.* ”

The amendment was duly seconded.

Mr. J. G. ALEXANDER thought they would be treading on dangerous ground if they singled out one of the numerous explorers of Africa.

The CHAIRMAN thought it would be better not to depart from that which was international, and he hoped that everyone would feel that M. de Brazza's Mission was not in the slightest degree slighted by that.

Mr. HODGSON PRATT suggested that it might meet the case if Mr. Braithwaite was asked to include M. de Brazza's name amongst those he had mentioned in his paper.

The amendment was thereupon, by leave, withdrawn, and the original resolution was carried.

SECTION H.

“INDIRECT CAUSES OF WAR, AND REMEDIES FOR THE SAME.”

Mr. T. SNAPE read the Report of the Committee with reference to this section. Five papers, he said, had been submitted to them, two of which they recommended to be read in full, and only the *précis* of the others.

Mr. HODGSON PRATT read the following paper, on “Indirect Causes of War” :—

INDIRECT CAUSES OF WAR.

There can be little doubt that the responsibility for the outbreak of war does not rest, as was perhaps the case at one time, solely with monarchs or statesmen. It is quite obvious to any impartial eye how rapidly the mass of unthinking people in any nation becomes disposed for war, when an appeal has been made to their passions or prejudices, by the Press, or by public men.

In former times the Press hardly existed ; in modern days it has become an enormous power for good or evil, and the Press of Europe is certainly ready enough, as a whole, to stimulate a false “patriotism.” This “patriotism” constantly takes the form of the most groundless and bitter enmity against some other nation—upon the strength of rumours and telegrams, which contradict themselves on successive days ; or at the bidding of leading articles and public speeches, which incite to hatred. Often there is not a shadow of real ground for these mischievous articles and speeches, and where some ground for alarm *does* exist, the exaggerations are so great as almost to be falsehoods.

Thus elements of national anger and hostility are developed, which did not exist to anything like the same extent formerly, and it is the business of the friends of Peace to take account of them. It is a noteworthy fact that political ignorance in the sphere of foreign affairs, even in these days, is very great. There is hardly a week in which we may not find in some foreign newspaper the most astounding statements regarding the motives and conduct of the English people. And I have no doubt that foreigners find in our newspapers a similar ignorance and perversion of the truth. The universal habit of reading newspapers, and of public discussion—which has become a special factor of our time—gives a mighty impetus to the slightest word of some ill-informed Foreign Correspondent, who is, perhaps, a man deficient in the important qualifications necessary for such a post. The result of this

is that when a Government has a dispute with another, it finds its hand forced by its own citizens, who are in their turn excited and misled by their journals.

A Government may earnestly desire to maintain relations of peace, but the newspapers hound it on to aggression. Every act of mediation or demand for further consideration, and every proposal of an amicable kind, is treated as a betrayal of the interests of the State, as poltroonery and want of public spirit.

These facts are most serious, and demand the attention of our Congress. How, then, can the mutual ignorance and mutual prejudices and hostility of this nature be diminished or removed? We have to fall back upon that greatest and best of remedies—however slow its operation may appear—*Public Opinion*; and the education of that opinion must rest mainly with the Peace Societies. As I have said in another paper, if these latter are to exercise any greater influence than they have in the past, they must prepare to deal with such practical questions as these. I hold that it is the duty of each of them to enter on the task of influencing the public mind through the Press and through the Parliament.

Thus, whenever a grave statement is made as regards the conduct of some foreign Power, the Peace Society should always at once enter into communication with the Peace Society of that other country. It should obtain full and authentic knowledge of the facts, and at once publish them, in order to neutralise the effects of the statements in question, without untruth or exaggeration. In other words, I would say that the true peacemaker must become a more efficient and careful student of foreign affairs, if he is to guide the public opinion of his countrymen in regard to them. Notwithstanding our Foreign Correspondents and Telegraphic Agencies, the ignorance of Foreign Affairs is, as I have said, universally and dangerously great. Such obscurity is full of danger, and security is to be found in *light*—and in light alone. I hold it to be absurd that diplomatic negotiations and correspondence should be concealed from the mass of the citizens, and wrapped in a veil of mystery. The public everywhere must insist upon the correspondence of Foreign Ministers being made known—*before it is too late*. If this silence and obscurity were removed, the Press would have no opportunity of playing the devil's game that it at present plays in Europe. Articles would not then be written by so-called able editors from week to week, which are based on falsehoods, and lead to uncontrollable enmity.

I think that in time public opinion will compel the proprietors of newspapers to have more reliable Foreign Correspondents. They are too often absolutely silent upon questions of the greatest interest and of value in the cause of that better understanding and mutual knowledge which are essential to the preservation of Peace. It is remarkable that the foreign Press is often full of articles requiring the attention of our country, while the barest allusion is made to them by our Correspondents, and the nation remains in ignorance of what the other nation is thinking or saying on a matter of perhaps vital importance.

Under this head, I would venture to bring before the Congress a proposal which has been frequently made, *i.e.*, that an *international daily paper* should be published, and under the following conditions:—

- (1) The seat of its publication should be in a neutral State.
- (2) Editions should appear simultaneously in two or three of the principal languages of Europe.
- (3) The capital raised for the purpose should be on such a scale as to make the paper of value to statesmen, men engaged in commerce, and to the bulk of the citizens generally, in the various European countries.
- (4) It should command the very highest qualifications on the part of its Correspondents, placed in all the chief cities of Europe.
- (5) It should be edited in the distinct interests of the solidarity of nations, their mutual interdependence on each other, and the need of organised peace, and the reign of love.

Specially, in order to accomplish such purposes, its leading ideal should be to enable the nations to know each other. Such mutual knowledge would form an indirect and most powerful condition of international concord.

Among the remedies for the indirect causes of war as constituted by international prejudices and passions, *viz.*, misstatements and misapprehensions, is one frequently proposed of late years.

It is this:—That in the case of every dispute, competent, well-informed and trusted representatives of the two countries should meet and examine into the facts, the allegations, and the claims brought forward on both sides, with the following results:—

- (1) The publication of a joint *Report*, which shall inform the public of the two countries as to the *causes*, *facts*, *and*

(2) The adoption of a *suggested solution of the difficulty*, for the information of the public and of the Governments of the two nations in question.

Through the first of these two steps the further circulation of false and misleading statements would be removed, and the spirit of rancour and animosity would be checked.

By means of the second step, the Parliaments of each country would know what view to take, and what course should be urged upon the Government. The latter would, in most cases, rejoice to have the aid of suggestions in which leading men of both countries had concurred.

In time, such independent and impartial action taken by able and trusted citizens would be found so valuable, that ministers on both sides would gladly furnish such "Committees of Conciliation" with all the necessary information.

The International Arbitration and Peace Association has, during the last eight years, sought to lay this proposal before the friends of Peace in various European cities, and it has everywhere been most cordially accepted.

It may be carried out either by members of Peace Societies representing the two countries having a dispute, or by Members of Parliament nominated by the new International Parliamentary Conference. That Conference has indirectly accepted this proposal by one of the resolutions adopted last year at Paris; and the above-named Association has twice addressed the Interparliamentary Committee during the last few months, inviting it to create such a "Commission" of Enquiry to report on two pending international disputes, both of which may have very grave consequences if allowed to fester through the excessive delays of the Foreign Office.

MR. THOMAS CROSFIELD, of Liverpool, followed by reading a paper on

THE ALLEGED INFLUENCE OF PROTECTIVE AND DISCRIMINATING TARIFF ON DUTIES.

The connecting links between communities and nations are strengthened by mutual wants and requirements, each nation is in some way or other dependent for the supply of its wants on its brother nation, which incites the adoption of friendly relations between the various countries of the world. Increase these bonds of amity by the extension of trade and the links which connect nations are rendered stronger and stronger.

Let us for a short time examine a little closer how this works if left to its natural development, say for instance that our own nation being richly endowed with great mineral wealth, finds that her natural employment is works of manufacture; aided by her large supply of coal and iron: her agricultural resources are small in comparison, and to supply her toiling millions she has to draw largely from the resources of other countries more abundantly supplied than we are with food commodities: thus springs up a trade between us which cements us with other nations in bonds of amity and friendship.

It is in relation to peace I now speak.

Withdraw our Import duties and increase our mutual dependency one on another: so that to break the peace of the world would be a suicidal policy. We should be made to feel that we cannot afford to fight, not for lacking resources, but that our industrial population would feel that the market for their industries would be stopped if we went to war. This may be thought by some to be a mean and unworthy motive, but the prompting for existence is nothing mean or unworthy, particularly if it refers to those dependent upon you: but some say: How are our taxes to be raised? If we did not spend so much in warlike accoutrements, our other national expenses would not be more than could readily be raised upon the only legitimate object for taxation—"real property."

We have done much in the past towards the consummation of this happy result, but we have much more to do in the future. I may be met by the question, why do not other nations follow out this plan? Suffice it for me to say, We must do our duty! We are the gainers and they are the losers: with the spread of intelligence they will follow our example, but if they do not, we, at any rate, have done much in the way of binding ourselves to the other nations. Every grain of wheat, every ounce of sugar, has to be paid for, and this is not done by our money but by our manufactures, and this is a welding of the links of the chain which binds us to other nations.

If I had time I could show how a "Cheap Ocean Postage," how a "Universal Decimal Coinage" and a "Universal Maritime and Mercantile Law" would take away those hindrances which stand in the way of commerce.

Although these aids towards obtaining Peace may not be based on the highest motives, yet we must make use of every argument, and these reasons which I have adduced may appeal to those whose minds are not yet prepared for the adopting of Peace principles on the higher Christian stand-point.

I will conclude by quoting an example from the Scriptures in support of my argument :—

“Now Herod was highly displeased with them of Tyre and Sidon : and they came with one accord to him, and having made Blastus the King’s chamberlain their friend, they asked for peace, because their country was fed from the King’s country.”—Acts xii. 20 verse.

Thus showing that a country cramped up into a narrow seashore limit had not the means of supplying its own bread stuffs, but drew from the rich plains of Judea and Samaria, and the supply of their wants was the means of Peace being brought about.—

Mr. T. SNAPE read *précis* of the remaining papers offered in this section, and moved the following resolutions :—

I.—The Congress believes that the warlike prejudices and traditions which are still fostered in the various nationalities, and the misrepresentations by leaders of public opinion in legislative assemblies, or through the press, are not infrequently indirect causes of war. The Congress is therefore of opinion that these evils should be counteracted by the publication of accurate statements and information that would tend to the removal of misunderstanding amongst nations, and recommends to the Inter-Parliamentary Committee the importance of considering the question of commencing an international newspaper, which should have such a purpose as one of its primary objects.

II.—The Congress proposes to the Inter-Parliamentary Conference that the utmost support should be given to every project for the unification of weights and measures, of coinage, tariffs, postal and telegraphic arrangements, means of transport, &c., which would assist in constituting a commercial, industrial, and scientific union of the peoples.

I.—Le Congrès est convaincu que les préjugés militaires et les traditions qui sont encore enracinés profondément dans certaines nations, ainsi que les déclarations exagérées que font dans les assemblées législatives et dans les organes de la presse, certains meneurs de l’opinion publique, sont très fréquemment la cause indirecte des guerres. Le Congrès émet donc le vœu qu’on coupe court à ces erreurs en publiant des faits exacts et des informations qui dissiperaient les malentendus qui se glissent entre les nations. Le Congrès recommande aussi à la Conférence interparlementaire d’examiner attentivement s’il ne conviendrait pas de créer un journal international destiné à répondre au besoin ci-dessus exprimé.

II.—Le Congrès propose à la Conférence interparlementaire de recommander à ses membres la défense devant leurs Parlements respectifs des projets d’unification des poids et mesures, des monnaies, des différents tarifs de réglemens postaux et télégraphiques, des voies de transport, etc. ; cette unification devant constituer une véritable union commerciale, industrielle et scientifique des peuples

The papers of which *précis* were read by Mr. SNAPE were as follows :—

HOW TO PROMOTE PEACE.

By Mr. ALFRED H. LOVE, Philadelphia.

The Peace movement has risen from a mere sentiment into the realm of practical, ethical, and international importance.

We need to suppress the mere animal nature of man and exalt the moral and spiritual. We need to modify our selfishness, our patriotism, and our religion, in so far as to have self control. We need to expand our patriotism until "all the world is our country, and all mankind our countrymen," and that we recognise that "the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof," and that our love is not limited by geographical boundaries or confined within genealogical distinctions. We need to modify our religion so that we may see the good in all and be charitable, to "do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly."

We have unwittingly woven a network of peacemakers that we do not comprehend or at least utilise. Commenced early became one of them. The facilities of travel enable human beings to see each other face to face, and hand in hand feel the magnetic influence of touch : the postal system gives us the power of communicating, at the least possible cost, our heart-throbs for the welfare of each other : the telegraph can, with the rapidity of lightning, transmit our messages ; the representative system of ministers' plenipotentiary enables Governments to receive and give information, and to explain and adjust differences ; the intermarriage of the people makes relationships at home and abroad. Here we have peace agencies at our right hand. If used for peace and not for war, peace will be the result.

After seventy-five years and no foreign war, and after a quarter of a century and no civil war, America has good reason to present a plea for disarmament, assured that no country desires to molest us, so long as the elements of peace are based upon being right and doing right, and making strength depend upon moral force. In a word, to remove the causes and abolish the customs of war, to establish the principles and live the conditions of peace. This, with equal propriety, may be said for all countries.

It only needs more of moral courage on the part of rulers and more dependence upon the powers of reason, affection, and a common humanity, and there can be disarmament, and then the wonderful rebound after the strain is removed, of wealth, prosperity and happiness.

Great results are gained by practice ; hence practice pacific mediation, arbitration and conciliation in everything, in homes, in business, in communities, in nations, and between nations. Hold Peace Congresses, petition for arbitration treaties, elect peace representatives to governmental position, go unarmed, send for ministers of peace to visit the courts of the world.

Therefore, while we are preparing the way for peace by all the reformatory agencies in the land, by more of justice, freedom, equal rights, temperance, a world-wide philanthropy and reverence for God and man, we are developing the hidden forces of man's divine nature as the great substitutes for war, and the time will come when it will be a wonder of history, that a people ever resorted to deadly force to settle differences, and peace will abound with such unerring certainty and so naturally and gracefully, that the query will be when, how, and whence did it come.

THE CONNECTION BETWEEN ALCOHOL AND WAR.

By Mr. JOHN HILTON, London.

The curse of drink is connected with and promotes many other curses. It was intimately associated with, and a means of extending slave trade and slavery. Elihu Barritt said it was the circulating medium of slavery.

In africa it was the means by which slaves were easily captured or obtained. Fathers would sell their sons for rum, and the first employment of the captured slaves was (in the West Indies) the making of rum, to be used as a means for obtaining more slaves for other parts.

It demoralises young men, blights their prospects in life, and leaves them in despair to find refuge in the Army.

It is at the doors of drink shops, where the recruiting-sergeant finds most of his victims.

Any day in the City of Westminster you may see the recruiting officers at a public-house door, and I find them nowhere else. One of these officers told me that but for drink he should get no men at all. Soldiers and pensioners have confessed to me that it was drink and its consequences that brought them and their comrades into the ranks of the Army.

Turning from the *machinery* of war to the *chances* of war, I think the subtle and dangerous influence of drink may again be clearly traced.

Take the case of a strained relationship between this country and some other power.

When the words of the Government should be well and carefully weighed so as to avoid an expression which, read under a condition of feverish excitement, might possibly be so understood as to increase the irritation already existing, is it not conceivable that even a glass or two of wine, the direct tendency of which is to *lessen* caution in speech, may do incalculable harm at such a critical moment?

Again. At such times ministers always have one eye on the supposed adversary and one on the *people* at home. This is the time when the people should keep their heads and do their utmost to restrain the Government, but what happens? Statesmen and leaders of the people make "after-dinner speeches" calculated to urge the Government on to recklessness and to inflame the passions of the people on both sides of the dispute.

I have sometimes thought these speeches seemed to be inspired by some evil spirit, it was the demon alcohol!

Then the people drinking intoxicants at the rate of two million and a half pounds worth weekly are in just the condition to catch fire from inflammatory speeches.

Thus I believe drink has been a chief factor in plunging this nation into past wars.

Long before the people had the power and influence they now have were the caustic words written:

War is a game which were their subjects wise,
Kings could not play at.

Now the people are practically all powerful they should keep their brains clear from that which has the direct tendency to disturb the judgment while it fires the passions.

During the perils of war the Press has the power of wielding a mighty influence for evil, and too often has used it with disastrous consequences.

When we know the free living habits of many brilliant press writers, and have read with agony of mind the exciting and passionate appeals to "let loose the dogs of war," just when such reckless and wicked writing was most calculated to do harm, we can hardly doubt that wine and whisky, mingling with the midnight oil, has been the inspiration of these fulminations.

The effect of drink in promoting wars among uncivilized nations might form a topic for a separate interesting paper, but I would here simply remind the Congress that in all efforts to protect native races from these destructive conflicts, the prohibition of *spirits* as well as *fire arms* has invariably been advocated.

Now I would strongly urge the proposition that the removal of the drink curse from the circle of national evils would weaken all other sections of the circle, even that of war, which it is the great purpose of this Congress, by God's blessing, to weaken, and to finally destroy.

May the peoples of all nations struggling upward for that liberty, which is the right of humanity, soon see that the burdens caused by drink and by military establishments, are the chief obstacles in their way; and above all their strikings, strike for *parity* and for that peace which Cicero says, is "*Tranquil Liberty.*"

" THE RESPONSIBILITY OF STATESMEN TO FIND A REMEDY FOR WAR."

By Mr. J. MATHER, Manchester.

Anyone of a philosophic turn of mind who will visit the graphic reproduction of the Battle of Waterloo, now exhibiting in London, will probably be the subject of some curious reflections, while standing apparently in the centre of the field of slaughter, he is able to contemplate without alarm or excitement the ghastly details of the scene. Here are scores of thousands of human beings calling themselves rational, who, without any quarrel or difference with each other, are devoting a whole day to the one all-absorbing object of mutual destruction, because ordered so to do by certain men credited with superior intelligence, who can find no better way than this for settling questions of disputed frontiers or international politics. No wonder if Wellington (as it is said) when the fighting was over, having to cross the battle-field amongst the wounded and dying, was so affected as to confess that the awful sights and sounds of that hour drove from his mind all thoughts of any military or political advantages he had won by his " famous victory."

Since this historic battle more than two generations have come and gone, and the

plain of Waterloo, once so richly fertilised with human blood, is covered with waving corn and smiling flowers. Can we who live in this last decade of the 19th century, say that our statesmen have grown so much wiser that we are not beset with the same risk of a repetition of this wholesale tragedy any time in the near future, as were our fathers 20, 40, or 60 years ago? Nay, we have in the interval seen several repetitions of it in other countries, followed by increased international distrust, suspicion, and envy, and ever increasing armaments.

Had the loss of life at Waterloo been due to pestilence, famine, or accident, or any other cause than war, no enquiry or effort would have been deemed too great by statesmen and rulers to discover the means to prevent its recurrence. They would own it to be one of the first duties of their high and responsible position to protect human life from such ravages in future. But notwithstanding the marvellous progress made by civilized communities in all other directions, no systematic effort to stop war has yet been made in high places. Nay, the resources of human ingenuity, science, and wealth are still lavished by rulers and statesmen in perpetuating the war system with all its burdens and perils. The sole efforts to discover and urge a remedy are left to an insignificant portion of the community, with regard to whom the question of old may be repeated with slight variation. "Have any of the rulers or the Pharisees believed in them?" And with little better response.

Statesmen with the aid unhappily too often of poets and painters—not to say now and then even of preachers—are still to be seen bowing down to the god of war. They are proclaiming, not in words perhaps, but in deeds: "Great is Mars of the Europeans," with as much self-complacent folly and superstition as that great concourse in the streets of Ephesus 19 centuries ago, who, by the space of two hours, cried with one accord, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians." And what is the nett result at the present moment? Listen to the recent words of a man who ought to know a good deal about it—Count von Moltke: "If the war which has now been hovering over our heads for more than 10 years, like the sword of Damocles, should break out, it is impossible to say how long it will last. The greatest Powers of Europe, armed as they have never been armed before, would take the field against one another." Yes, three and a quarter millions of able-bodied men, kept at a yearly cost of 200 millions sterling on a "peace footing," and capable of being multiplied six-fold in case of need, are waiting the word of command from some unknown "superior," to rush to each others and their own destruction.

And yet war will be no more a "necessary evil," nor a less preventible catastrophe than pestilence, famine, or accident, when once rulers and statesmen are brought to see their moral responsibility for its perpetuation. As an institution professing to right the wrong, or to do more good than harm, war stands condemned through all history as the most complete fraud, and appalling failure, that ever victimised deluded humanity. What are statesmen for, if they cannot devise some better substitute or remedy for it than that of ever increasing their engines of destruction? The question still awaits an answer.

"What can war but endless war still breed?" For men in their position of power and influence to say that they can conceive of no other remedy, is tantamount to a confession of imbecility and incompetence, and an admission that they are the wrong men in the wrong place.

Of all the achievements of that English statesman who, though not infallible, is regarded by many as about the greatest who ever lived, future history will probably record the Geneva Arbitration, which so effectually dispersed the black cloud then gathering between England and America, as the most glorious act of his political career. But a still greater halo would attach to the name of that statesman who by inaugurating a system of *disarmament* should restore true international confidence, and drive out the war-spirit; for he would strike a final blow at the war system by teaching the nations to "learn war no more."

The late Earl Russell was a sufficiently impartial witness when he said: "On looking at all the wars which have been carried on during the last century, and examining into the causes of them, I do not see one of those wars in which if there had been proper temper between the parties, the questions in dispute might not have been settled without recourse to arms." What a fearful indictment by a statesman, of 19th century statesmanship! If the indictment be true—and who can deny it?—the appalling and needless waste of life and treasure, in the wars of the last century at least, resulted from the want of "proper temper" on the part of rulers and statesmen. And where have we a right to look for proper temper if not amongst this dignified class! If in the quaint words of the old song we could "let those who make the quarrels be the only men to fight," what an incalculable saving to mankind would have resulted.

And Earl Russell's opinion on the matter does not lack confirmation Listen to that great warrior General Grant : " Though I have been trained as a soldier, and have participated in many battles, there never was a time when in my opinion, some way could not have been found of preventing the drawing of the sword. I look forward," he adds wisely, " to an epoch when a court, recognised by all nations, will settle international differences, instead of the system of keeping large standing armies as they do in Europe."

More than 40 years ago the late Earl of Aberdeen, himself a prominent statesman of the time, admitted the folly of that pagan notion which has cost Christendom so dearly—that warlike preparations are a preventive of war. Speaking in 1849, he says : " In the state of society in which we now live, and when the warlike preparations of Great Powers are made at an enormous expense, I say that so far from being any security for peace, they are directly the contrary, and tend at once to war."

Another statesman, who was never accused of any sympathy with the peace movement—the late Lord Beaconsfield—had sufficient discernment to see the mischief of " bloated armaments," and had he realised his responsibility when in office and power, might have done much to carry out the sensible advice he offered in 1859. " Let us terminate," said he, " this disastrous system of wild expenditure, by mutually agreeing, with no hypocrisy, but in a manner and under circumstances that admit of no doubt, by the reduction of armaments that peace is really our policy." Seeing how completely Europe still remains under the cloven hoof of militarism, what answer could be made if anyone should assert that modern statesmanship is a failure and a fraud ? Is it not almost startling to discover that nearly half a century has elapsed since Sir Robert Peel asked the following sensible questions, which are not less but more pertinent to-day than in 1841 :—" Is not the time come when the powerful countries of Europe should reduce those military armaments which they have so sedulously raised ? Is not the time come when they should be prepared to declare that there is no use in such overgrown establishments ? What is the advantage of one Power greatly increasing its army and navy ? Does it not see that other Powers will follow its example ? The consequence of this must be that no increase of relative strength will accrue to any one Power ; but there must be a universal consumption of the resources of every country in military preparations. . . . The true interest of Europe is to come to one common accord, so as to enable every country to reduce those military armaments which belong to a state of war rather than of peace." What a melancholy contrast to the far-sighted common sense of the above utterances was exhibited so lately as March last, and so near home as in the House of Commons. The first Lord of the Treasury was asked by the persevering peace advocate, Mr. Cremer, M.P., whether Her Majesty's Government had received any communication from the Emperor of Germany in regard to a conference upon the subject of a reduction of armaments, and whether, failing any such proposal being made, the Government would endeavour to ascertain the views upon the subject of the nations with whom they are in friendly relations. Instead of the sympathetic reply one might expect to such a question from a statesman of a professedly Christian country, it was repelled in the following stilted and cold-blooded language : " Her Majesty's Government have received no such communication as that referred to. It is notorious that no such intention is entertained by any Government. Her Majesty's Government are in friendly relations with all the Powers, but they are not in a position which would justify the taking of such a step as that proposed."

When will the patient and long-suffering taxpayers and electors take means to bring home to the men in power and office a sense of their responsibility in a matter which concerns the life and death, the ruin and prosperity of men and nations more than any other subject with which they concern themselves ? Perhaps we may draw some faint hope that this responsibility is beginning to dawn upon some of these men from the novel attempt recently made to shift it on to other shoulders by an able and eminent authority already quoted—Count Von Moltke—whose long life has been so exclusively given to the art and science of war as to entitle him to be called the modern high priest of Mars. Speaking on the Army Bill in the German Parliament in May last, he is reported to have said : " It was not Princes and Governments now-a-days that brought on wars. We had now to do with wars of nations, and no Government with any particle of discretion would bring on such an evil with all its consequences if it could be foreseen. Wars," he continued, " are now brought on either by the covetousness of those classes who, not possessing much, hope to improve their position speedily by measures of force, or by national antipathies and race-hatred or envy, which foment discontent in

nations. Foreign wars arise from these latter causes, even against the will of the Government."

That there is a section in every country (though not the poorest) who profit by war, and for that reason welcome it, is only too true; but that the masses in any country to-day desire war is an assertion devoid of evidence, and which the great man does not attempt to prove. Referring to a possible European struggle, the Count proceeds: "It might be a seven or a thirty years' war, and woe to him who should set Europe ablaze; who should be the first to apply the match to this powder barrel!" Yes, woe indeed; and the incredible wisdom of 19th century statesmanship therefore continues piling up *more powder barrels*, oblivious of the glaring fact that it is not the "match" but the "powder" that does the mischief, and that if Governments would cease to provide the combustibles, no dangerous lunatic could "set Europe ablaze." Surely if there is a hideous *fiasco* under the sun it is this attempt to cure war by the *war-system*—in other words, to "cast out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils." While the military nations of Europe live in constant dread and distrust of each other, those countries with the smallest armed forces pursue their peaceful avocations with confidence and security.

If, by some sudden miracle, European armies could be disbanded and the nations delivered but for twelve months from the crushing nightmare of the war-system, it would not require a miracle to perpetuate the deliverance, for although this would not eradicate human depravity, it would effect such a change for the better in the conditions of national and international life as would suffice to deter any statesman or politician who was not a candidate for Bedlam from suggesting a return to the present state of scientific barbarism.

It is for all who believe this to see to it, without relaxing effort in other directions, that by their words and acts and votes they impress upon all who call themselves Statesmen their moral responsibility for the perpetuation of war, and remind them that while "force is no remedy," Arbitration and Disarmament *are* remedies, and it shall not be long before experience shall confirm the unchallenged truth of Longfellow's words:

"Were half the power that keeps the world in terror,
Were half the wealth that's spent on camps and courts,
Given to redeem the human mind from error,
There were no need for arsenals and forts."

Signor MAZZOLENI, of Milan, in a paper covering the whole programme, writes on this section:—

I believe that many indirect causes of war or at least of misunderstandings might be removed.

(a) By opposing many prejudices founded on traditions which, being ancient and historical, enlist supporters especially in the field of literature and art.

In addition to the old prejudices and those put up by an exalted and misunderstood patriotism, the cause of peace, will always find its way blocked by our own education and customs, and by the passion pervading the political world and kindled by party exaggeration to such a degree as not seldom to force war to break out.

(b) By calling the press to keep within the boundaries of its high educational mission, *i.e.*, the checking of passions and political folly.

The eminently civilizing mission of the press is misdirected when, speculating on prejudices and popular errors, it depraves and leads astray public opinion by rousing national enmities and keeping discord alive on international differences existing or expected.

(c) By recommending moderation of language, evenness of temper, and, above all, prudence to the Legislative assemblies while judging the acts of foreign or internal politics of other States.

The action of Parliament, as we will soon see, may have a strong influence on the nature of the relations good or bad, with other nations.

(d) By promoting free trade and customs unions, based on a wise system of protection, and respect to the economical interests of each State concerned.

Economical questions like the political must be pacifically solved, and contests and reprisals on financial grounds will then no more retard the general economical progress and the concord of peoples in the fields of industry and trade.

The resolutions were seconded by Mr. GILLIVER, and carried unanimously.

M. le Chevalier VLADIMIR DE BOLESTA-KOZLOWSKI asked permission to submit a question to the Congress, and moved the following resolution :—

“ That this Congress do appoint a Committee having the duty of convoking (in July, 1891) a special Conference of Delegates of Societies of Political Economy ; and that these latter shall hold a meeting of Parliamentary Representatives who shall consider the best means of establishing equitable commercial relations by reductions in import duties as a step towards Free Trade.”

In moving this resolution,

M. LE CHEVALIER VLADIMIR DE BOLESTA-KOZLOWSKI a dit :

Ayant étudié les annales et les rapports du parlement Anglais, je puis dire que je suis complètement d'accord avec les principes libre-échangistes dont il a été le bastion et qu'il est très regrettable que dans la plupart des états le règlement pratique du libre échange et de la protection soit descendu du niveau de question de principe à celui de question d'intérêt particulier.

Au lieu de rapprocher les peuples et de faciliter leurs relations mutuelles dans un temps dans lequel on organise des sociétés de paix et où l'arbitrage est à l'ordre du jour la question douanière est devenue un motif de guerre cruelle et implacable entre les états de l'Univers.

Bien qu'il soit naturel que l'intensité des moyens d'encourager l'agriculture varie selon le rôle qu'ils jouent dans l'ensemble des intérêts économiques d'une nation.

Notre parlement fidèle aux principes libre-échangistes a su résister bien longtemps à la hausse des droits d'entrée sur les blés.

Ce n'est pas de Vienne mais de Berlin qu'est venue l'initiative de l'élévation des droits de douane pour les matières premières et cette initiative a entraîné bon gré mal gré ceux qui devaient lui tenir tête.

Il faut remarquer qu'il est bien plus aisé de se passer de protection dans un pays qui est obligé d'importer les matières premières pour satisfaire aux besoins de la population que dans un autre qui, comme l'Autriche, peut non seulement se passer des matières premières des pays étrangers mais encore a son intérêt principal non pas dans l'exportation des objets fabriqués, mais justement dans l'exportation de ces produits bruts.

Dans les pays qui exportent, les prix des denrées de première nécessité sont réglés par la concurrence intérieure qui garantit la population contre la hausse des prix de ces denrées. Or la protection dans ces pays-là n'a pas causé une hausse artificielle des prix, elle a eu seulement pour but de conserver les marchés aux producteurs du pays qui sans elle, vu la situation géographique de l'Autriche, n'aurait pu trouver un débouché pour l'écoulement de ses marchandises.

Le bénéfice de la baisse des prix du blé en Autriche a été au profit des négociants et des boulangers bien plus qu'à celui des consommateurs et dans le temps pendant lequel la diminution du blé a été très considérable, une fabrique de pain a payé 15 o/o de bénéfice à ses actionnaires.

Il faut reconnaître que tout aussi bien la situation extérieure de l'Autriche que sa situation intérieure lui rend, par le temps qui court, l'abandon de la protection bien difficile.

Un économiste pratique est tenu de ne pas ignorer, je dirai plus, il est regrettable qu'il ne lui soit pas permis de se laisser diriger par les principes d'économie toute pure, et aussi qu'il ignore la géographie commerciale.

Sur le rapport de la situation géographique, l'Autriche, au point de vue du commerce des blés, est très mal située ; les pays de l'occident de l'Europe ont, dans l'espace qui les sépare des pays fertiles de l'Orient une protection naturelle. Notre pays ayant du côté de l'Orient, pour voisins immédiats, des pays dans les quels la main d'œuvre et les impôts sont moins élevés que chez nous, en outre le système des tarifs de chemins de fer donne une prime très considérable à l'exportation ; par conséquent, dans l'espace écoulé entre 1883 et 1887, la Russie représente une proportion de 36 o/o la Roumaine 8 o/o du commerce universel des blés et l'Autriche seulement 4 o/o.

A l'occident et au Midi nous avons sur nos frontières des pays qui, au lieu de profiter de cette circonstance que l'Autriche ne peut suffire à ses besoins industriels et de tâcher d'agrandir l'exportation, ferment leurs frontières en établissant des droits

très élevés qui frappent les matières premières produites en Autriche. Ce qui entraîne l'Empire autrichien dans une voie de représailles contre l'exportation des objets industriels fabriqués dans l'occident.

C'est aussi la situation intérieure de l'Autriche qui rend l'abandon des droits d'entrée sur les blés bien difficile.

Dans ces dix dernières années, le prix des blés a diminué en Autriche d'environ 30 o/o, sans que les autres objets de consommation ordinaire aient subi une baisse dans cette proportion.

L'impôt foncier autrichien y compris les centimes additionnels, s'élève de 35 à 50 o/o du revenu net ; le nouvel impôt sur l'alcool a causé la ruine des distilleries agricoles. Les chemins de fer autrichiens transportent les produits étrangers à un tarif d'environ 15 o/o moins élevé que les produits de l'Autriche, ce qui constitue un genre de protection à rebours en donnant une prime d'importation qui réagit contre les droits d'entrée, et la division de la propriété en très petites parcelles, rend aux petits propriétaires l'élevage du bétail et la stercoration de la terre très difficile et le jeu effréné de la bourse des produits agricoles rend le prix intérieur incertain.

Voilà les facteurs qui, sans légitimer la protection dans le domaine des principes, sont au moins une excuse pour l'application de ce moyen.

Sous le rapport des traités de commerce, je partage un grand nombre des opinions émises par M. M. Frédéric Passy et Ernest Breléj à la Société d'Economie politique à Paris et je crois que l'indépendance des états ne souffrira pas du tout en acceptant un moyen propre à atténuer la guerre économique entre les nations et qui est un pas effectif vers la paix.

Des traités constituent un échange de gain pour les deux côtés et je crois qu'il serait bien naïf d'abandonner son gain à soi parce qu'il s'accorde avec celui de l'étranger.

Je considère les traités de commerce comme un moyen, mais non comme un système, ce moyen peut-être employé tout aussi bien au profit du libre échange que de la protection.

Dans la situation actuelle, l'application des principes d'économie politique toute pure, quoique très recommandable, a peu d'avenir dans les parlements, et les traités de commerce sont en état de modifier le régime de la protection des matières premières et d'être, sinon en théorie pour le moins en pratique, un genre de pis aller libre-échangiste.

Après ce premier pas, j'en désirerais un autre et je crains bien qu'il ne faille de grands désastres pour démontrer l'utilité d'une idée qui a été traitée avec un grand talent par M. de Molinari, l'idée d'une union douanière du Continent de l'Europe centrale et occidentale contre le Nouveau Monde qui nous démontre l'utilité des représailles par le "Bill Mac Kinley" et par le projet d'une union Pan-américaine.

Or, je considère les traités de commerce comme le premier pas et la question douanière comme le second vers le libre échange, mais je reconnais en même temps que la question de l'union douanière n'est pas pour le moment une question d'actualité immédiate.

The resolution was seconded by M. GASTON MORIN (Paris), but was deemed by the CHAIRMAN out of order, nevertheless, after expressing his doubtfulness, he put it to the vote, when it was lost in consequence.

On the motion of Mr. T. SNAPE, the question was referred to the Committee on Procedure, and was introduced in a modified form, which would bring it within the practical scope of the Congress, next morning. See page 166.

The Congress then took up the consideration of a question which was outside the printed programme, but was specially introduced by the Committee of Organisation, namely :—

WOMAN'S WORK FOR PEACE.

Miss P. H. PECKOVER introduced the subject, and moved that

(ENGLISH.)

“The Congress, in view of the vast moral and social influence of woman, urges upon every woman throughout the world to sustain, as wife, mother, sister, or citizen, the things that make for peace; as otherwise she incurs grave responsibilities for the continuance of the systems of war and militarism, which not only desolate but corrupt the home life of the nations. To concentrate and to practically apply this influence the Congress recommends that women should unite themselves with societies for the promotion of international peace.”

(FRENCH.)

“Le Congrès, en vue de l'énorme influence morale et sociale de la femme, engage chaque femme comme épouse, mère, sœur, citoyenne, à encourager tout ce qui tend à assurer la paix; car si non, elle encourt une grande responsabilité dans la continuation de l'état de guerre et de militarisme qui non seulement désolé, mais aussi corrompt la vie des nations. Afin de concentrer et d'appliquer cette influence d'une manière pratique le Congrès engage les femmes à se joindre aux sociétés pour la propagation de la paix internationale.”

Women's Societies, she said, were, on both sides of the Atlantic, leaders in all upward movements. It might be said that women had done a great deal to promote war, and that should only incite the Congress to take up the question of woman's influence, for it was the character of women that whenever they believed a thing was right and necessary, no amount of personal sacrifice would deter them from working at it and for it. Therefore it was the more important that women should be taught that war was neither right nor necessary. There was some danger of their thinking that war was a necessary evil, and therefore every effort should be made throughout all lands to bring the influence of woman upon the right side.

The resolution was seconded by M. F. BAJER, and supported in a letter, dated 12th July, 1890, written to the Congress by Madame Johanne Meyer, of Copenhagen—editor of *Hvad vi vil*, the organ of the Danish Women's Society—who had been appointed a delegate from the Danish Peace Association. The following is a summary:—

Madame Meyer regrets her inability to be present in consequence of illness, and then states that Danish women who work for the emancipation of their sex, believe that it must be advocated simultaneously with that of the establishment of peace. Those whom she represents send a cordial greeting to the English nation, whose energy cheers and stimulates the Danes in their efforts for the same cause. They feel indignant that while there are no adequate funds for the education of homeless children and homeless poor and ailing, millions are squandered for military purposes. Danish women would lay even greater stress upon the educational aspect of the question: “They feel that it is degrading to teach our sons the great social lie that it is a virtue to kill, while at the same time, in childhood, the mothers teach them ‘thou shalt not kill.’ Thus the youth's conscience is placed in conflict with the conscience of society. We women wish, therefore, to bring the true personal conscience to rebel against the conscience of society. In whatever degree, therefore, women are put on an equal footing with men, in that degree will the peace cause be strengthened.”

Miss ROBINSON, in supporting the resolution, remarked that

Every encouragement ought to be given to women to do their utmost in advancing the cause of peace. Sometimes it was said "We do not see that you women have much to do with these questions; you had far better leave them to those who know more about the business of the nations"; but the people who made such remarks forgot that women were not a mere supplement to men, but formed half of humanity, and what affected men affected women. War was the assertion that "Might is right," and that was the most unfortunate antagonism that had to be met. But man was surely not merely a fighting animal. Underneath all these questions of international relationships there lay great moral and religious questions. If the reasoning of women was, perhaps, not always so sound as that of men, yet their insight was occasionally much clearer, and, therefore, their help was needed to support the principles of justice, truth, and morality. War was killing, lying, stealing, and it could not be made anything else, whatever the motive was. These doings must be wrong, and a more righteous method of settling international difficulties should be established on earth. It must not be said, "Leave these things to men, because for thousands of years they have been managing them." They had not managed them so very well. She believed that if women were called to help in this and other causes, the strength of good, right, and truth would be doubled.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

Mr. GREEN read a telegram of congratulation from the Peace Society at Rome.

Mr. SNAPE proposed a vote of thanks to the Chairman.

M. DESMOULINS seconded the motion, which was unanimously agreed to, and the Congress adjourned.

WEDNESDAY EVENING, 16TH JULY.

RELIGIOUS SERVICE AT THE CITY TEMPLE.

In the evening a religious service was held at the City Temple, Holborn Viaduct, kindly lent for the occasion by the Rev. Dr. Parker and his Deacons. There was a good attendance; and an able and eloquent sermon was preached by the Rev. Reuen Thomas, D.D., of Boston, U.S.A. This sermon will be jointly published by the American Peace Society, Boston, Mass., and the Peace Society, 47, New Broad Street, London, E.C.

THURSDAY MORNING, 17TH JULY.

The Congress resumed its sittings at 10 o'clock, the President, Hon. DAVID DUDLEY FIELD, in the chair.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and confirmed.

RESOLUTION UPON NATIONAL CONTROL OVER DECLARATION OF WAR.

The PRESIDENT: The next business is the Resolution left over from yesterday. It is now put into my hands for the first time. I am told that the debate has been closed and that nothing remains but to vote on it.

Mr. W. E. DARBY then read the Resolution which was as follows:—

“Whereas the very principle and purpose of a Universal Peace Congress is the establishment of the juridical status among nations, and consequently the negation of the right of war; whereas an investigation by the Congress into the conditions precedent to a declaration of war, and into the powers of the several authorities in this matter, would imply recognition of the right of war, this Congress hereby declares that right of war does not exist. The Congress, therefore, affirms its belief that all international disputes can be settled by peaceful means. The Congress further affirms that the duty of a Peace Congress is to investigate the means of establishing a juridical status. It further recommends that, while awaiting and promoting the establishment of the juridical status, there should be created under every Government a juridical court in harmony with the following principles: (1) There should be established juridical courts for the examination into, and judicial decision upon, all disputes which may occasion war. All documents relating to such disputes should be communicated to the said courts by the Foreign Offices. (2) Executive authorities should neither declare war nor notify hostilities before the juridical court has cognisance of the facts of the case, and has delivered its considered judgment affirming the justice of the claims. (3) A considered judgment of the juridical court, together with the decree requiring reparation of the wrong as set forth in the said judgment, shall be notified through the Embassy to the other party, and be communicated to the people of the other nation and to the Powers; but no proceeding shall be taken against the other party except on their refusal to make reparation or to agree to an arbitration.”†

Mr. SNAPE said he should feel compelled to move an amendment because the wish of the meeting of yesterday had not been carried out by the Committee.

Mr. W. E. DARBY said in that case he hoped it would be at once referred again to the Committee without discussion.

The PRESIDENT said that suggestion appeared to him to be eminently proper. As the resolution now stood he was bound to declare frankly that he could not vote for it. He thought it was very pernicious. He would never vote for a resolution which declared that if a German army were to land at Folkestone the English nation should not oppose it.

† See page 188 for final form of Resolution.

Mr. SNAPE : I rise to move that this be remitted to the Bureau for further consideration.

A DELEGATE : I second the motion.

Mr. SNAPE said that the first part of the resolution committed those who felt that under certain circumstances there was a right of war to the declaration that there was no right of war ; and the second part of the resolution committed those who objected to war under any circumstances, to the sanction of war under certain circumstances. The resolution was therefore inconsistent with itself. He certainly could not vote for the latter part of the proposal, and he was sure that some present could not vote for the former part, and therefore he thought the Bureau ought to consider it again.

Mr. HODGSON PRATT said that the Committee had simply received an order to throw the resolution into a form which would be more intelligible, but Mr. Snape now proposed to refer the whole question back to the Committee on various disputed points. The resolution now laid before the meeting was the result of an agreement between the original mover of the resolution yesterday and those who moved the amendment.

Rev. R. B. HOWARD : I move that the reference to the Bureau be amended in this particular :—

“ That it be referred to the Committee with power to make such amendment in the report as they may see fit ; ”

[Mr. SNAPE : I accept that.]

Rev. R. B. HOWARD : And that Mr. Gillett and others may let the Committee know what light they may have on the subject.

The amendment was seconded.

The PRESIDENT : This is the resolution proposed, as amended and accepted.

“ Resolved that the amended form of resolution brought up by the Bureau be referred back for further consideration with power to amend its propositions.”

The resolution was carried.

Mr. W. E. DARBY said he must now ask the Congress to give instructions as to what direction the amendments were to be made in—whether in the direction indicated by Mr. Snape, or in that of those gentlemen who took the opposite view. They had two distinct and diametrically opposite opinions behind the proposal to remit, and he would move

“ That the resolution be re-committed for the consideration of the Bureau in order to remove, if possible, any inconsistency in the terms, or reference to conflicting views as to the right of war or otherwise, and that those gentlemen who entertained differences of opinion with regard to the wording of the resolution, be asked to appear and state their difficulties, so that the Committee might know what was intended.”

Mr. SNAPE seconded the proposal, which was carried.

RESOLUTION ON FREE TRADE.

Mr. HODGSON PRATT, on behalf of the Committee, to which the subject had been referred yesterday, in the absence of le Chevalier Vladimir de Bolesta-Kozlowski moved :—

(ENGLISH.)

"That this Congress expresses the hope that the Financial Reform Association, and other similar Societies in Europe and America, should unite in convoking at an early date a Conference to consider the best means of establishing equitable commercial relations between states by the reduction of import duties as a step towards Free Trade.

(FRENCH)

"Que ce Congrès exprime l'espoir que l'Association pour la Réforme Financière et d'autres sociétés du même genre en Europe et en Amérique s'unissent pour convoquer à une date prochaine une Conférence pour examiner les meilleurs moyens d'établir des relations commerciales équitables entre les États par la réduction des droits d'importation comme un premier pas vers le libre-échange.

The motion, having been seconded by a delegate, was carried with only three dissentients.

An American delegate, who was dissatisfied with the vote, said that it had not been understood by half the people in the room.

The PRESIDENT said if some person would move its reconsideration he was quite ready to take the vote again.

SECTION E.

DISARMAMENT.

Rev. R. B. HOWARD, Boston, then moved the following resolutions and read the following paper :—

I.—The Congress feels that it can affirm that the whole of Europe desires Peace, and is impatiently waiting for the moment when it shall see the end of those crushing armaments which, under the plea of defence, become in their turn a danger, by keeping alive mutual distrust, and are, at the same time, the cause of that general economic disturbance which stands in the way of settling in a satisfactory manner the problems of labour and poverty, which should take precedence of all others."

II—"The Congress, recognising that a general disarmament would be the best guarantee of Peace, and would lead to the solution, in the general interest, of those questions which now most divide States, expresses the wish that a Congress of Representatives of all the States of Europe may be assembled as soon as possible, to consider the means of effecting a gradual general disarmament, which already seems feasible."

III.—"The Congress, considering that the timidity of a single Power or other causes might delay indefinitely the convocation of the above-mentioned Congress, is of opinion that the Government which should first dismiss any considerable number of soldiers would confer a signal benefit on Europe and mankind, because it would oblige other Govern-

ments, urged on by public opinion, to follow its example, and by the moral force of this accomplished fact, would have increased rather than diminished the conditions of its national defence."

IV.—"This Congress, considering the question of disarmament as well as the Peace question generally, depends upon public opinion, recommends the Peace Societies here represented, and all friends of Peace, to carry on an active propaganda among the people, especially at the time of Parliamentary elections, in order that the electors should give their votes to those candidates who have included in their programme, Peace, Disarmament, and Arbitration."

(FRENCH, AS FINALLY PASSED.)

I.—"Le Congrès croit pouvoir affirmer que le monde civilisé désire la Paix, et attend impatiemment le moment de voir cesser les armements qui, faits à titre de défense, deviennent à leur tour un danger, en maintenant la défiance réciproque, et sont en même temps la cause de ce malaise économique général qui empêche d'aborder dans des conditions satisfaisantes les questions qui devraient primer toutes les autres, celles du travail et de la misère."

II.—"Le Congrès, reconnaissant qu'un désarmement général serait la meilleure garantie de la Paix et conduirait à résoudre au point de vue des intérêts généraux les questions qui à présent divisent les États, émet le vœu qu'un Congrès de représentants de tous les États de l'Europe soit le plus tôt possible réuni, afin d'aviser aux moyens de réaliser un désarmement graduel général, que l'on entrevoit déjà comme possible."

III.—"Le Congrès, attendu que la timidité d'un seul Gouvernement pourrait suffire à retarder indéfiniment la convocation du Congrès ci-dessus indiqué, est d'avis que le Gouvernement qui le premier résoudra à renvoyer dans leurs foyers un nombre notable de soldats aura rendu un des plus grands services à l'Europe et à l'humanité, parce qu'il obligera les autres Gouvernements, poussés par l'opinion publique, à suivre son exemple, et par la force morale de ce fait acquis, il aura augmenté au lieu de diminuer les conditions de sa défense nationale."

IV.—"Le Congrès, considérant que la question du désarmement aussi bien que celle de la Paix en général dépendent de l'opinion publique, recommande aux Sociétés pour la Paix représentées ici, et aussi à tous les amis de la Paix, de se livrer à une propagande active dans le public, spécialement pendant les périodes d'élections parlementaires, afin que les électeurs donnent leurs votes aux candidats qui auront fait entrer dans leur programme la Paix, le Désarmement, et l'Arbitrage."

CONDITIONS OF DISARMAMENT.

There is a sincere difference of opinion among good and wise men as to Armaments. Some think them the guarantee of Peace. Others count them a menace of war. I share the latter opinion. The more numerous and expensive the army, the more necessary it is to employ it. Armament provokes Armament. Germany recently added 36,000 to its army because France added as many to hers. The self-confidence, induced by conscious military power, renders a Government careless of conciliation. • A great army so exhausts the resources of a nation in money and men

that ten years of Peace becomes as burdensome to the Treasury as one year of war. The people are more restive under the exactions of an "Armed Peace" than they are under the excitements of actual war. Statesmen understand this. Governments are therefore inclined to risk a war on slighter pretexts, and are slower to inquire for its moral sanctions. Such considerations had weight in the last Franco-German War, and helped to precipitate that terrible calamity. But whatever the pretext, the dominant purpose of great nations seems to be to excel in military power, and overawe their neighbours solely by an appeal to their fears. So long as Governments deny the obligation and practicability of Christian principles, I do not see but they are logical in appealing to the *lex talionis*, the ancient and barbarous ethics which Christ came to supersede by a higher law. A solemn agreement to submit disputed questions to wise and deliberate arbitration vacates no alleged right. It simply substitutes the judicial for the military method of obtaining those rights. Once sincerely and solemnly adopted by any two nations, disarmament must follow as a matter of course. No adequate reason exists any longer for proportionately vast armies.

But before Governments can be brought to change the ancient for the modern policy for determining the questions at issue between them, it seems to me that they may enter upon disarmament with no sacrifice of either principle or pride if the conditions suggested in the programme of this Congress be complied with.

1. Disarmament should be *gradual*. This is to save the sudden shock of the dismissal to civil life of millions of men now under discipline untrained to labour, and thus unprepared for citizenship. There is danger that sudden disarmament would at once augment the idlers, the strikers, and the mobs. Only one country, the United States of America, could have as easily and safely absorbed at once into civil life the vast armies of the civil war. The process put that country to a tremendous strain, though its soldiers were originally citizens—never "professionals"—and readily resumed business occupations. Sudden emancipation of slaves or serfs is to be deprecated, and soldiers are apt to acquire some disabilities common to all subject classes, as well as other characteristics which unfit them for the immediate enjoyment and best use of peaceful citizenship. Those nations oppressed with vast armaments will then consult their own welfare if they will agree with each other to disarm.

2. Disarmament ought to be *simultaneous*. As nations are now constituted it *must* be. One nation, if both are equally armed, will be slow to lead another in disarming. France and Germany might agree, first, how many troops to dismiss; secondly, at what time. Russia will be harder to win to disarmament, for her statesmen will allege the greater difficulties which she has to encounter in the vastness of her territory and the increased obstacles thus put in the way of raising and massing of troops. Germany and France may each dismiss 100,000 men to-day, and call them together within a short time as did Napoleon after Elba, in France. Great Britain would allege the world-wide character of her dominions—the need of military supervision in Africa, Asia, and at her distant islands—and the difficulty of a recall if once she dismisses her present force or any considerable part of it. The United States is not "armed" in the sense in which European nations are. The question for that nation to solve is, "Does any necessity exist here to create great armaments?" Any general argument in favour of disarmament in Europe must tell against armament in America. Simultaneity can then be secured only with the co-operation of two, possibly three, leading Powers; in this, one nation must take the initiative.

3. It must be *mutual*. Neither France nor Germany would consider disarmament except as a mutual act. If thus entered upon the lesser Powers might easily follow their example, especially Italy, if freed from the obligations of the triple alliance. Spain, Portugal, Sweden, Denmark, and other countries would gladly lessen their armies and their expenditures. As soon as a mutual agreement could be made between the leading Powers a general disarmament would naturally follow.

4. The disarmament must be *proportional*. This in the interest of equity and the balance of forces.

It seems to me that a gradual, simultaneous, mutual, and proportional disarmament is practicable. Interest, economy, morality, safety, and peace call for it. The Pope has addressed the Emperor of Germany, characterising the numerous Peace military establishments as *unchristian*. In this he represents not only the Catholic Church, but also the sentiment of the best people in Christian Churches and outside of them. Religious opinions have been fruitful sources of persecution and bloodshed, and it is worth something to the cause of Peace that one so eminent and wise as the present Pope discerns, and has pointed out, the oppressiveness of the great armies, and the threat they contain to the peace of the world.

The Emperor of Germany has lately said many kind and conciliatory things to

his peaceful, laborious, and suffering subjects. But we can only know him as all men are judged, by his fruits. A proposition to arm has just come from him to the German nation, and this is a time of profound peace, with no recent or provoking question in debate. This to him may not mean war. But France so interprets it, and other nations are compelled to so understand it. He is in a position to say to France, "Let us have peace by beginning to dismiss our soldiers."

A single regiment dismissed from the service of each of those countries would mark the turn of the tide, and do more for peace than all the protestations possible.

SIGNOR E. T. MONETA, of Milan seconded by reading in French the Report of the Sectional Committee (of which he had been convenor) as follows :—

LE DÉSARMEMENT.

Les protestations contre les lourds armements ne datent pas de nos jours. Écoutez, je vous prie, ce qu'écrivait Montesquieu de son temps.

"La France (vous pouvez substituer le mot Europe) se perdra par les gens de guerre. Une maladie nouvelle s'est répandue en Europe : elle a atteint nos princes, et leur a fait entretenir un nombre désordonné de troupes. Elle a des exacerbations et elle devient nécessairement contagieuse ; car sitôt qu'un état augmente ce qu'il appelle ses troupes, les autres soudain augmentent les leurs ; de façon qu'on ne gagne rien par là que la ruine commune.

"Chaque monarque tient sur pied toutes les troupes qu'il pourrait avoir si son peuple était en danger d'être exterminé, et on nomme paix cet état d'effort, d'effort de tous contre tous. Aussi, l'Europe, est-elle si ruinée que des particuliers qui seraient dans la situation où sont les puissances de cette partie du monde, les plus opulents n'auraient pas de quoi vivre. Nous sommes pauvres avec les richesses et le commerce de tout l'univers."

Cela s'écrivait il y a déjà presque cent cinquante ans ; vous voyez que la peinture semble faite d'aujourd'hui. Une seule chose a changé : le système de gouvernement. Au temps de Montesquieu, et aussi après, on disait que la cause du maintien de grandes armées c'étaient les rois absolus, qui faisaient la guerre dans l'espoir de trouver dans les conquêtes, les moyens d'enrichir leur budget privé, et de passer dans l'histoire avec l'aurole de la gloire.

On disait : Ah ! si les peuples pouvaient élire eux-mêmes ceux qui auraient le droit de refuser aux gouvernements les soldats et l'argent, la politique de guerre serait arrivée à sa fin.

Nous avons aujourd'hui dans presque toute l'Europe des gouvernements représentatifs, et toutefois les frais de la guerre et de sa préparation sont augmentés dans une proportion épouvantable.

C'est que la folie des princes est passée dans les classes dirigeantes. A présent on ne fait plus de guerre parce qu'un prince a manqué de politesse envers une courtisane, comme cela s'est vu du temps de Louis XIV., mais en exagérant des sentiments respectables, comme celui de la dignité nationale et du patriotisme, en échauffant l'opinion publique contre une nation voisine, il arrive un jour où il suffira de dire—sans que la nouvelle soit vraie—que l'ambassadeur de votre gouvernement n'a pas été reçu par le chef d'un état, pour faire éclater la plus épouvantable et la plus funeste des guerres qu'on ait vue.

A présent l'Europe tient sous les armes plus de soldats qu'elle n'en avait au temps des grandes guerres de Napoléon. Tous les citoyens, à peu d'exceptions près, sont obligés, sur notre continent, de passer quelques années dans les casernes. On bâtit des forteresses, on construit des arsenaux et des navires, on fabrique continuellement des armes qui après peu de temps doivent être remplacées par d'autres, parce que la science, qui devrait être dirigée toujours vers le bien-être des hommes, prête malheureusement son aide aux œuvres de destruction, invente à chaque instant de nouveaux engins pour tuer de plus grandes masses d'hommes, et le plus vite possible.

Et pour maintenir tant de soldats et faire de si énormes préparatifs de mort, on dépense par an des centaines de millions, c'est-à-dire ce qui suffirait à l'éducation du peuple, à l'exécution des plus grands travaux d'utilité publique et fournirait les moyens de résoudre pacifiquement la question sociale.

L'Europe se trouve donc de ce côté en déficit de tant de conquêtes scientifiques, comme si elle vivait encore dans les temps les plus mauvais du féroce moyen âge. Tous se plaignent de cette situation qui n'est pas encore la guerre, mais qui n'est pas non plus la paix, et tous en voudraient sortir. Les chefs des gouvernements protestent qu'ils veulent la paix, et c'est une éroulation entre eux à qui fera les plus

solennelles déclarations pacifiques. Mais le même jour ou le lendemain, ils présentent aux chambres législatives des propositions pour augmenter les armements, et ils disent que c'est précisément pour maintenir et assurer la paix, qu'ils prennent tant de précautions.

Or cette paix-là n'est pas celle que nous aimons ; les peuples ne s'y trompent pas non plus. La vraie paix a pour base la confiance réciproque ; tandis que ces énormes armements accusent une défiance profonde, si non une hostilité cachée entre les états. Que dirait-on d'une personne qui, voulant prouver ses sentiments d'amitié à son voisin, l'inviterait à discuter avec lui quelque question en tenant un revolver à la main ? C'est cette flagrante contradiction entre les déclarations pacifiques et la politique guerrière des gouvernements que tous les bons citoyens désirent voir cesser à tout prix le plus tôt possible. Par quels moyens ? Ici les opinions se divisent.

Je vous en donnerai un petit aperçu. Sept mémoires ont été envoyés au comité d'organisation ou présentés à votre commission qui révèlent chez leurs auteurs le profond désir de chercher un remède à la situation intolérable dans laquelle l'Europe se trouve. Je dois me limiter à vous en donner une idée sommaire.

Le Rév. Rowland Howard de Boston, dont je prononce le nom avec un sentiment de profonde gratitude pour les grands services qu'il a rendus à la cause de la paix et de la fraternité humaine, a présenté un mémoire que vous avez sous les yeux, et dans lequel il développe la proposition qui, à la lettre E, a été inscrite dans le programme. Il dit que le désarmement doit être général, graduel, simultané, proportionnel. Graduel, parce qu'il croit qu'il serait à craindre qu'un désarmement subit augmente aussi soudainement le nombre des désœuvrés, des grévistes et des émeutes. Il y a du vrai dans cette réflexion du révérend Rowland Howard, mais peut-être n'a-t-il pas tenu compte de la considération suivante. Le licenciement des soldats doit porter dans le même temps une diminution proportionnelle d'impôts. On a fait le calcul qu'un soldat sous les armes coûte à la société presque le double de l'entretien d'un jeune homme dans la vie civile. Si l'on renvoie dans leurs foyers un million d'hommes, ce sera un milliard d'argent que la société aura reçu, par lequel on pourra donner un fort élan au commerce, et faire surgir de nouvelles industries, qui rendront nécessaire l'emploi d'un nombre plus grand de travailleurs. Il veut le désarmement simultané, parce qu'une nation ne voudra pas précéder une autre. Pourquoi non ? Dans toutes les choses il y a ceux qui voient et agissent plus tôt que les autres ; et si c'est une folie, comme nous le croyons, que ces lourds armements qui écrasent les populations, ce n'est pas une raison si quelqu'un tarde à guérir de cette maladie, pour que les autres soient obligés de la supporter aussi. Nous croyons que la nation qui aura désarmé la première, deviendra la plus forte, par la preuve qu'elle aura donnée de sa confiance en elle-même, et de sa foi dans les idées de paix, et par la reconnaissance qu'elle aura méritée pour ce fait de la part de l'opinion publique.

Dans ce moment même, il y a en Allemagne* et en Italie un courant qui va toujours croissant vers une considérable diminution de soldats sous les armes ; pourquoi leur dire qu'il faut attendre qu'on désarme dans les autres pays ? Ces considérations peuvent s'appliquer aussi à la proposition d'un désarmement mutuel et proportionnel. C'est toujours rester dans le cercle vicieux de la défiance ; tandis que la paix doit s'appuyer sur une entière confiance dans les idées de solidarité, d'union et de justice internationale.

Le Dr. Ch. Depraz de Bordighera a envoyé au comité la copie d'une lettre qu'il a envoyée, au mois d'avril, à l'empereur d'Allemagne, afin qu'il prenne l'initiative du désarmement dans son empire. Si l'Allemagne ne craint que Dieu elle doit se soumettre à ses ordres, qui sont pour la fraternité humaine, non pour la guerre.

Le Congrès a déjà résolu l'envoi d'une adresse à tous les chefs d'états ; il est donc inutile d'en faire une mention spéciale, qui pourrait s'appliquer à un gouvernement plutôt qu'à un autre, dans les résolutions qui visent au désarmement.

M. Jean Baptiste de Ferrer a écrit un important mémoire au point de vue du droit international. Il croit que le désarmement des états aura besoin de garanties, et que celles-ci ne peuvent se trouver que dans un code international, qui serait le plus beau livre encore à faire, et dans un tribunal arbitral des nations, qui aussi n'existe pas encore. Code et tribunal seront un frein puissant et invincible contre les abus de la force.

Ce sont des considérations qui ne manquent ni de valeur ni de justesse ; mais *non est hic locus* ; c'est aux chapitres d'arbitrages qu'il serait mieux de remettre ce mémoire.

M. Mazzoleni, député au Parlement italien, membre du comité parlementaire international, qui a fait un savant rapport sur l'arbitrage à l'occasion des Congrès de

l'année dernière de Rome et de Paris, pense, comme M. de Ferrer, que la question du désarmement est liée à celle de l'arbitrage.

Si tous les états établissent l'arbitrage, il n'y aura plus besoin d'armements. Oui mais si un traité général d'arbitrage tarde, nous croyons qu'un désarmement imposé par l'opinion publique dans quelqu'une des principales nations, pourra le hâter.

La Société de la Paix Perpétuelle par la Justice Internationale de Paris, qui compte 1,100 affiliés, a présenté à la commission par les mains et la signature de son délégué, M. Gaston Morin, une résolution, par laquelle elle déclare que le moyen le meilleur d'obtenir le désarmement serait la fédération des nationalités européennes, analogue à celle des États-Unis d'Amérique. En attendant la société de la paix perpétuelle par la justice internationale voudrait voir se réunir, moyennant un pacte fédératif, ceux des états d'Europe qui bordent les rivages de la Méditerranée. Le mémoire conclut en proposant la résolution suivante: Le Congrès appelle l'attention de toutes les chancelleries, des savants etc., sur les avantages d'un pacte fédératif à établir entre les états méditerranéens d'Europe et d'Asie, duquel résulterait dès le premier jour, le désarmement général. . . . La commission n'a pas vu dans ce projet un moyen tout-à-fait pratique pour arriver, le plus tôt possible, au désarmement général. Pour écarter des difficultés, il nous semble qu'ici on en cherche d'autres. Si cette fédération méditerranéenne était déjà faite il est possible que la question de la paix fût plus tôt résolue; mais nous sommes encore bien loin de cette fédération, plus loin peut-être que d'un désarmement satisfaisant.

Le Capitaine F. Siccardi, Secrétaire de la société internationale de Milan (Unione Lombarda) a envoyé un très-intéressant mémoire, dans lequel il soutient que les amis de la paix doivent, dans chaque pays, viser au désarmement, sans se préoccuper de ce que feront ou ne feront pas les autres pays. Il soutient la nécessité de substituer les nations armées aux armées permanentes, à l'instar de la Suisse. La nation armée n'est pas faite pour les guerres offensives, mais elle est invincible dans la guerre défensive. Il croit qu'il n'est pas possible de se débarrasser des gouvernements arbitraires tant que les peuples ne s'occupent pas de leurs intérêts, et finissent par s'enivrer de la gloire militaire.

Mrs. Belva Lockwood, avocat aux États-Unis, que nous admirons tous pour son talent, pour son savoir, pour son éloquence, mis au service des grands principes de liberté, de paix, et de fraternité, assure la possibilité du désarmement qui n'est plus une Utopie. La Suisse n'a pour ainsi dire pas d'armée, mais elle possède une milice bien exercée; par conséquent le désarmement chez elle est virtuellement accompli.

Les États-Unis sont aujourd'hui virtuellement désarmés, car ils ne possèdent que 25,000 hommes de troupes pour 65,000,000 d'habitants, tandis que toute l'Amérique a déclaré qu'à l'avenir ce sera chez elle un point de droit public de régler toutes les difficultés entre ses états au moyen de l'arbitrage. Pour son importance, ce mémoire mérite d'être lu tout entier devant vous. J'ai fini le résumé. La commission a pris dans ces mémoires ce qu'elle a trouvé de plus inhérent au thème qu'elle avait la charge d'étudier. Elle a voulu être pratique sans oublier l'idéal que poursuivent nos sociétés, et qui sera un jour leur honneur.

Vous avez devant vous les résolutions que nous vous proposons. Elles partent de ce même ordre d'idées qui sont le fondement de l'agitation qui se fait en ce moment en vue de la paix et du désarmement en France, en Allemagne, et surtout en Italie. Votées par vous, elles auront plus de probabilité de triompher des obstacles qui ont empêché jusqu'ici leur réalisation.

In supporting it the following Paper was read by Mrs. BELVA A. LOCKWOOD :—

DISARMAMENT.

"IS ANY SCHEME FOR DISARMAMENT PRACTICAL AT THE PRESENT TIME?"

Mr. President and Members of the Congress; with the facts and figures before us, it does not seem optimistic or Utopian to declare that disarmament under certain conditions is not only practical but feasible. Switzerland, situated in the fastnesses of the mountains, and surrounded by warlike nations, has virtually neither army nor navy, and has not had for years. Her Treaty of Arbitration with the United States, formulated under Secretary of State Frelinghuysen, was agreed to by both nations, but never signed. Whenever the question of renewing the negotiations are broached now, we are met by the answer that it is not necessary.

Belgium, under her treaty of neutrality with the five European powers in 1832 and 1833, known as the Treaty of London—the great work of Lord Palmerston—has had no war since that time; and although she maintains an army only sufficient to police her kingdom, and no navy.

Iceland has neither army nor navy, and Sweden says she will not fight.

President Carnot, of Republican France, says that it shall be "his mission during the balance of the seven years of his Presidency to maintain the peace of Europe," while Secretary Blaine says, in transmitting to the United States Senate the petition of the French people for arbitration with the United States, "that the effective consideration of the question would doubtless be deferred until after the disposition of the subject by the Conference of American Nations now in session." That hour is passed, and there is nothing now wanting but for France to come in and sign the Treaty formulated by the Pan Americans.

Emperor William declares that "it is the mission of Germany to preserve the peace of Europe," but says to the Reichstag, "This can only be done by keeping up the efficiency of our standing army." We wish to teach him another way by which he can at once commence a gradual disarmament.

With the United States, their acts are probably quite as forcible as their words. At the close of the Civil War, now 25 years ago, 150,000 men marched through the city of Washington at the grand review. The standing army of the United States to-day numbers only 25,000 foot and horse—hardly sufficient to police our vast country with 65,000,000 of inhabitants, and 44 sovereign States, and yet I believe that all of these millions would rest quietly in their beds, and sleep on undisturbed, were this army disbanded to-morrow. The effort to revive the United States Navy has been done as a matter of national pride, rather than as a measure offensive or defensive, and these war ships, when built, will probably rot in our Navy yards as their predecessors have done, and only their blackened hulks remain to tell what once has been. They are being built under the old mistaken idea that should now be exploded by civilised nations, and especially by Christian nations, that a nation's grandeur depends upon her ability to make conquests. We have in the last century grown out of the savage and heathen idea that we have a right to conquer a nation and appropriate her goods and her territory—dismember her for our aggrandisement. We relegate it back to the dark ages of the world.

A nation's grandeur to-day—her respect among the nations of the world should depend upon the probity and morality of the people,—their obedience to law,—their advancement in the arts and sciences,—their skilled manufactures,—their extensive commerce,—their improvement in everything that elevates man above the brute.

The United States has not only disarmed, but she has paved the way to make disarmament perpetual under a reign of perpetual peace.

When that International Congress declared as with one voice, and as an authoritative and legally constituted body, "That hereafter it shall be the established principle of American Public Law, that all differences between American States shall be settled by arbitration"; they uttered the grandest declaration propounded by any legalised body of men since our forefathers declared that "all men are born free and equal, with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

When they followed up this declaration by elaborating a Treaty of Internal Arbitration, to continue for twenty years, and it was followed by the Legislatures of 11 of those national autonomies ratifying this act on the 28th of April, 1890, at Washington, with the greatest probability that the seven remaining nations will sign, who are agreed upon this question so far as known, with the single exception of some little disaffection with Chili; they took the grandest step forward in the interest of civilization and humanity of the century. They have followed it up by an authoritative call for a Monetary Congress in Washington next year, a Customs Union, Commercial Reciprocity, subsidised merchant ships, extension of silver coinage, an International Railway, etc., etc.

President Harrison and Secretary Blaine, recommended all of these matters to the United States Senate last week. The good work is going on, and the work is begun in earnest. America will disarm,—a Continent will be free. The World's Fair in Chicago will usher in a revolution with reference to war in the national sentiment of the world.

When this great Congress (I call it great, because it will live when you and I have mouldered into dust,) had finished its labours, it still lingered, as though there was something else to be done while war existed upon the earth, and with its last and final resolution, it stretched out its hands to the nations of the earth, and especially to European Nationalities, and invited them to come in. They made no provision, no apology for war; left no *ifs*, except the one condition where a nation's life is involved. The closing article of that treaty, the fac simile of the form of which I hold in my hand, states:

"Any other nation may accept this Treaty and become a party thereto, by sign-

ing a copy thereof and depositing the same with the Government of the United States, whereupon the said Government shall communicate this fact to the other contracting parties."

Thus the way is open for Treaties of Arbitration by the nations of the World, and under it disarmament becomes easy. Do you not see, brothers, in the vista beyond and yet not far away, the white dove of peace coming down, when nations shall know war no more.

Other papers submitted were :—

GARANTIES POUR LE DÉSARMEMENT SIMULTANÉ DES ÉTATS.

Par JEAN BAPTISTE DE FERRER.

SOMMAIRE.

Besoin de garanties pour le désarmement des États. L'arbitrage d'un État ne peut offrir les garanties d'impartialité, de sécurité et de force morale et matérielle qu'aurait la justice des nations. Double création d'un code international et d'un tribunal arbitral des nations. Le tribunal des nations appuyant ses arrêts, rendus code en mains, sur les forces réquisitionnées dans tous les États. Le tribunal arbitral des nations vidant tous les différends entre nations, n'ayant d'autre pouvoir en dehors du mandat que lui donnera le code, comme les juges des tribunaux civils. Le code et le tribunal seront un frein puissant et invincible contre les abus de la force brutale. Peut-on empêcher la continuation de la guerre civile ? La volonté des majorités doit-elle être sanctionnée par le tribunal ? Si oui ; il est dès lors facile, dans ce cas, de mettre toujours un frein puissant à la guerre civile ; si non : il devient impossible d'intervenir dans les affaires intérieures et particulières des peuples. Le tribunal ne pourrait que donner un conseil officieux. Comment obliger les gouvernements à adopter la garantie du code et du tribunal international ? On ne peut obliger, mais seulement demander le concours, l'accord, l'approbation aux Parlements de tous les États, pour qu'ils adoptent la double création proposée.

Dès 1863, nous écrivions : " Il faut une égide puissante et impartiale qui protège les États comme le sont les individus, et voilà ce que les nations n'ont pas encore, malgré l'urgence absolue où elles se trouvent toutes aujourd'hui de cette garantie réciproque.

Le livre le plus utile qui puisse être écrit est encore à faire : c'est le code international ; la plus belle, la plus nécessaire des institutions du globe reste encore à créer : c'est le tribunal arbitral des nations.

Ce code international et ce tribunal arbitral des nations étant une nécessité, un besoin absolu non seulement pour garantir la paix mutuelle de tous les États et le respect des nationalités, mais encore, pour que le progrès et la civilisation ne soient pas condamnés à rester stationnaires ; l'avenir, si ce n'est notre siècle lui-même, créera, certainement l'un et l'autre.

À une époque où tout est réglé minutieusement, n'est-il pas prodigieux, lorsqu'il s'agit de rapports entre États, c'est à dire de la chose la plus sérieuse, la plus importante, la plus grave, qu'on laisse chaque État être lui-même juge et partie dans toutes les questions souvent compliquées qui peuvent s'élever, faisant arbitre le caprice d'un souverain ou d'un gouvernement dont souvent l'ineptie ou l'égoïsme apporte la perturbation dans le monde entier ?

Dans une semblable situation doit on s'étonner que les États n'ayant aucune garantie de sécurité pour l'inviolabilité de leur territoire, prennent des mesures pour se défendre ainsi que le feraient les particuliers s'il n'existait ni lois, ni tribunaux pour les protéger ?

Aussi, les États dépensent milliards sur milliards à des armements de plus en plus considérables et ruineux, pour s'assurer par la paix armée contre les éventualités d'une attaque imprévue de la part du voisin redouté.

S'il survient aujourd'hui un conflit entre deux grandes puissances, le monde entier se trouve bouleversé parce que nulle justice suprême, impartiale, invincible, n'existe encore pour rétablir l'ordre.

Comment dès lors pouvoir croire qu'une nation grande ou petite aura l'aveugle confiance de désarmer la première, sans aucune garantie de sécurité. Pas une seule nation ne commencera ; et certes, ce sera agir avec prudence.

Pour qu'on puisse opérer un désarmement général *simultané*, il faut commencer par prouver *par des faits accomplis*, qu'il existe des moyens certains, infailibles de réprimer les excès *collectifs*, comme on réprime les abus individuels. Voilà ce que la double création proposée donnera.

On ne pourra plus dire : la force prime le droit, quand les nations d'accord,

prouveront que la force *protège* le droit. Ce jour là, l'ère de la véritable civilisation commencera à donner ses fruits en abondance.

Il est facile de voir que nulle institution, nulle combinaison, pour ingénieuse qu'elle soit, ne peut remplacer, pour les nations, pas plus que pour les individus, des lois et une autorité judiciaire formées par l'ensemble de ces mêmes nations. C'est dire que l'arbitrage par un Etat, si puissant qu'il soit d'ailleurs, n'est pas une garantie de sécurité et d'impartialité qui permettra aux nations de désarmer sans danger.

L'arbitrage est un *pis aller*, acceptable seulement à défaut de mieux, dans les circonstances actuelles. Mais puisqu'il suffit d'un accord entre nations pour avoir de suite la sécurité réciproque la plus grande ; pourquoi dès lors, rester dans un *statu quo* préjudiciable pour tous ? qui d'ailleurs, est une anomalie, dans notre siècle de progrès et de lumière, qui ternit son éclat.

Chose remarquable, ce tribunal des nations ayant une puissance morale et matérielle si grande qu'elle serait invincible, comme il convient que soit la justice, serait cependant impuissant, s'il tentait d'outrager son mandat, ne pouvant pas plus excéder ses pouvoirs que ne peuvent le faire les juges des tribunaux ordinaires qui sont soumis à la seule application des lois.

Le tribunal des nations serait composé de juges envoyés, en nombre égal, par toutes les nations, grandes ou petites, lesquels jugeraient les différends entre Etats, code international en mains. Ce code serait fait au préalable par des jurisconsultes et hommes d'Etat envoyés *ad hoc* par toutes les nations.

Les lois internationales faites, les législateurs ayant rempli leur mandat, l'assemblée des législateurs serait dissoute, jusqu'à l'adjonction de quelque nouvelle loi au code international, ou de quelque modification nécessaire à ces lois.

Le code indiquerait la façon dont les juges du tribunal arbitral des nations seraient nommés, le temps durant lequel ils devraient remplir leurs fonctions et les honoraires qui devraient leur être alloués. Il indiquerait aussi les capitales où le tribunal devrait siéger à tour de rôle, et le temps pendant lequel le tribunal fonctionnerait.

Les arrêts rendus par le tribunal arbitral des nations seraient définitifs et sans appel, puisque ce tribunal suprême n'aurait pas de juridiction plus élevée que la sienne. Il est bien entendu que, lorsque deux ou plusieurs Etats auraient un différend à vider devant le tribunal arbitral des nations, les juges de ces pays en litige ne pourraient faire partie du tribunal, jusqu'à l'entière conclusion de l'affaire à juger.

Le code indiquerait les peines appliquées aux Etats qui violeraient les conventions internationales : amendes, dommages-intérêts, réparations, etc., etc., etc., selon les cas.

Il serait indispensable de préciser avec soin, dans le code international, les limites frontières de chaque Etat ; d'indiquer toutes les conventions faites pour s'accorder tous les avantages réciproques possibles.

Le code international renfermerait les lois de navigation, de commerce, les lois postales, télégraphiques, de chemin-de-fer, des poids, mesures et monnaies, qu'il conviendrait de rendre uniformes ; de libre échange, d'extradition ; celles concernant l'établissement d'une police universelle, etc., etc., etc.

Le code international donnera le droit au tribunal des nations de faire une réquisition d'hommes et d'argent chez toutes les nations.

Avec les forces imposantes et invincibles dont pourrait disposer le tribunal, l'Etat qui serait assez téméraire ou assez fou pour se révolter contre un jugement rendu d'après la loi internationale par le tribunal des nations, serait anéanti en un moment.

Si l'épée doit sortir du fourreau que ce ne soit, du moins, que celle de la justice, pour faire respecter les lois internationales.

Aussitôt le code international achevé, il conviendrait d'établir immédiatement le tribunal arbitral des nations chargé de le faire exécuter.

A cet effet chaque Etat enverrait des juges en nombre égal dans la capitale désignée au code international.

Le tribunal arbitral des nations aurait pour mission spéciale de vider tous les différends, toutes les questions litigieuses soulevées entre Etats ; il devrait pour rendre un jugement consulter et appliquer les lois inscrites au code international. Dans le cas où la question à vider ne serait pas encore prévue par le code international—ce qui devra souvent arriver dans les premiers temps de l'établissement du code—le tribunal alors, en ferait l'observation à chaque Etat ayant des juges au tribunal, pour que ces Etats envoient immédiatement de nouveaux législateurs pour voter la loi qui manque, afin que le tribunal puisse prononcer son jugement.

Il est très important de ne laisser jamais, au tribunal des nations, le droit de prononcer un jugement *de son propre chef*, sans s'appuyer sur la loi insérée au code

international ; et voilà pourquoi, si la loi fait défaut, il conviendra de convoquer les législateurs de toutes les nations pour remplir la lacune.

Ainsi, à mesure que le temps s'écoulera, le code international se complétera de plus en plus.

La double création que, depuis 1863, nous proposons d'établir, comme garantie réciproque indispensable donnée à tous les États d'être pour toujours à l'abri de l'abus de la force brutale, n'a rien de commun avec le projet de l'abbé de Saint-Pierre—et non de *Bernardin* de Saint-Pierre l'éminent auteur de Paul et Virginie, comme bien des personnes, d'ailleurs instruites, *le disent par erreur*. En effet, l'abbé de Saint-Pierre, publia en 1713, un projet de fédération de quelques États, qu'il voulait opposer à d'autres États, et qu'il attribuait à Henry IV., afin de lui donner du poids. Selon lui, c'était le moyen d'avoir la paix perpétuelle.

Mais, outre que loin d'assurer la paix c'était, au contraire, mettre deux camps en présence prêts à en venir aux mains ; il y avait encore l'article VI., du projet, qui rendait les souverains entièrement maîtres de faire exécuter leur volonté par l'espèce de Parlement de l'Europe établi pour assurer la paix.

Voici cet article VI. :

“ Le sénateur ne pourra opiner que suivant les instructions de son souverain et sera révoqué toutefois et quantes par son maître.”

Des juges qui opinent d'après la volonté du souverain : quelle impartialité !

Il est évident qu'une semblable garantie donnée pour avoir la paix, prouve que ce projet illusoire est de tous points *l'antipode du nôtre*.

La ligue amphictyonique des grecs, quoique loin de valoir la forme juridique des tribunaux de nos jours, eut été pourtant bien préférable au projet de l'abbé de Saint-Pierre, malgré que ce ne fut qu'une ligue offensive et défensive comme celle de l'abbé de Saint-Pierre.

En 1585, douze peuples de la Grèce étaient représentés par des députés nommés amphictyons au nombre de trente, lesquels étaient en droit d'armer la confédération contre le peuple rebelle et l'exclure de la ligue amphictyonique.

Dans les moments critiques de différends soulevés entre nations, ce n'est pas l'opinion de quelques personnes sur laquelle les États peuvent se reposer pour être l'arbitre de leur destinée, parce que cette opinion peut-être entachée de partialité pour des causes diverses ; mais c'est sur des lois faites au préalable, par tous les États, et consenties par tous, que l'on peut compter pour le prononcé d'un jugement arbitral, équitable, et vraiment impartial.

Donc, le peuple qui se révolterait contre un arrêt du tribunal des nations, serait illogique, car il se soulèverait contre la loi qu'il aurait contribué à faire lui-même ; de plus, il serait insensé parce que les forces de toutes les puissances, que le tribunal pourrait requérir, l'écraseraient comme un pygmée pourrait l'être par une armée de géants.

Cette répression indispensable, ne peut avoir rien de commun avec la guerre arbitraire faite par l'égoïsme et la force brutale. Pas plus que l'action de l'exécuteur des hautes œuvres ne peut-être confondue avec le meurtre accompli par un scélérat.

Quant à compter sur la fédération des États pour assurer la paix, c'est se faire illusion, quand cette fédération est composée de quelques États seulement, et non de tous les États réunis.

Supposons tous les États de l'Europe fédérés entre-eux, et, d'autre part, tous les États d'Amérique fédérés de même entre-eux. Que résulterait-il ?

Nous aurions deux formidables camps en présence l'un de l'autre ; et en cas de différends, si on ne parvenait à s'entendre, une lutte gigantesque épouvantable aurait lieu.

On en a eu la preuve, dans la guerre civile des États-Unis d'Amérique pour la question de l'esclavage.

Ce ne sont pas les alliances plus ou moins grandes qui peuvent empêcher qu'on en vienne aux hostilités.

Il faut, nous ne saurions trop le répéter, un frein puissant, d'une force proportionnée à la force collective qu'il faudra maîtriser. Ou, comme cette force collective pourra être considérable, il suit de là, que le frein doit être indestructible, invincible, comme peut l'être une autre force collective composée de tous les États du monde réunis.

La force de répression doit donc exister en dehors de chaque État en particulier, et être constituée par tous les États réunis, dans un but de commune protection.

De même que les puissants de la terre ont autant, si ce n'est plus, besoin de lois et de tribunaux protecteurs que les autres ; de même les grandes puissances ont autant, si ce n'est plus, besoin de garanties mutuelles que les puissances secondaires ou de dernier ordre ; car elles ont bien plus à perdre que ces dernières aux con-

séquences désastreuses inhérentes à la guerre, et leur repos importe plus au reste du monde.

D'ailleurs, le temps des conquêtes est passé et ne saurait revenir, parce que les peuples ont appris, au triste prix de flots de sang, qu'en dernier résultat, les conquêtes si brillantes, si glorieuses même qu'elles aient été, n'ont apporté aucun *avantage durable*, et qu'il a fallu toujours, partout, en tous temps, rendre tôt ou tard, le fruit de la spoliation, dû à la force des armes. Ce qu'un peuple faible attaqué injustement ne peut faire, dix peuples, réunis contre l'oppression, le font.

Les conquêtes si vastes qu'elles aient été, les empires si loin qu'ils se soient étendus, ont toujours fini par être démembrés. Fruit de la force brutale, ils ont péri eux-mêmes par cette même force, qui alors au moins avait avec elle la force morale du droit et de la justice en combattant pour une restitution.

Que sont devenus les empires des Alexandre-le-grand, des Césars, des Mahomet II, des Soliman, des Charlemagnes, des Charles Quint, des Napoléon 1er?...

Chaque nation grande ou petite n'a-t-elle pas eu sa part de gloire? Oui, de gloire; puisqu'il est convenu que gloire il y a à être le plus fort; puisqu'il est entendu qu'il y a du mérite à avoir des richesses et des troupes nombreuses qui permettent d'asservir momentanément ses voisins. Mais la force matérielle est un lot qui change de mains.

Aujourd'hui plus que jamais, la tendance des peuples se porte vers le renversement de la prépondérance absolue et exclusive d'un État quel qu'il soit; et comme toutes les grandes puissances se jaloussent, se méfient avec raison les unes des autres, il suit de là un état de gêne constant dans les finances par suite des armées, des vaisseaux, du nombreux matériel de guerre, des formidables fortifications qu'il faut élever: toutes choses d'ailleurs, que les nouvelles découvertes de la science rendent bientôt inutiles, obligeant à recommencer sans cesse ces armements pour se mettre au moins au niveau des puissances rivales.

Les États et les gouvernements qui voudront être logiques, reconnaîtront que, puisque nul ne peut plus tirer avantage de la guerre, et que la paix armée les ruine tous, il est de leur avantage d'apporter tous leur concours loyal, indispensable, pour l'établissement si urgent du code international et du tribunal arbitral des nations.

Un désarmement général est devenu indispensable; mais les nations ne peuvent prudemment l'opérer d'un commun accord, que lorsqu'elles auront une *garantie réciproque de sécurité*: cette assurance consiste dans la création du double établissement que nous proposons depuis 1863.

Le désarmement une fois opéré *par tous simultanément*, le rôle des quelques régiments armés qui resteront dans chaque pays sera complètement changé: il se bornera au maintien de l'ordre intérieur de l'État.

Il ne s'agit pas seulement d'assurer le repos de l'Europe: ce ne serait là qu'ébaucher une œuvre imparfaite, parce qu'aujourd'hui, plus que jamais, tout dans le monde s'enchaîne par des liens sympathiques; et la commotion qui a lieu au bout du monde fait sentir son ébranlement et réagit sur la base de l'édifice social.

La grande famille humaine ne forme donc plus qu'un corps à l'immense cerveau et lorsqu'un membre souffre, tout le corps s'en ressent par la sympathie intime qui existe entre tous les organes.

La vapeur, l'électricité, les téléphones, en rapprochant les distances, rendent les relations plus fréquentes, plus faciles entre les peuples les plus éloignés; et perçoivent au jour à l'action du tribunal arbitral des nations de s'étendre aux dernières limites du globe avec la rapidité de la pensée: chose précieuse surtout pour la police générale et l'extradition des malfaiteurs.

Quant à la guerre, qui ne voit que c'est tout ce qu'il y a de plus anti-social?

Qui ne comprend que tôt ou tard, cette calamité que l'homme a créée comme s'il ne trouvait pas son existence assez misérable, assez éphémère, la guerre cette anomalie qui existe encore chez les nations policiées, doit disparaître à jamais de la surface du monde: ou du moins, *ne doit être que la mesure répressive de la justice éternelle des nations*.

Tout prouve, du reste, que la coutume barbare de s'entre-tuer penche vers son déclin.

Chose singulière, le génie de l'homme en travaillant au perfectionnement des machines de destruction s'achemine sans le savoir, à grands pas vers la disparition du plus horrible fléau qui afflige l'humanité: la guerre. . . .

Si notre être était moins réduit nous aurions bien des pages à écrire pour peindre toutes les fâcheuses conséquences que la guerre produit sur le moral et le physique des hommes, dont la moins fâcheuse est de les habituer à se faire une fausse

idée du juste et de l'injuste, n'ayant connu pendant nombre d'années que la loi matérielle du plus fort, dans les chances heureuses ou fatales des combats.

Est-ce la continuelle vue du sang humain qui peut donner aux hommes l'amour du prochain, la charité qui compatit aux souffrances d'autrui.

Ne craignez-vous pas que leur sensibilité ne soit singulièrement émoussée ?

Est-ce en faisant *le fourbi*, c'est à dire en volant tout ce qui leur sera tombé sous la main, sous prétexte qu'ils sont en pays ennemi, que les hommes auront ensuite une bien grande délicatesse à l'égard de leurs voisins ?

Quelle contradiction entre la morale évangélique toute de charité, de douceur, et ce qui se passe sur les champs de bataille où l'on envoie les hommes s'entre-tuer comme de méchants fous, la plupart du temps, pour les besoins de la politique.

N'est-il donc pas encore temps d'en finir avec ces scènes propres aux siècles de barbarie ?

Vous vous croirez civilisés au suprême degré, hommes du 19^{me} siècle ; on voit bien que vous êtes à la fois juges et parties !

Les peuples vraiment éclairés, avancés en progrès, en véritable civilisation ne feront plus la guerre ; ils ne parleront qu'avec horreur du temps où les hommes s'entre-tuaient comme de méchants fous, pendant qu'ils inséraient dans leurs lois des peines contre ceux qui maltraitaient les animaux et contre les duellistes.

Les législateurs qui rédigeront le code international, auront à résoudre une question fort épineuse !

Est-il possible d'empêcher la continuation d'une guerre civile ?

On pourrait répondre oui ; avec certitude, si on établissait pour principe, sans autre considération, que la volonté de la majorité des citoyens d'un pays sera toujours respectée et sanctionnée par le tribunal des nations ; parce que dans ce cas, le tribunal après avoir ordonné la suspension de la lutte, consulterait le peuple en révolution et la volonté de la majorité serait sanctionnée par le tribunal des nations pour asseoir le gouvernement désiré.

Mais la difficulté pour établir un tel principe comme base fondamentale des lois, internationales, c'est que *les majorités peuvent se tromper*, et vouloir, par exemple, établir une mesure qui soit préjudiciable et peu équitable envers certaine classe de la société.

Les législateurs auront à examiner cette question épineuse qui pourrait dans certains cas, offrir des périls. Ils décideront, si on ne doit pas laisser chaque peuple faire lui-même ses affaires intérieures particulières, et si, en cas de guerre civile, on devra, à la demande de la majorité des citoyens, intervenir pour asseoir le gouvernement voté par cette majorité, ou ne pas intervenir, si ce n'est pour donner seulement un conseil.

Voilà le nœud gordien difficile à trancher.

Comment arriver à faire adopter par les gouvernements la double création du code international et du tribunal arbitral des nations :

Notre humble avis : Si la majorité des honorables membres qui composeront le congrès universel de la paix, réunis à Londres en Juillet 1899, adopte, comme la meilleure des garanties de sécurité pour les États, la double création que nous proposons d'établir depuis 1863 ; après avoir signé l'acte constituant l'approbation du congrès, ce document pourrait être communiqué et soumis à la haute appréciation de la vénérable doyenne des souveraines : Sa Majesté la reine d'Angleterre.

Avec cette précieuse approbation, qui donnerait un grand poids à celle du congrès, on pourrait alors adresser une demande à tous les gouvernements et à tous les Parlements des États, en commençant par l'Angleterre, où a été tenu le Congrès.

Cette demande consisterait en l'invitation faite aux Parlements de tous les États d'envoyer dans une capitale : Londres, Paris ou autre, des juriconsultes et hommes d'État pour travailler et délibérer en commun à l'importante élaboration des conventions et lois internationales qui devront être insérées au code international.

Cette réunion des législateurs de tous les États est d'autant plus urgente, que la création du code international est la plus importante des garanties mutuelles pour tous les États ; et que ce travail, fait de commun accord, demandera plusieurs années, avant d'être terminé.

Les États ne pouvant désarmer que *simultanément*, et lorsque le code international et le tribunal arbitral des nations auront été créés de commun accord ; il importe de faire rédiger au plus tôt le code international au préalable.

L'humble vieillard qui a l'honneur de présenter ce projet des garanties à l'appréciation du Congrès de Londres, s'est affirmé, depuis 1863, dans la conviction profonde, que la double création du code international et du tribunal arbitral des nations est la seule garantie sérieuse qu'on peut donner aux peuples pour leur sécurité réciproque, et qu'elle leur est aussi nécessaire que les lois et les tribunaux sont

nécessaires aux particuliers : et même, aussi indispensable que l'est la lumière du soleil.

Aux nations d'opter entre l'ère nouvelle de repos et de prospérité qu'elles peuvent voir commencer, et la gêne et l'anxiété où elles sont.

C'est le cas où jamais d'appliquer le fameux adage : vouloir, c'est pouvoir.

PRÉCIS OF PAPER BY CAPTAIN SICCARDI.

Captain Siccardi, of Milan, presents a paper on "Disarmament." Disarmament needs only the irrevocable decree of public opinion. Nations are still like flocks, led by shepherds. We do not get rid of this shirt of Nessus, because we have the poison of militarism in our veins. This virus is at the root of the disease. It is a fact of History, that wars between city and city, or district and district, were abolished as soon as the cities or districts were disarmed. They were disarmed by violence, and though petty wars were put an end to, the era of great wars began. It is idle to suppose that Governments will disarm spontaneously or as the consequence of some general Congress. We must address ourselves to the people who have hitherto been blind to their true interests. We must disperse their ignorance and prejudices and show the evil and misery of the war. To ask for simultaneous disarmaments is to ask an impossibility, but everyone should advocate disarmament in his own country. A country disarmed may safely rely upon the valour of its citizens fighting for hearth and home. Fear produces our armaments, it is pity that will dissolve them.

SUMMARY OF ADDRESS ON THE DISARMAMENT OF NATIONS.

By GEORGE DANA BOARDMAN, D.D.

Dr. Boardman commences by referring to two principal theories of human society,—the one that it consists of separate units having no "organic union"; the other that humanity is a person, each individual member being a "vital component in the great organism." The latter theory is found in St. Paul's famous analogy of the human body; so mankind is one "body of divers natures and offices unified into one great common society." Every nation is a person having its own idiosyncrasy, mission, and function. Each in simple virtue of its own existence is also international; its relation to the other nations being one, not of competition, but of co-operation. "We are members one of another" is St. Paul's conception of this ideal society.

Although wars may have had their purpose in the past, the fundamental principle of God's government is progress; and what war may have been relatively right yesterday is absolutely wrong to-day. War now is as though the right foot should kick against the left; and "if right, honour, and truth are in their nature spiritual instead of carnal, then the weapons of our warfare must be the same."

Believing that the policy of God is peace, I believe that the Divine Master summons the nations to disarmament. It may be the most effectual means of preventing war, while "I believe in the right of self-defence; and we still need a body of armed men as a National Police."

Let America propose to the nations to disarm, substituting arbitration or some other pacific policy. William Penn showed that it could be done; as well as the Geneva Arbitration.

"In the conception of all mankind lies the secret of the great conciliation of the great schism in the body of humanity." The cure of war lies in the confidence and the brotherhood and co-operation announced in disarmament.

DISCUSSION.

Rev. G. D. BOARDMAN, D.D. (U.S.A.) moved as an amendment to the first resolution that the words, "**the whole civilized world,**" be substituted for the words "*the whole of Europe.*" There were 100,000,000 people on the other side of the Atlantic who wished to have a part in the passing of that noble resolution.

The amendment having been seconded, was adopted.

Mr. LEVI K. JOSLIN (Rhode Is., U.S.A.), in supporting the resolution, said that in America disarmament had proceeded relatively to population. In 1875 there was one soldier to every 1,700 persons, while to-day there was but one to every 2,500 persons. According to the Arbitral Treaty of the American States Congress no conceivable question was exempted

from arbitration. Even the question of the independence of the States of America might be settled by arbitration. Brazil had recently endorsed the Treaty, and had recommended that every State on the American Continent should send a delegate to Chili, urging her to accept it. Brazil had only one soldier to every thousand people.

Professor BENJAMIN TRUEBLOOD (Penn College, Iowa) said that he did not rise to go at all into the general discussion of the subjects, but simply to give an illustration of the moral force of disarmament. He disliked to allude to his own country (America), but that was about the only one of which he knew anything. At the close of the Great Civil War there were about a million of men in the Federal Armies, and something near half-a-million in the Southern Army. The Government deliberately disarmed and sent back to civil life the soldiers of the Federal Armies, and, following that, the Southern Army disbanded. That simple act on the part of the two sections of his country had had a moral power which had been incalculable. There had been a great deal of talk in his country, since the war of the bloody shirt, and yet no one had ever been able to find it. It had been about as mythological as the celebrated garment of Nessus, but if the country had kept the armies lest there should have been another outbreak of rebellion, he feared that they would have found that bloody shirt a hundred times over. There was a moral power in disarmament which would wield a force in Europe that would be simply tremendous. The great historian, Guizot, claimed for France the lead in all the civilization of Europe. If France would have the courage to begin the great movement of disarmament her example would, in a short time, he believed, be followed by all the European nations.

M. PASSY said that the Chairman had expressed a desire that some European voice should be heard upon the subject. He (M. Passy) was for the moment the European voice, and he assured the assembly, not only in his own name, but in the name of the greatest part of the universality of Europe, and he might say of America, there was a feeling of revolt against the present state of things. He hoped that they would be unanimous in carrying the resolution. In his country they had the conscription, and he asked the meeting to think of all the misery that that caused. It compelled men to leave their homes and abandon their professions and go to serve in the army.

Mr. JOHN WILSON, M.P., was the next speaker. He said that he had attended the Congress meetings since the beginning, and had been very much pleased by the spirit which had been manifested by all the speakers. He felt sure that that Congress in this the first city of the world would have a very material effect upon the Governments of the nations of the world. Speaking as a Scotchman he felt sure that the great majority of his countrymen would fully endorse the sentiments of the Congress. He hoped that the day was not far distant when there shall be such a unanimity of feeling among the nations of the world, that Christian people everywhere will lift up their voice as one man and say that no longer should the sword be drawn from the scabbard, but that the people shall dwell in peace: and when an end shall be put to the enormities and the evils that arise from the warlike armaments that we see around us on every hand. As a member of the legislature he protested against the enormous amount of money that was taken from the pockets of the people for the purpose of maintaining an armed peace. An armed peace was an anomaly. Let every one of them not only in name and in profession be Christians, but let them use every opportunity of making that profession clear and unmistakable in the world, until the time comes when every nation shall acknowledge that He who is our lawful King is the Prince of Peace.

M. JAKES DUMAS FAUCHER, of Nismes, France, said that he thought that if he could read the minds of his English and American friends he should find a sincere commiseration for those who were still under compulsory service. For the consolation of people who pitied them he wished to say that evil bears its remedy in itself, and he thought that it would be precisely that compulsory service that would bring about disarmament. Even their preachers, their ministers, and their priests had to be soldiers now. Formerly in the schools they could hear teachers, who had never seen what war was like, holding it up to their pupils as a very grand thing; but now that they themselves had to go to the barracks, and be drilled, they did not find it amusing at all, and he thought that they would no more show war under such a grand aspect to their pupils. It had been said by their hon. friend, M. Passy, that morning, that the greatest part of their money had gone into smoke, but they did not get even that now for their money, as the new powder did not smoke. The way to peace would be found in the love for peace.

M. VASSEUR (representative in Paris of the Peace Society) said that it was all very well to tell the Powers to disarm. They would do nothing of the kind. He would ask the Congress to call upon the Inter-Parliamentary Congress, which was to meet in London next week, to urge France to go to Washington, and be the first nation in the world to conclude an arbitration treaty. If France did that the other nations would very soon follow the example. France and Germany are armed to the teeth, Russia had a sword in each hand, and if you ask any one of these countries to disarm it would say: "Disarm? Why, look at my neighbour! I will not disarm." The speaker concluded by saying that the people of Europe were at this moment in the position of a man standing on the brink of a precipice, who was so fascinated by the danger before him that he was in imminent danger of falling over the precipice. The people of Europe were fascinated by the terror of war: and he would say to them as you would say to the man on the edge of the precipice, "Lo! Friend: Avert your eyes from the danger: Look up, LOOK UP."

RAFIUDDIN AHMAD MOULVI (Bombay) said that it was a great pity that in the International Peace Congress no representative from the great continent of Asia should be found. He was sorry indeed because that excluded Asia from the civilized world, because the first resolution said: "The Congress feels that it can affirm that the whole civilized world desires Peace." There being no representative from Asia seemed to show that Asia did not want peace and that therefore it was not civilized. That was a great stigma. He came before the meeting to say that no continent more desired peace than his: and if any continent was in need of peace it was certainly Asia. Asia was noted for wars and knew the consequence of wars and battles, and he was in a position to tell the delegates from Europe and America that every person in Asia would be for peace. But when Asia saw that her most civilized sisters, America and Europe, wanted more armaments, more men, more battles, then it was content with its own destiny and said "What is the use of knowledge, what is the use of philosophy, what is the use of modern civilization when all quarrels are to be decided by mere brutal and physical force?"

He could assure them that the government of India was the most happy government of the present day, although India was in darkness. Through the peace and order which the British Government had brought into the country, and the intellectual food that it had given, they were able to tell what was better for civilization. In such weak countries peace was absolutely necessary for progress and civilization. It had

been said that Christian people desired peace. He as a Moslem could tell them that Mohammedans were equal to Christians in their desire for peace. Perhaps the word "Mohammedan" was inseparably connected with bloodshed in the eyes of Europeans and Americans. There were no such doctrines in his religion. If there was any religion on the surface of the globe that wanted and enjoined Peace, that religion was Mohammedanism. No monarch in the world had a greater desire for peace than the Shah of Persia, and the article by Professor Vambery showed that the Sultan of Turkey wanted Peace. At present the countries of the East were afraid indeed of civilized Europe with its million of soldiers. If Europe would set the example of disarmament those countries would follow that example.

M. DESMOULINS (Paris) asked why were the nations armed? The object of arming was to conquer and to hold the results of conquest. Under the American Treaty of April 28, the right of conquest was eliminated for ever. If the nations would eliminate that right, there would be no excuse or pretext for armies.

Mr. LASSASIE (London) said that the question was a social question. Lord Randolph Churchill was not exactly a peace man, he thought, but for all that at the Paddington Vestry Hall, some time ago, he pointed out that the English were better able to cope with the Continental people, because they (the English) did not have to waste three long years of their youth in military service. Who were the nations who had to work hardest? The Germans, the French, the Belgians, the Swiss, and, indeed, all the armed nations. Who were, next to that, the nations who worked the least, who had Saturday afternoons, no Sunday work, plenty of holidays, only fifty-four hours' work a week, and who were actually asking eight hours a day? The English, the Americans, the Australians, the New Zealanders.

Mons. le Pastor A. CADOT (Chauny) said that it was not enough to have a social system of peace, but that we should have the Gospel of Peace preached. Our duty to everyone was to go and spread round about us the good principles represented at that meeting. A man, because he is anxious to proclaim the doctrine of mercy and magnanimity, may be taken and put in prison: but will he be stopped by that? Never! He will go on in the name and with the strength of the Lord. There was at the meeting a dear lady, Miss Peckover, who had given the means of spreading hundreds and thousands of tracts about peace, and if any of his countrymen would write to him he would give them as many as they desired.

Mr. J. BEVAN BRAITHWAITE said that they had had Americans, a Scotchman, and several foreigners on the platform, and he did not want the question to go as though there were no Englishmen interested in it. The deep heart of England responded to the necessity of disarmament. He wished to lay responsibility upon the Christian Church. How was it that among the great churches of this country there was only one very small section—a little Benjamin, as it were—that was thoroughly, heartily faithful on the subject of disarmament. If the Church of Christ were faithful, we should learn war no more.

Mr. CHARLES THOMPSON proposed that the third resolution should read, "The Congress considering that the timidity of a single power or other causes might delay indefinitely the convocation, &c."

Mr. W. EVANS DARBY: I may say, on behalf of the Committee, that we accept that alteration.

The Rev. WILLIAM U. MURKLAND, D.D., said that it was one of the great remarks of Goethe, that the chief benefit of history was to create enthusiasm. A great deal of enthusiasm had been created in the

Congress, but there was one imperative necessity for every cause that was to conquer, and that was faith in its ultimate success. It seemed to him that the press regarded the proceedings of the Congress from day to day with somewhat of a pratronizing air, as if to say, "You are good children, some of you cranks, but we will pat you on the back; what you say does not amount to anything." It should amount to something. They had faith in the ultimate issues of the Congress. Disarmament was not an impossibility. Nobody who read the history of the last thirty years could consider any reform an impossibility that had God on its side. It was a great saying of the German people that one with God was a majority. They had God on their side in the Peace movement, and, therefore, they were decidedly in the majority. Was it not possible so to agitate public opinion through the press and through the pulpit that they should create an atmosphere in which the truth of that German saying should become regnant, should become invincible? The abolition of slavery seemed an impossibility but it was accomplished. One of the great leaders of that movement took for his motto, "The battle is not yours but God's," and he said to his daughter, "You will find that my Bible opens at that verse." As one of the race of men, made in the image of God, he (the speaker) supported the Peace movement, and he looked forward to its complete and glorious consummation.

Mrs. WIGHAM (Dublin), who was received with loud applause, said: There is a French maxim naturalised in our country, "*Ce n'est que le premier pas qui coûte.*" In this matter of disarmament it is very true, "*Ce n'est que le premier pas qui coûte.*" What a glorious ambition for any nation to be the first to lay the sword at the feet of humanity and at the foot of the cross of Jesus Christ! It is not bravery which keeps the nations armed to the teeth. If the gentlemen of various nations who meet day by day on this platform, and exchange loving looks and words, came armed to the teeth, we could not call them brave and noble. It is cowardice which keeps the nations armed, and it would be magnificent and true self-sacrifice to be the first in this noble work of disarmament. Now just one word about those dumb millions of Europe, the women and children, who are the greatest sufferers in war. In the names of those who cannot speak for themselves, I ask, and I pray, that every one of you here may feel your arms strengthened and your tongue made more eloquent in forwarding this great cause of peace when you remember the terrible sufferings of the poor women and children that war has produced—when you remember that for part of her life almost every woman on the Continent is a widow virtually, and very often actually; that most of the children are, at least for part of their lives, virtually orphans, because the husband and father is taken away to fill the armies which are to desolate this earth. Oh, in the name of all those sufferings, all those tears, all those heart-breaking agonies which women and children have suffered, I ask you to be strong and self-sacrificing in this great cause, and the God of Peace will reward you!

The CHAIRMAN: If there be no objection I will put the four resolutions together.

The four resolutions on the paper were then put to the meeting and carried unanimously.

Mr. DARBY announced that in consequence of communications of enquiry received from the Greek Minister and M. Emil Mijatovitch, invitations for the remaining sittings would be sent to them in the name of the Congress. The latter subsequently attended.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON, 17TH JULY.

RECEPTION OF DELEGATES AT THE MANSION HOUSE.

The delegates, about 400 in number, had the honour of being received by the Lord Mayor and the Lady Mayoress at the Mansion House at four o'clock on Thursday, the 17th July. The formal reception having taken place in the saloon, tea and coffee were provided, and the handsome suite of rooms thrown open to the guests. After an interval the company gathered in the Egyptian Chamber. Amongst those present, either on the platform or in the audience, were the Hon. D. D. Field, the Marquis of Bristol, Sir J. W. Pease, Bart., M.P., M. Frederic Passy, Rev. Dr. Reuen Thomas, Rev. Dr. Murkland, Mr. F. D. Mocatta, Rev. Newman Hall, Rev. R. Balgarnie, Rev. R. B. Howard, Rev. P. Husband Davies, Rev. Dr. Grammer, Rev. J. O. Jackson, Mr. George Jacob Holyoake, Mrs. Belva Lockwood, Mr. W. Hazell, Mrs. Wigham, Mr. W. Evans Darby, Mr. Hodgson Pratt, Miss Peckover, Miss Ellen Robinson (Liverpool), Baron De St. Georges Armstrong, Rev. Dr. Moxom, Dr. Pankhurst, Rafiuddin Ahmad Moulvi (Bombay), M. Dumas-Faucher, M. Vasseur (Paris), M. Borg, M.P. (Sweden), Signor Moneta, Mr. J. B. Braithwaite, &c., &c.

The Lord Mayor.

The entrance of the Lord Mayor, accompanied by the Lady Mayoress and several of the distinguished guests, evoked applause, which continued during the depositing of his Lordship's insignia of office. This having subsided,

The LORD MAYOR said :

My Lords, Mesdames et Messieurs,—Mon premier devoir en qualité d'hôte est de vous souhaiter une cordiale bienvenue à la Mansion House. Je puis vous assurer que je n'ai jamais présidé aucune assemblée avec un plus grand plaisir que celui que j'éprouve en ce moment, car je ne me souviens pas qu'il y ait eu une réunion dont le but comportât des principes aussi profondément philanthropiques et d'une aussi vaste étendue que ceux que votre Congrès se propose de propager.

Je suis heureux de constater que vos travaux en faveur de la Paix ne se bornent pas à rechercher cette Paix entre les nations, mais, ce qui est encore bien plus important et qui est le premier de tous les besoins, tendent à l'établir entre les hommes.

Je remarque qu'entre autres questions vous traitez de celle qui touche au caractère sacré de la vie humaine. Je crains, malheureusement, que ce caractère ne soit en différents endroits tout au moins méconnu, si ce n'est dédaigné.

Je vois également que vous vous occupez de la fraternité des hommes et des peuples. Pour ma part, je ne conçois pas comment vous pourrez obtenir la fraternité des peuples sans avoir établi celle des hommes, puisque les peuples ne sont que des agglomérations d'hommes.

Vous traitez aussi de l'enseignement de Dieu aux juifs dans l'Ancien Testament, et de l'enseignement du Christ au monde dans le Nouveau Testament. Ce n'est pas trop de dire qu'on peut chercher en vain à travers ces hautes leçons la moindre justification de la persécution des créatures de Dieu, au nom de Dieu même, ou au nom du Christ. Aussi n'est-ce pas un fait à déplorer qu'à la fin du XIX siècle il se trouve des hommes, se prétendant civilisés, qui se forment en partis dans le but avoué de persécuter leurs semblables? N'est-ce pas décourageant, n'est-ce pas humiliant de tourner des regards vers la Russie et de songer aux traitements barbares infligés à la fois par le gouvernement de ce pays aux chrétiens et aux juifs?

My Lords et Messieurs, vous avez une grande œuvre devant vous. Ce sont les écuries d'Augias à nettoyer. Puisse Dieu vous accorder la force d'accomplir cette tâche!

My President, my lords, ladies, and gentlemen,—My first duty as host is naturally to welcome you—as I do most heartily—to the Mansion House of the City of London. I have had the great privilege of presiding over many meetings under this roof, but I say unhesitatingly I never presided with greater pleasure than upon this occasion, for this reason: that I believe there never was a gathering at the Mansion House—certainly there has not been one during my mayoralty—the objects of which are so thoroughly humanitarian and so far-reaching as are the objects of this Congress. I am pleased to find that your labours in the interests of peace are not restricted to peace between nation and nation, but that they are devoted first of all to bringing about, if possible, that first desideratum, peace between men and men. Nations are mere agglomerations of men; and I say without hesitation that if you cannot succeed in bringing about peace between men and men then peace between nation and nation is a mere empty phrase. I see from your programme that you consider, among other things, the sacredness of human life. I am sorry to say the result of my observation is that in some countries that item is scarcely appreciated at its full, that in some countries the sacredness of human life is almost ignored; because if that sacredness were properly appreciated, surely human beings—men, woman, and children—could not by any possibility be driven out of the countries of their birth upon any pretext whatever save that of utter criminality. According to your programme, I see that you deal, among other items, with God's teaching to the Jews in the Old Testament, and with Christ's teaching to the world in the New Testament. I say without scruple that in either of those teachings man must seek in vain for the slightest justification for persecuting his fellow creatures on the mere ground that they worship our common Divine Creator after the fashion of their own faith. Unfortunately there is a blot in that connection in this nineteenth century of ours. It makes one almost blush for his humanity when he hears of men calling themselves human beings, calling themselves civilised, banding themselves together in order to persecute their fellow beings and their fellow countrymen because they do not agree on that one point which is, after all, an item between God and God's creatures—the item of faith. While we have to blush for some countries, we must feel pride in regarding the action of others. Pride swells one's breast immensely when one thinks of the freedom in that respect which prevails in this England of ours. I say in this respect England sets an example to the world; and I should be very glad if the world as a whole were a little more quick than it is at present to follow it. But I am proud to see that in several nations the attempt to introduce religious persecution is promptly quenched, and if it is not as promptly quenched as it might be, it is not for the want of determined efforts on

the part of good and pious men, Christians and others, who are determined to stamp out that blot upon our humanity. One does not like to be personal, but when we turn to Russia, and when we see how Christians and Jews alike are barbarously treated because of their belief, I say we must blush for that country, and we must pray that God's blessing will open the eyes of those who direct, humanly speaking, the fate of that country. I say no country can prosper, no country can be happy where persecution is paramount. I turn again to this country of ours, and I speak upon a subject in which I am personally interested—the treatment of the Jews in this country. My position here is an evidence of the liberality of the English people, a liberality that is illustrated in many quarters. And what is the result of it? The result is to be summed up in a few words uttered in this very room not long since by that large-hearted prelate, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who said that among the best supporters of hospitals and other charities in this country were to be found the members of the ancient faith to which it is my pride to belong. Ladies and gentlemen, as you treat people, so you mould them. I am a lover of horses, and I have frequently seen a horse possessing the best possible temper made the wildest and most uncontrollable of all brutes because the man who has had charge of him has treated him in a brutal manner. In every animal kindness begets kindness, and surely that must apply to the highest and the noblest of all God's creatures. I am afraid I have detained you too long, but if I have, you will forgive me, I am sure, on the ground that the subject I have touched upon so lightly is one very near and dear to my heart. My nearest, dearest, and best friends are not all of my own belief, and when I am introduced to a stranger I never ask of the introducer, "What is your friend's religious belief?" One does sometimes ask when a gentleman is introduced to the Mansion House, "What is his character?" But I hope the day is far distant when the question will have to be put, "What is his religious belief?" A man's religion, I repeat, is a matter between his Creator and himself. I may add this with regard to differences of belief, that if we think we are right, and that certain of our friends in their religious belief are wrong, it is our duty in our hearts to pity those whom we think are wrong on an important point, and not because we think them unfortunate, to say, "We will kick them in order to add to their misfortune." Ladies and gentlemen, I thank you for the kindness with which you have listened to me, and I am privileged to call upon the President of the Congress to address the next few words to you.

Hon. DAVID DUDLEY FIELD: The Lord Mayor has been good enough to say that I am called upon to utter a few words. They shall be few—very few; but I hope to the point. He shows by what he has said that he knows very well what we are coming together for; he knows that we are not banded together for any faith, for any nationality, but for the union of the whole human race. One of the first phrases uttered in our deliberations was, "The Fatherhood of God," and following that was "The brotherhood of man." You, Sir, have alluded to circumstances peculiar to yourself and your Lady Mayoress in this free country. Let me tell you that we, in our far-off land beyond the horizon, long ago proclaimed the equality of all men before the Almighty and before the law. We have hospitals in New York, but among our munificent charities, the charities of the Hebrews are distinguished for their munificence and their liberality. I say for one that in America there is no prejudice whatever against the Hebrews as a race. Whatever prejudice there may be against them is a prejudice against individuals, just as there is a prejudice against individuals, fewer or more, in every nationality, in every creed. The world may

laugh, the world may sneer, but

For a' that, and a' that,
It's coming yet, for a' that,
When man to man, the world o'er,
Shall brothers be for a' that.

The MARQUIS of BRISTOL: I am very glad to be able to come here to-day, and, as a vice-president of the International Arbitration and Peace Association, thank you on their behalf for the kindness with which you have received us, and for the welcome which you have accorded to those who are interested in this great cause, which I have brought before the House of Lords, though, I am afraid, very ineffectively. It strikes me, if I am to say anything for England, I cannot say it better than in the words of Lord Derby, who said, "England may have many interests, but the greatest of all its interests is peace." I am perfectly certain that in the centre, as it were, of this great City of London the inhabitants will echo that sentiment to the utmost.

M. FREDERIC PASSY: I have the honour of being here as one of the representatives of my country (France). I well remember that when in the midst of the war we were saying that it was possible to substitute arbitration for war we were laughed at by all the nations. But that idea has been growing year by year, and gaining strength day by day. You, my Lord Mayor, would not have received men in the name of peace and goodwill among nations if it were not in your heart. I thank you. We are encouraged now that we see that the official representatives of the rights and interests of nations are receiving us and encouraging us, and that from the official chair of the Mansion House the Lord Mayor has not only said "Welcome" to his guests, but (what is more important) has welcomed the idea, the truth we are carrying to the world.

Rev. Dr. GEORGE DANA BOARDMAN, U.S.A.: There is one word which I have heard in this Congress that has been ringing through my ears, and has been appealing to my deepest sensibilities. It is this one word, Mankind. We are here to demonstrate that humanity consists, not only of men one by one as atoms, but that humanity in the large and abiding sense of the term means man.

Mr. GEORGE GILLET then proposed a vote of thanks to the Lord Mayor. He said: As a citizen of this great City, I have to thank you on behalf of the Secretary and the Committee, of which I am a member, for your kindness in receiving the Congress on this occasion. Might I be allowed to add that you, in your official capacity of chief magistrate of this great empire, rule not by the sword—which I am happy to see lies in its scabbard on your table—but by an army of constabulary, which we recognise as the true and legitimate representatives of a righteous and just Government. Whilst we have a quarrel against that anarchy which is summed up in the tiny word war, we have no quarrel against the position of the constables, which represent your authority. Indeed, it is our belief and hope that when the Governments of the world shall be guided by enlightened words and just administration, it will be found that a constable government is the proper attitude, and that, in consequence, soldiers will be done away with and men learn war no more.

Mr. HODGSON PRATT seconded, saying that in the Mansion House all great social, religious, and philanthropic movements had their origin. No great organisation for the welfare and progress of mankind considered it had had its birth until its meeting had been held there.

The vote of thanks was carried by acclamation.

The LORD MAYOR, in acknowledgment, said: I thank you for this, if you will allow me to call it so, unnecessary vote of thanks—unnecessary because my reward for receiving you has been in the pleasure of receiving you, and in the additional pleasure of expressing my sympathy with the great work you have in hand. I venture to say that this Congress, and those who are working in this movement, have an exceedingly great work before them: they have to cleanse an Augean stable. My words to you in this hall will be, "God grant them strength to accomplish it."

THURSDAY EVENING, 17TH JULY.

SERVICE AT STAMFORD HILL CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH.

The Rev. J. MORGAN GIBBON, the Pastor of this church, had undertaken to preach a sermon before the Congress. A terrific thunderstorm, accompanied by heavy rain, which lasted the whole evening, greatly interfered with the attendance, and the sermon was postponed until Sunday morning, when it was delivered to a large audience. This sermon will be published by the Peace Society. A service was, however, conducted for those who had braved the weather, in which a Peace Address was given by the Rev. R. B. HOWARD, Boston, U.S.A.

FRIDAY MORNING, 18TH JULY.

The chair was taken by the PRESIDENT (Hon. David Dudley Field).

The minutes of the previous meeting having been read and confirmed, Mr. W. EVANS DARBY read a letter of sympathy from the Westminster and Longford Monthly Meeting of the Society of Friends : also letters expressing regret because of their inability to attend the Congress from Heeren Van Eck and Bik, of Holland, and M. Van Put, of Belgium.

NATIONAL CONTROL OVER DECLARATION OF WAR.

The following resolution, which had been agreed upon by the Procedure Committee, was brought forward by Mr. SNAPE :

(ENGLISH.)

“Whereas the very principle and purpose of a Universal Peace Congress is the establishment of the juridical status among nations; whereas the Congress believes that all international disputes can be settled by peaceable means; the Congress therefore affirms that the duty of these Congresses is to investigate the means of establishing a juridical status. The Congress whilst refraining from expressing an opinion respecting the establishment of juridical courts in the form suggested by the Abbe Defourny in his paper, is of opinion that most wars could be avoided if delay could be secured, during which the voice of passion could be stilled and the voice of reason heard. The Congress therefore recommends that there shall be established national juridical courts, independent of the executive, for the examination of all disputes which might occasion war, and that such courts should have power to call for all information in the possession of their respective Governments. The considered judgment of the juridical court, together with the decision requiring reparation of the wrong, as set forth in the said judgment, shall be notified through the Embassy, to the other party and people, and be communicated to its own people as well as to the other Powers.”

(FRENCH.)

“Attendu que le principe même, le but d'un Congrès Universel de la Paix est l'établissement de l'état juridique entre nations; attendu que le Congrès est persuadé que toutes les disputes internationales peuvent se résoudre par des moyens pacifiques, le Congrès affirme que le devoir de ces Congrès est de rechercher les moyens d'établir un état juridique. Le Congrès, tout en s'abstenant d'exprimer une opinion ayant rapport à l'établissement de tribunaux juridiques dans la forme suggérée par M. l'Abbé Defourny dans sa motion, est d'avis que la plupart des guerres pourraient être évitées si un délai, pouvait être obtenu pendant lequel

la voix de la colère pourrait être apaisée et la voix de la raison entendue. Le Congrès recommande donc l'établissement de tribunaux juridiques, indépendants du pouvoir exécutif, ayant pour mission d'examiner toutes les disputes qui pourraient amener une guerre et ayant le pouvoir de réclamer toutes les informations dont leurs Gouvernements respectifs seraient en possession. Le jugement du tribunal juridique, avec ses considérants, ainsi que la décision par laquelle la réparation des torts serait requis, telle qu'elle serait établie dans le dit jugement, seraient notifiés par voie diplomatique à la partie et à la nation adverses et communiqués à la nation en cause aussi bien qu'aux autres puissances."

Mr. JAMES H. CHACE, Rhode Island, U.S.A., seconded the resolution, which was unanimously agreed to without any discussion.

SECTION B.

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

Mr. J. G. ALEXANDER, London, convener of the Sectional Committee, presented the report on this section, and proposed the following :—

FIRST RESOLUTION.

(ENGLISH.)

"The Congress congratulates the friends of peace on the resolution adopted by the International American Conference—with the exception of the representatives of Chili and Mexico—at Washington in April last, by which it was recommended that arbitration should be obligatory in all controversies concerning diplomatic and consular privileges, boundaries, territories, indemnities, right of navigation, and the validity, construction, and enforcement of treaties, and in all other cases, whatever their origin, nature, or occasion, except only those which, in the judgment of any of the nations involved in the controversy, may imperil its independence. The Congress respectfully recommends this resolution to the attention of the statesmen of Europe, and expresses the ardent desire that treaties in similar terms be speedily entered into between the other nations of the world. The Congress expresses its satisfaction at the adoption by the Spanish Senate, on June 16th last, of a project of law authorising the Government to negotiate general or special treaties of arbitration for the settlement of all disputes, except those relating to the independence and internal government of the States affected ; also at the adoption of resolutions to a like effect by the Norwegian Storting, on March 6th last, and by the Italian Chamber, on July 11th.

(FRENCH.)

"Le Congrès félicite les amis de la Paix de la résolution adoptée par la Conférence américaine Internationale (à l'exception des représentants du Mexique), à Washington, au mois d'avril dernier, par laquelle il a été recommandé que l'Arbitrage devint obligatoire dans toutes les contestations ayant trait à des privilèges diplomatiques ou consulaires, à des frontières ou limites, territoires, indemnités,

droit de navigation, ou concernant la validité, la confection et la mise en vigueur de traités, et dans tous les autres cas quelles qu'en soient l'origine, la nature ou l'occasion, excepté ceux qui, au jugement de l'une des nations quelconque, parties à la contestation, pourraient mettre en péril l'indépendance de cette nation.

“Le Congrès recommande respectueusement cette résolution à l'attention des hommes d'État d'Europe et d'Amérique et exprime l'ardent désir que des traités dans des termes semblables soient promptement signés par les autres nations du monde, de façon à prévenir toutes causes de conflits futurs entre elles, et, en même temps, à servir d'exemple pour les autres États.

“Le Congrès exprime sa satisfaction de l'adoption par le Sénat espagnol, le 16 Juin dernier, d'un projet de loi autorisant le Gouvernement à négocier des traités généraux ou spéciaux d'arbitrage, pour le réglément de tous différends, à l'exception de ceux ayant trait à l'indépendance ou à l'administration intérieure des États en cause. Il exprime aussi sa satisfaction de l'adoption de résolutions tendant au même but par le Storthing norvégien le 6 Mars dernier, et par la Chambre italienne, le 11 Juillet courant.”

Mr. F. BAJER (Copenhagen) seconded the resolution.

Dr. PANKHURST read a paper, supporting it, on

THE TREATY SYSTEM AND CONCERT OF NATIONS IN RELATION TO AN INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL.

With the establishment on a firm basis of an International Tribunal the problem of peace between nations would receive a practical solution.

It is vital then to gather into full view the agencies now in action capable of contributing to the formation of such a Tribunal.

In a nation, the existing system of law, regarded in its theoretic completeness, consists of legislation—the law-making power—law, a tribunal, and coercive processes to secure obedience to the decisions of the tribunal.

Stated summarily, in a nation there are legislation, law, tribunals.

Historically, the full national system started from a power to decide disputed questions and to enforce the decisions.

With the presence of a tribunal competent to decide questions and capable of giving effect to its decision by inflicting punishment, all the other constituents of a complete system of justice gradually followed by evolution.

In order to possess on the international scale a parallel system, it is necessary to find a practical working power analogous to the sovereign power in a nation. This is the *crux* of international law considered as an instrument of international justice.

A complete international system would comprise, international legislation—law-making power—international law, tribunal, and coercive processes enforcing by sufficient penalties the judgments of the tribunal.

In establishing such an international system, can the same historic course be pursued, as that which has been followed in the case of the national system?

Where in the international body of agencies can be found the material out of which to develop a competent coercive agency analogous to that in the body of national agencies?

The Romano-Germanic Empire was successor to the Roman Empire. The Roman Empire conducted government and law on the basis of common Empire. A single sovereignty prescribed law and secured peace. The supreme majesty of the Roman Empire gave the nations the *Pax Romana*.

The Romano-Germanic empire was in substance a federation, a federal organisation.

This empire preserved and presented to the modern world in a more or less unaltered form, on an international scale, international legislation, law, tribunal,

procedure more or less effective for securing obedience to the judgment of the tribunal.

This federal organisation represented in a tentative form an international system, having for its working organ the salient features of an International Tribunal.

The imperfections and weaknesses of this Romano-Germanic empire are parts of the history of nations.

The modern states-system was put upon its historic career by the Treaty of Westphalia, 1648.

But this states-system was attended from its origin onwards by the memory, traditions, and precedents of the Romano-Germanic empire, considered as an international system with its international legislation, law, tribunal, and coercive agencies.

Therefore, the modern states-system began its historic course with the rudiments, as to idea, tradition, and precedents, of an international system, having for its main characteristic an International Tribunal.

This conception of an international system and an International Tribunal has never ceased to occupy a place in the life of nations.

In the course of the generations that have passed since the Treaty of Westphalia, two great international forces have been in constantly increasing activity and range of operation, contributing greatly to prepare the way for an international system with an International Tribunal.

These two forces are the Treaty System and the Concert of Nations.

The Treaty system is a great instrument to define common duties ; the Concert of nations is a great organ to express common life among the nations.

By the joint action of the Treaty System and the Concert of Nations the people are drawn ever more and more into the condition of United States, of a true Commonwealth.

The action of these two forces brings the nations more and more into a great federation, called by interests and sympathies to common aims and joint action.

The nations thus enter into a system of mutual assurance to keep the peace and to cause it to be kept.

The treaties commit the nations to common obligations ; while the Concert of Nations commits them to common action.

It accordingly becomes important, as a practical question, to consider how far out of the Treaty System may be evolved international legislation and law ; and out of the Concert of Nations may be evolved an International Tribunal, with coercive agency, to secure obedience to the judgment of the Tribunal.

Now, treaties are in the international system what statutes are in the national system, with the difference that in the latter case there exists, and in the former case there does not exist, a definite common sovereignty to enforce the law.

It is to supply in the international sphere the absence of a definite common sovereignty, that the Concert of Nations is prominently appealed to.

As in nations statutory law tends to the formation of a code, so, on the international scale, treaties tend to the formation of an international code.

The processes are historically parallel. What sanctions the law national is the sovereignty of the nation.

The sanction of the law international historically, has been arbitration, mediation, war.

For these sanctions, it is desired to substitute the joint action of nations in concert, regulated by treaties, and pursuing common ends under the impulse of international obligation and conscience. When international law is put more and more on treaties, and when the treaties, being made between a larger and larger number of nations, are at the same time put upon broader grounds of common right and interest, then the basis is firmly laid for engaging the whole power of all the nations in enforcing the due performance of the treaties, and of restraining by sufficient penalties any breach of them. These treaties being set up in the common interest of all, all in common will stand forth to defend them.

Looking, then, to these two uses of the Treaty System and Concert of Nations, it becomes of the highest importance to put each of these factors on a comprehensive basis.

Since the Treaty of Westphalia, the States-system has on several great occasions been resettled under common treaty by the joint action of the Powers.

The Treaties of Ryswick and Utrecht came into existence in the name of the doctrine of the balance of power among the nations.

No doubt this was an ideal to which facts were seldom answerable.

Still there was present the sense of common interest and effort after joint action.

The underlying principle was the maintenance of the independence of each, combined with the practical equality of all.

The Treaties of Utrecht, in their policy, represented the Concert of Nations.

They grounded the States-system upon an alliance of the States for common ends. The system being based by the Powers on joint agreement, was to be disturbed or modified only by joint action.

The foundation of all was an alliance of the Powers, for the purpose of presiding over and directing the international life of the nations.

The Treaties of Vienna were a supreme instance both of the Treaty System and the Concert of Nations.

These Treaties set up the Five Powers as a great international organ.

Amidst much, very much, that was against liberty and the good of man from the Treaties of Vienna, and the action in concert of the Powers, there emerges the fruitful idea of an alliance of nations, bound by common obligations, which each is called to obey under the joint influence of all.

Obligation to obey law is historically derived from external authority.

It is the existence in a nation of definite external authority that gives to law its binding and obligatory character.

This authority sanctions it, and in the last resort enforces it by punishment.

Now, what is wanted is to get for nations an analogous authority, more or less definite and positive, by means of the Concert of Nations operating by joint action.

The greatest modern instance of the Treaty System and Concert of Nations is presented by the Treaty of Paris and Declaration of Paris, 1856.

Here, after joint deliberation, the Powers prescribed a series of international obligations.

By declaration, as a constituent international authority, the Powers determined grave questions and supplied notable defects in existing international law.

It was a great act of international legislation.

By this joint action of the Powers, a *mutua* pledge of observance was given. The Powers became in effect a federated external authority to secure obedience to the prescribed International obligations.

Historically this joint action of the Powers was a most important epoch in the direction of peace.

The long competition, over ages, between the claims of Belligerency and Neutrality was decisively determined in favour of Neutrality.

It was, indeed, a renowned victory of Peace.

It is necessary to take most careful note of the weak part in the Concert of Nations.

In 1870 Russia threw off the obligation of the Treaty of Paris, 1856, relative to the Black Sea. The Plenipotentiaries of the Powers concerned, in conference, declared "That no Power can liberate itself from the engagements of a treaty, nor modify the stipulations thereof, unless with the consent of the Contracting Powers, by means of an amicable arrangement."

The Powers did not proceed beyond this declaration.

This state of things opens out some definite considerations relative to machinery to be set up for rendering the sanction of treaties more direct and effective.

The time has now arrived to add to existing international arrangements an International Treaty Board constituted of representatives of the nations.

At first, its function would be to collate and compare existing treaties, with power to report as to revision, amendment, extension.

Later a mandate might be granted to the Board, in particulars, to amend and extend, with a power of reporting only as to other matters.

A most valuable analogue to such a Board is the just constituted International Tariff Bureau.

There has within the last few days been concluded the Brussels Convention, 1890, for publishing the customs tariffs of all nations.

The representatives of the Governments of almost all the five continents concurred.

The tariffs of all countries will be published in five languages. The publication will be at joint expense.

If the Concert of Nations can thus take effect in tariffs, making for commerce, surely it may operate in treaties making for peace.

Again, the Brussels Anti-Slavery Conference, 1890, has just been sitting with representatives from seventeen Powers, twelve European, two African, two Asiatic, with the United States.

Cannot the Powers be appealed to in order to establish an International Treaty Bureau by which the Treaty System may be simplified, systematised, and put upon a comprehensive basis fitted to preserve peace and promote goodwill.

The writer proceeds to urge the desirability of perfecting the Concert of Nations by Congresses of the Powers meeting at fixed periods.

In these and other directions the Treaty System and Concert of Nations, acting through an International Treaty Board and periodic Congresses, could effect much in preparing the way for a permanent International system with a real International Tribunal.

These agencies would naturally co-operate with the various forces—industrial, intellectual, moral—that make for peace and international goodwill.

The nations under modern civilisation are becoming more and more an International Commonwealth, conscious of a common life and common destiny.

For this Commonwealth the supreme necessity is peace.

The Treaty-system used and Concert of Nations founded in common interest and consent may be put to still higher uses than ever before, in being made directly to contribute to the establishment of a comprehensive International system having for its central force that much-needed and long-desired instrument of International peace an International Tribunal.

DISCUSSION.

DON ARTURO DI MARCOARTU said the Spanish Senate had appointed a special committee to make a report on the Bill which he had introduced.

MADAME THOUMAIAN said that when she was eleven years old, and the German-French war broke out, she was told that right was on the German side, but her heart was French. Where then was the duty; for which nation was she to pray? For France? But if the right was on the German side, could she ask God to be unjust? Oh! the inconsistency of war. War was altogether wrong. Jesus Christ was the way, the life, the truth, and He forbade men to do violence against their brothers. It was an inconsistency to have war whilst they had hospitals, nurses, and doctors. In a battle men were mowed down, but there were doctors and assistants present to try to preserve life. War was not only an inconsistency, but was an evil. Was it a necessary evil? When she was a young girl she spoke to some friends about a Congress of Peace to settle the differences between nations, but the idea was regarded as a dream; it was laughed at, and the answer given to her, by clergymen even, was that war was a necessary evil. But such a thing did not exist. Necessary evil meant necessary sin, but would the word "necessary" and the word "sin" be joined together by children of God? They had no right to believe that the end justified the means. Now the time of objection to Peace Congresses had passed away. The light of God was now shining, dispelling the dark shades, and in that light they could see what was right and what was true. Their constant prayer to God should be, "Help us higher, Lord; excelsior."

The resolution was carried unanimously.

Rev. W. A. CAMPBELL, D.D., U.S.A., proposed the

SECOND RESOLUTION :— (ENGLISH.)

"That a committee of five be appointed to prepare and address communications, in the name of the Congress, to the principal religious, political, commercial, labour, and peace organisations in civilised countries, requesting them to send petitions to the governmental authorities of their respective countries, praying that measures be taken for the formation of suitable tribunals for the adjudicature of international questions, so as to avoid the resort to war.

(FRENCH.)

“Qu'un comité de cinq membres soit formé pour préparer au nom du Congrès une adresse ou communication aux principales organisations religieuses, politiques, commerciales, du travail et de la paix de toutes les nations civilisées, pour leur demander de faire parvenir des pétitions aux gouvernements de leurs pays respectifs, les priant de prendre des mesures nécessaires à la constitution de tribunaux convenables appelés à trancher les questions internationales et éviter ainsi de recourir à la guerre.”

He said the design of the resolution was to give a practical turn to the deliberations of the Congress. It was in their power to do two things: to influence public opinion, and to bring that public opinion to bear upon the Governments, so as to secure the great end at which they were aiming. He proposed the appointment of a Committee to prepare and address communications in the name of the Congress to the several bodies indicated. The religious organisations would regard the moral aspect of the question; the commercial organisations would consider its economical aspect; and the labour organisations would take into account the personal service and suffering which war entailed. Some admirable papers had been read before the Congress which he was afraid would not reach the world at large, and the design of his resolution was to bring the matters for deliberation before the various organisations. When an organisation discussed a matter it made an impression upon the minds of those who were present beyond what the mere reading of a paper would affect. A communication sent in the name of the Congress, representing as it did so many nations, would surely be respected by a very considerable number of bodies, and the discussion of the subject would do something to disseminate peace sentiments.

Mr. AUGUSTINE JONES seconded the resolution. He said that an eminent friend of his was once at a meeting, presided over by Neil Dow, and was in a very low state of mind. Neil Dow closed his speech by saying “We want something to turn up.” His friend said “I did not understand it: I thought we were there to turn up something.” They had heard of the great progress that had been made, and it seemed to him that in the resolution so submitted they were really presenting definite specific work for carrying out their object. Their movement began like a little snowball on an Alpine peak, but it had gone on increasing in force and size until now the whole mountain was shaking, and their watchword must be “Keep the ball rolling.”

Mr. HOWARTH (of Liverpool) moved as an amendment “That this address when prepared by the Committee shall be sent by the Committee of Organisation, the body charged to carry out the decisions of the Congress, to the various organisations represented at this Congress, to be distributed in their own localities.”

Mr. W. E. DARBY seconded the amendment.

Mr. HODGSON PRATT, in supporting the motion, read the following paper on

ARBITRAL TRIBUNALS.

At a Congress of the kind now being held, all are agreed as to the ultimate object to be desired and pursued. Our chief duty, therefore, is to consider and decide what action should be taken, and by whom, in order to attain the object. The latter may be defined as an effort to establish permanent legal relations between states. In other words, what we are seeking is to create what is termed by jurists a “legal order,” or a condition of things in the civilised world whereby all disputes shall be so decided as to secure absolute justice, and so eliminate the decision of such

questions by a resort to force. What, then, is to be done as the first step towards the attainment of this desired end? The word on our lips at every moment is the word "arbitration," meaning the submission of all differences to a recognised tribunal. Therefore, the first step would appear to be the constitution of such a tribunal, or, in other words, the creation of a tribunal which shall be permanent, which shall consist of the elements most likely to attract the confidence of the disputants—a tribunal which has not to be constituted each time a dispute arises, but precedent to the same and permanent. For this reason, it seems that the publication of a draft for the constitution of a tribunal such as was prepared by the late Leone Levi constitutes a most important step, and perhaps the first step, to the realisation of our aims. As has been repeatedly pointed out, the permanent existence of such a body of judges must gradually lead Governments to resort to its services as a matter of course. The mere existence of the Court would be a powerful argument for resorting to it. It would prove a constant educator of public opinion among statesmen and nations in favour of juridical decision, instead of decision by armed force. In the absence of such a tribunal, Governments will generally be afraid to propose arbitration, either because of the absence of a national opinion in favour of that principle, or because the Government will shrink from the charge of being unprepared to support its claims by arms. Once have a tribunal constituted, and citizens, nations, and Governments alike would come to regard a resort to war as disgraceful and useless; and the sentiment of the civilised world would rise against such an unjustifiable course as a resort to force. In order, however, to make judicial decisions accepted, it must be clearly stated that resort to the Court would be voluntary, not obligatory, on the part of the nations concerned. That being so, it is difficult to see what valid objection can be made to its immediate creation. All that the Governments are invited to do is to unite, for the general benefit of all, in creating a High Court of Nations. By acceding to such a proposal no Government would incur any responsibility, and each would hold itself perfectly free on the next occasion of a dispute to resort to the services of the tribunal or not. Most Governments profess to accept the principle in view so far as it is applicable. They are now asked in addition to facilitate resort to that principle whenever the circumstances of the case admit of it; in other words, the Governments are simply invited to co-operate in the creation of an experimental court, which can do no possible harm to any supposed interests whatever, and which may, in the course of time, render the greatest service to the welfare and prosperity of nations. So long as there is no such machinery permanently provided, and ready at all times to entertain claims which may be brought before it, resort to arbitration remains uncertain and accidental. The difficulties and delays necessary in constituting a court, to say nothing of the primary obstacles and objections above indicated, leave room for the growth of that dangerous excitement and passion which often render a proposal to arbitrate impossible. Indeed, one of the greatest difficulties which at present besets this suggestion arises out of prejudices, passion, misapprehension, and misrepresentation which spring up directly there is a rumour of a divergence between two states. Incidentally a thousand exaggerations and falsehoods are put into currency by the Press. A crisis of hatred and enmity arises, which every day makes it increasingly difficult for the Government to propose so reasonable a remedy as a juridical decision. Now, if there were a permanent court of international justice there would be no reason for all this growing excitement and ill-will. There would be no fear and there would be no hatred. Men on both sides would know that there existed the means of examining the facts by carefully-trained judges, and that justice, so far as it is possible in human affairs, would be awarded. On the one hand, the Government would not find it necessary, in order to create a military enthusiasm on the part of the people, and secure the required amount for naval and military outlay, to appeal to passion. On the other hand, the citizens of the nations concerned would not be induced by false rumours to call upon their Government to defend the national rights and honour. Is it not, therefore, the duty of this Congress to take such steps as may be necessary whereby the Parliaments and Governments of the world may be urged at an early date to appoint an international commission, having for its object the constitution of such a High Court of Nations as is outlined in Professor Leone Levi's excellent draft? Copies of this have already been sent, in the first place, to eminent jurists, many of whose suggestions have been embodied in a second edition, which has recently appeared, including an examination by a learned judge of the Privy Council of Great Britain—the Right Hon. Lord Hobhouse. What is now needed is that representatives of the people in the different legislative assemblies shall press for the suggestion of an international commission upon their respective Governments. In suggesting such a course, due attention must be paid to

the widespread objections which are often raised in the Press and by so-called practical men. Although the mass of the people would everywhere rejoice at such a remedy for the monstrous evils which at present oppress mankind, they are silenced by those who assume to lead public opinion. It is not to be denied that the majority of men holding offices, sitting in Parliament, directing public affairs, or holding the reins of the Press, regard any such proposals with ill-disguised contempt, as being utterly impracticable. Reformers defeat their own object whenever they neglect to take account of the objections made by such men. Under the present circumstances, the objection most generally raised is that no nation will submit its right of self-preservation, its independence or its honour, its dearest interest to a decision framed by such an International Court. It will, therefore, be wise if we repeat on all possible occasions that the objection does not meet the case in point. We must declare that no reference can be made to an Arbitral Court unless the two parties agree to make it, and that neither is at all likely to refer any case in which either feels that its honour or its independence is involved. Another common objection is that the decisions of an Arbitral Court of the kind suggested will have no military power to enforce them. This is true; and the reply is that the somewhat large experience which the world now has of Arbitration affords grounds for thinking that such decisions will be accepted without being enforced. The cases are very few, if any, in which a nation, having beforehand declared its readiness to accept an arbitral decision, would decline to do so when it had been delivered. Each nation is more or less under the influence of the world's public opinion, and such a refusal would place the Government and people outside the pale of that opinion. It would then find itself so treated by all other members of the community of nations that its position would be intolerable. Another popular objection is that arbitration would only be resorted to in cases of comparatively small difficulty, and where both parties desired to avoid war. I think we may reply that, notwithstanding the present state of Europe, the desire for peace felt by Governments grows daily. In the most emphatic manner they express that desire, and all alike feel the terrible uncertainty of a resort to the arbitrament of the sword; all alike agree as to the unparalleled destruction and ruin which any future war is likely to create, owing to the gigantic scale on which it will be conducted. Again, with the increasing resort to this mode of settling differences, and with the growing experience of its practicability, will come increasing readiness to make use of it. While it was applied in the beginning to a more simple class of cases, it will gradually come to be applied to those which are more difficult. In conclusion, it seems desirable to consider whether it would be more useful to press for the constitution of an International Tribunal or for the creation of Arbitral Treaties, such as those which have been the subject of the remarkable decision of the great American Conference which has recently concluded its beneficent labours. As regards Arbitral Treatises, perhaps it would be found that the main difficulty is to define clearly in what cases the contracting parties shall be bound to resort to the Arbitral Court. The provisions of a treaty should, of course, exclude its application to cases involving the existence, national sovereignty, and independence of a State. Is it not possible, however, there may be cases which, although not coming within that definition, are cases about which a nation may hesitate to tie its hands? There may be great interests which do not come under the definition just indicated, but there may be what is called "national honour" involved, and it is the business of a Congress of this kind to take account of all such difficulties which present themselves to the minds of the statesmen who are asked to conclude such treaties. Now, there is not this difficulty about the proposed International Tribunal. As regards the latter, no State is bound to submit every possible difference to the judgment of the Tribunal. Perhaps, therefore, our present efforts should be mainly directed to its constitution.

DISCUSSION.

M. EDOUARD SEVE, Consul General of Belgium in the United Kingdom, said :—

Monsieur le président, mesdames et messieurs.

M. Pratt vous a dit que le meilleur moyen d'arriver à la paix universelle, c'est de voter un culte spécial à la justice. Permettez-moi, en ma qualité de Belge, de vous communiquer que tandis que d'autres nations élèvent d'admirables monuments à la religion, à l'art, aux assemblées législatives, nous avons été les premiers à édifier un gigantesque temple à la justice.

La Belgique, cette terre classique des congrès internationaux, du loyal et libre échange, de l'arbitrage qui s'y pratique depuis le onzième siècle, travaille, avec constance et ardeur, à constituer le droit public, à faire prévaloir les principes de l'arbitrage, à répandre les grandes notions d'humanité et de justice. C'est un sentiment de justice qui m'engage à vous faire la proposition d'envoyer votre projet d'adresse en discussion au Chili et au Mexique.

Il semblerait résulter de l'adoption du principe de la résolution précédente, que ces deux pays ne sont pas partisans de l'arbitrage ; ce serait tomber dans une erreur profonde et ignorer complètement ce qui s'est passé et se passe dans ces bien intéressantes contrées hispano-américaines.

J'ai des amis au Mexique qui défendent depuis trente années les principes de l'arbitrage, et je puis vous assurer que ses partisans sont également très nombreux au Chili.

J'étais dans le Cabinet du président Pinto, à Santiago, lorsque la guerre du Pacifique a été déclarée, et je vous certifie que c'est les larmes dans les yeux que cette déclaration a été signée par lui. Ayant eu l'honneur d'être nommé délégué unique du Comité international de Genève en Amérique, il m'a été donné d'organiser la Croix-Rouge parmi les belligérants et de la proposer également aux États-Unis, avec le concours de la noble et distinguée Miss Clara Barton et du regretté général Garfield.

J'ai donc été témoin des horreurs de la guerre du Pacifique et des sentiments chrétiens qui animaient les valeureux soldats chiliens.

Notre illustre président, l'honorable Dudley Field, possède au Chili, des collègues en droit international public fort éminents, et depuis quelques années, les Andres Bello, les Hunneus et beaucoup d'autres, ont enseigné dans les établissements supérieurs du pays les principes du droit international.

Lorsque, au début de la guerre, j'ai eu l'honneur d'être nommé rapporteur dans les séances du corps diplomatique, présidées par le baron d'Avril, sur de nombreuses questions de prises, de droit des gens, de droit maritime, j'ai pu constater que le gouvernement du Chili a toujours accueilli nos réclamations dans le sens du droit et de la justice.

N'est-ce pas le cas de rappeler ici, et M. le président pourra le confirmer, qu'il y a plus de vingt-cinq ans, en 1863, le roi des Belges, Léopold I^{er}, rendait dans l'affaire du *Macedonion* une décision arbitrale qui satisfaisait le Chili et les États-Unis, et qu'à cette occasion, la presse et l'opinion publique du Chili engageaient le gouvernement à soumettre désormais à l'arbitrage tous les différents internationaux.

Vous voyez donc, mesdames et messieurs, que le Chili et le Mexique sont acquis à la grande cause de civilisation que vous défendez à ce Congrès.

J'en reviens à ma proposition.

Si l'on parvient jamais, et j'en forme le vœu le plus ardent, à adopter un code international, choisissez, mesdames et messieurs, le palais de justice de Bruxelles, ce splendide monument qui nous a coûté plus de trois millions de livres, pour y tenir les assises du Tribunal International d'Arbitrage, le Parlement universel de la Paix de toutes les nations du monde.

M. ARNAUD wished to pay homage to the name of an Italian Citizen who had rendered important services to the cause of Arbitration between nations, and announced that a Congress of the League of Peace of Liberty founded by M. Charles Lemonnier was about to take place in Grenoble next August.

Mrs. LOCKWOOD said that to her mind the only weakness in the proceedings of the Pan-American Congress was their failure to suggest

what Mr. Pratt had suggested—an International Arbitral Tribunal for the settlement of cases that might arise, such as those in the Behring Sea and Newfoundland. The Pan-American Congress proposed to create a Court for every occasion, but what was needed was a permanent Court. They did not want to have fresh men who had not studied the question, but the most learned men of every nationality.

The BARON DE ST. GEORGES-ARMSTRONG said it had been argued that physical sanction would be required for treaties and for international decisions, but that sanction was to be found in the judicial guarantee of nations. After the war between Turkey and Russia the Congress at Berlin took into account the treaty of San Stefano and reformed it. In 1885 again the Congress of great nations prevented Greece from making war against Turkey. The great powers, too, had guaranteed Servian and Roumanian independence and neutralized Switzerland and Belgium.

The resolution was agreed to.

THIRD RESOLUTION.

SENOR DON ARTURO DI MARCOARTU proposed :

(ENGLISH.)

“ That this Congress is of opinion that no treaty should receive the support of the national representatives in any Parliament unless it contains a clause which provides that any question arising as to the interpretation of the treaty shall be submitted to arbitration.”

(FRENCH.)

“ Que ce Congrès est d'avis que nul Traité ne devrait recevoir l'appui des représentants des nations dans aucun Parlement à moins qu'il ne contienne une clause portant que toute question soulevée soit soumise à l'arbitrage.

M. FREDERIC PASSY seconded the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

Signor MAZZOLENI (Milan) sent the following communication on the whole question :—

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

I. Principles of Arbitration. On doctrinal and historical considerations, I refer to the report on *International Arbitration* laid before the Rome Congress (12th to 16th May, 1889) and published in the records of the said Congress (pp. 95-181), the documents relating to it and the resolutions proposed and carried.

Arbitration as a juridical and political institution in international intercourse, is the delegation conferred by mutual agreement, to one or more persons or to friendly powers, to judge *ex equo et bono* a given question on which a contention exists between two or more States.

Arbitration differs from *good offices* or *mediation* ; these may lead diplomatically to arbitration as was the case in the contest between the republics of Nicaragua and Costa Rica, which, through the pacific intervention of three other republics of Guatemala, San Salvador, and Honduras, succeeded in inducing the parties by mutual agreement to submit their contest to the arbitration of the President of the United States. Thus brought into friendly contact, the five republics proved the beneficial practical results of arbitration by a subsequent treaty establishing a federation with a council residing in the Capital of Honduras.

Arbitration can be resorted to in all international contests, exceptions being very rare, as has been judged by the Brussels International Juridical Conference of 1873, which proclaimed *Arbitration as a means essentially just, reasonable, and even compulsory.*

Arbitration is not advisable only in contests of great magnitude, where the honour, the dignity, or the territorial integrity of a State are engaged. In this case a congress or mediation, subject in all cases to popular vote, taken directly or indirectly, but in all cases unmistakably free, is to be preferred. The liberty and independence of the peoples ought to be reckoned as a fundamental rule of modern public law, and therefore contrary to it, conquest open or disguised under any shape.

II. *Arbitral Treaties.* But in order that arbitration may find immediate application on a contest arising, it is necessary that in the political constitutions of the States, the formal obligation never to take up arms, but to submit every quarrel to arbitration, be included.

The New York and Vermont Peace Assembly stated this maxim in 1837 before the United States Congress in the following petition :

"Whereas arbitration occurs now-a-days as an accidental fact, it would be necessary to obtain from it all the good results whereof it is capable, to convert it into a general and unalterable institution, and in the same time to work out, according to the common sentiment of all nations, a code of international law.

"Disputes are better settled, and more according to equity, by a third impartial party than by the contending parties. Arbitration would gain much authority if a special tribunal for this object were instituted, composed of representatives of the different States, which tribunal would by action neutralise their diverging interests, and consequently be in a position to issue more impartial decisions than any government.

"That from this action good effects might ensue it would be expedient not to invest this Tribunal with coercive power.

"Considering the steadiness with which nations defend their honour—that they never wage war without serious reasons, it must be acknowledged that a right settlement of a contest, as decided by a competent International Tribunal, based on the provisions of an analogous code, supported by sound reasons, and imposing itself only on the sense of national honour and equity, would be favourably accepted by both parties. To assert the contrary would be like imputing to the States, in questions of honour, tendencies and intentions worse than those of private citizens."

In the same sense runs also the celebrated resolution adopted in 1874 by the United States House of Representatives, and put by Boardman Smith, of New York. 1

Arbitration ought as a rule, to be based on existing treaties, but when these have been imposed by the force of arms, they can never constitute a lawful title against the standing rights of peoples to their own independence and liberty, which right is *de jure divino* according to the classical expression of a celebrated jurist, "No annexation should be considered legitimate, except by virtue of the free consent of the people concerned" (Paris Congress 1889, 29th resolution).

Thus no clause implying a surrender of independence or liberty can be included in arbitration treaties, according to the principles of modern public law.

Notwithstanding the practical results achieved, especially of late, by arbitration, some illustrious jurists raise as an objection the absence of a power able to compel the carrying out of the award; but when it is considered that arbitration rests on inter national trust, it becomes evident that the moral control of the other nations ensures in a sufficient measure the execution of judgments. Then the objection, if good theoretically, ceases to be so in fact.

Arbitration can in principle have no other antagonists than those interested in the armaments and the continuance of the present latent state of war. Juridical reason, both moral and politic, stands on the side of arbitration, and this professors of international law ought to inculcate, reserving an important place to arbitration in their places (See resolution 15, 16, 17, Paris Congress, 1889).

The questions open to debate about arbitration, concern not so much arbitration in itself, as its modes of application, viz. :—

I. The law to be applied or in other words the codification of international law according to the principles and the new relations between civilised nations.

II. The constitution of *permanent* courts of arbitration and their different functions and spheres of efficiency.

These two momentous questions have formed the subject of serious study on the part of eminent men, from Emmanuel Kant and Jeremy Bentham down to Stuart Mill, Charles Sumner, Henry Richard, Dudley Field, Bluntschli, Laveleye, Mancini, Leone Levi, whose scheme of a high council of nations has been approved last year

1. A reference to it will be found at p. 106 of the records of the Congress of Rome—Report on Arbitration by Mazzoleni.

As a matter of fact, we may here refer to the conclusion, on the 17th and 18th of April last, of a permanent treaty of arbitration between the whole of the eighteen American States, ten of which sent in only ten after their ratification of the treaty.

by the Paris International Congress. (Resolution 25).

III. *Arbitral Tribunals.* The constitution of a unique Tribunal or Supreme Council of Arbitration for all international disputes, is approved of by all the friends of peace. But, as regards the European continent, some political and juridical difficulties dependent on the different forms of government, are in opposition to the scheme.

These difficulties can be removed only, and perhaps in a time near at hand, by the evolutionary process of the existing institutions.

The Congress, in reasserting on this point the resolution of the Paris Congress, ought to recommend to students of International Law and to Parliaments the adoption in principle of Levi's scheme, which is unquestionably to be classed among the best on the complex and difficult subject.

SECTION C.

INTERNATIONAL LAW.

Mr. J. G. Alexander, Convener of the Sectional Committee on this Section, read the following report:—

Three papers have been presented under this heading, two of which deal so largely with the same questions that it will be convenient to summarise the greater part of them jointly rather than separately, giving the conclusions of each in the writers' own words. The first is by Mr. J. Anson Farrer,¹ and the second by Mr. J. M. Gover, LL.D. They both deal exclusively with the branch of international law which derives its title, and in great part its origin, from Grotius' well known treatise, *De Jure Belli et Pacis*. Mr. Gover enumerates the Treaties of Vienna in 1815, of Washington in 1842 and 1872, and of Paris in 1856, with the declarations of Paris in 1856, and St. Petersburg in 1872, and the Geneva Convention of 1864, as all the international Acts which have left any mark of permanent utility on International Law.

Mr. Farrer takes a hopeful view of the possibilities of further amending International Law, in the direction of limiting the rights of belligerents. He considers that the desirability of bringing divergent customs into uniformity on such subjects as the rule that enemy's goods are as safe on a neutral vessel as on neutral territory "cannot be exaggerated." Both writers refer to the difficult questions, still controverted, whether the definition of contraband of war includes coal, provisions, etc., and what are the proper limits of the right of blockade.

Mr. Gover's paper takes a somewhat desponding view of the future. Starting with a reference to the prospects of a great international European War, such as men were tremblingly looking forward to as immediately imminent two or three years ago, and which he appears to think still likely to occur, he thinks that in such a war the bounds set to warfare, and the efforts of diplomatists and international lawyers during the past century would be soon overstepped. His general conclusions are stated in the following terms:—

"Having thus surveyed in some slight detail the whole field of conjecture opened by the original question, which has formed the subject matter of this paper, we are bound to confess that we cannot in the whole, arrive at very encouraging conclusions. We have seen that although there is strong reason to hope that so far as humanitarian considerations prevail, there will be no retrogression in any great future war, there are reasons for grave apprehension as to the efficacy of the other broad restrictions imposed on belligerents by International Law.

"That such apprehension appears to savour somewhat of pessimism ought not to prevent the matter from being very seriously considered by all who are interested in the preservation of peace, and the progress of civilisation.

"It will be said of the conclusion at which we have arrived, that it

1. Mr. Farrer's paper has been published by the Peace Society, of whom copies may be obtained.

really amounts to this :—Expediency and self-interest alone will dictate the actions of belligerents. This is just what it does amount to, subject to the qualifications which we have already mentioned. Moreover the same conclusion would not apply to the case of a comparatively small war confined for instance to two European States, as here there would be a sufficient number of neutral Powers to maintain inviolate principles affecting themselves. Under the best possible conditions a war on such a scale as we have, for purpose of argument, imagined, would be a fatality fraught with the most deplorable consequences to mankind at large.

“Should such a fatality actually ensue, however, international jurists and all true advocates of Peace, must, we fear, be prepared to witness at least a temporary overthrow of many of their most cherished principles. Whether this disaster would be altogether a temporary one, it is impossible to say. We fear that it would at any rate, materially retard the advent of that consummation devoutly to be wished, which has been the dream not of Grotius only but of so many poets and philosophers of all countries and ages.”

“Mr. W. E. Hall, a famous International Jurist of to-day, has a curious and apposite suggestion on this point in the preface to a recent edition of his well known work. He says :—‘Conduct in the next war will certainly be hard : it is very doubtful if it will be scrupulous, whether on the part of belligerents or neutrals, and most likely the next war will be great. But there can be little doubt that if the next war is unscrupulously waged, it also will be followed by a reaction towards increased stringency of law. In a community as in an individual, passionate excess is usually followed by a reaction of conscience.’

“Mr. Farrer contended with much force for the extension of the exemption of private property on land from seizure in time of war to private property on sea, as proposed by the United States after the Paris Conference of 1856, and supported by Russia and other Powers. He then dwells upon the lamentable fact that the proposals agreed to by all the chief military Powers, at the Conference of Brussels in 1874, for formulating laws of war in the direction of greater humanity were nullified by the refusal of Great Britain to consent to them. Referring to these proposals, he concludes as follows :—

“What, for instance, could be more important than the general admission of such a principle as that : The laws of war do not allow to belligerents an unlimited power as to the choice of means of injuring the enemy, a principle which involves the prohibition (1) of the use of poison or poisoned weapons, (2) of the murder by treachery of individuals belonging to the hostile army or nation, (3) of the murder of a surrendered antagonist, (4) of the declaration that no quarter will be given, (5) of the use of arms or projectiles, in addition to explosive bullets, calculated to cause unnecessary pain, (6) of the abuse of the flag of truce or of the military uniform of the enemy, (7) of the needless destruction or seizure of the enemy’s property.

“It would be also desirable to add to an International Code, an express prohibition of pillage in war, or of the confiscation of private property. And not only the property of individuals, but their lives their family honour and rights, and the free exercise of their religion, should be safeguarded from injury.

“Then again, it should be illegal to compel the population of an occupied territory to join in military operations against their country, or to swear allegiance to their enemy. All the personal effects of

prisoners of war, except their arms, should be deemed and declared their private property.

"Above all, it ought to be agreed that towns taken by storm should not be given up to troops for plunder; that only fortified places should be liable to bombardment, and towns or open villages be exempt from attack or bombardment. Churches, libraries, museums, and hospitals, should be specially spared, even in attacks on fortified places.

"Reprisals should not be allowed to be disproportionately severe, and should be allowed only on the authority of the Commander-in-Chief, who should also determine their degree and duration.

"A clause making illicit the threat of extermination towards a garrison that obstinately holds a fortress, was unanimously rejected at Brussels, and therefore the massacre of a brave but conquered garrison is still part of good war, as it is called, in the code of Christendom; but the clause should be an essential proposition in an International Code. So should a clause, that no commander should be forced to capitulate under dishonourable conditions, or to surrender unconditionally. It was only our insistence on an unconditional surrender from Arabi in 1882, that led to our bombardment of Alexandria, and all that came after. Arabi offered to surrender, but our military and naval forces were not so to be baulked of their sport and their prey.

"If some of these suggested reforms should seem Utopian, it must be remembered that they were all actually advocated at the Brussels Conference by practical military men, and are therefore presumably of practicable adoption by international agreement. They are all precisely of the same nature as the prohibition of explosive bullets, and would, if adopted, depend on precisely the same sanction, namely, on the conscience of the consenting Powers. It must be hoped that whenever again a serious effort is made by the nations of the earth to bring some sort of rules into the conduct of their wars on sea and land, opposition will not again come from a country like our own which has done so much in other respects for promoting the civilisation of the world. But it must be admitted that if we can all agree to regulate our conduct of hostilities with the reservations above mentioned, it would be much better, and quite as easy to agree once and for all to the abolition of war itself, as to the abolition of its most hateful incidents. But if progress must be slow to be effective, it may be historically necessary, in our gradual evolution to a better state of things, to attack the details of the war-system first before we attack the custom itself."

Signor MAZZOLENI, in the portion of his paper which deals with this subject, takes broader ground than even Mr. Farrer. He says:

Treaties imposed by force being deprived of the consent of the peoples concerned, last only as far as violence lasts, and the party who had to submit does not become strong enough to rebel against them and bear them in the face of the oppressor.

"The law of nations is ancient as the historical world; it is the expression of the relations necessarily existing between one people and another; the necessary consequence of the external mission of the peoples, which mission pertains to their nationality, and will last for ever. It follows human progress and changes with the prevalent ideas—starts from different points and by different ways, following always the extension of the sphere of international association, and will be radically renovated when, enmities having died out and jealousies disappeared, the holy alliance of the peoples will cancel every trace and remembrance of the Vienna treaties and of their stationary politics."

Thus wrote Joseph Mazzini, in 1839.

And another illustrious Italian writer, Terence Mamiani in his golden book, "On a new European law" (published in Turin in 1859), traced on the footsteps of Kant, the first lines of a new international legislation founded on the principles of morals and justice sanctioning the autonomy of States and the imprescriptible right of every people to their independence.

Accordingly he proceeds to lay down a series of general principles as to the imprescribable right of every people to independence and self-government, the applicability of the moral law alike to States and to individuals, and so forth. On these cases he proposes the codification of international law, and suggests that the Peace Congress should appoint commissions to deal with different branches of law, which should place themselves into communication with the Institute of International Law for this purpose, so as to insure the help of jurists. Finally he refers to the desirability of permanent arbitral treaties.

In moving the resolutions prepared by the Committee on this section. Mr. Alexander said that the Committee had endeavoured to group the international conventions together. These conventions dealt with law in different countries. For instance, there was the Anti-Slavery Convention which provided that all the governments of the countries represented at the Conference would introduce and carry satisfactory laws regulating the question of slavery. Next there was a convention which agreed to enforce certain principles with regard to patents, trademarks and so on. Then there were two societies, one of which owed its origin in a great measure to the late Dr. Miles, who came from America to bring together celebrated jurists for the purpose of codifying the law. The public perhaps heard very little about that, but from time to time summaries of international law had been produced.

Mr. ALEXANDER concluded the report by reading the following resolutions : —

(ENGLISH.)

I. The Congress expresses its extreme regret that the attempt made by the Conference of Brussels in 1874, to codify the rules of International Law affecting the conduct of belligerents, and to introduce regulations limiting the inhumanity of War, should hitherto have failed, and earnestly hopes that means may speedily be found for opening the question.

II. The Congress rejoices at the numerous International Conventions entered into within the last few years for regulating matters of common interest including the Postal and Telegraphic Conventions, the Convention of Industrial Property for regulating patents and trade marks, the Congo Convention of Berlin, and the recent Anti-Slavery Convention of Brussels, as evidences of the possibility of assimilating the laws of different countries with regard to commercial and humanitarian questions.

It recognizes with satisfaction and gratitude the endeavours made by the Belgian Government in summoning International Conferences on Commercial Law at Antwerp in 1886, and at Brussels in 1888, by the French Government in summoning a Congress on the same subjects at Paris in 1889, and by the Government of the United States of America in summoning a Conference on Maritime Law, which met at Washington in 1889-90, to obtain similar results with regard to further important branches of commercial law.

The Congress also expresses its satisfaction at the labours of the Institute of International Law and the Association for the Reform and Codification of the Law of Nations in promoting the settlement and unification of public and private International Law, and commercial usage on many different points. It recognises in all these efforts a

growing tendency not merely to facilitate the commercial intercourse of nations, but to eliminate sources of international irritation, to promote a spirit of mutual compromise, and to establish a habit of international juridical relations which is of happy augury for the cause of Peace."

(FRENCH.)

" I. Le Congrès exprime un profond regret de ce que la tentative faite par la Conférence de Bruxelles en 1874 pour codifier les dispositions du Droit International ayant rapport à la conduite des belligérants, et pour y faire entrer des réglemens limitant les horreurs de la guerre, soit, jusqu'à présent, restée sans suite, et il espère vivement que cette question pourra être bientôt rouverte."

" II. Le Congrès se réjouit des nombreuses Conventions Internationales intervenues pendant ces dernières années et ayant pour objet le réglemant des questions d'intérêt commun telles que les Conventions Postales et Télégraphiques, la Convention sur la propriété industrielle qui règle les brevets et les marques de fabrique, la Convention du Congo, conclue à Berlin, et la récente Convention Anti-esclavagiste conclue à Bruxelles, les considérant comme des preuves de la possibilité d'arriver à ce que les lois des différents pays, ayant trait aux questions commerciales et humanitaires, s'accordent entre elles.

" Il voit avec satisfaction et gratitude les efforts faits par le Gouvernement belge en convoquant les Conférences Internationales sur le Droit Commercial en 1886 à Anvers, et en 1888 à Bruxelles ; par le Gouvernement français en convoquant un Congrès sur les mêmes sujets à Paris en 1889, et par le Gouvernement des États-Unis en convoquant une Conférence sur le Droit Maritime qui siègea à Washington en 1889-90 dans le but d'obtenir des résultats semblables par rapport à d'autres branches importantes du Droit Commercial.

" Le Congrès exprime aussi sa satisfaction au sujet des travaux de l'Institut de Droit International et de ceux de l'Association pour la Réforme et la Codification du Droit des gens tendant à l'unification du Droit International public et privé, et des coutumes et usages commerciaux. Il voit dans tous ces efforts une tendance de plus en plus marquée, non seulement à faciliter les rapports commerciaux entre les nations, mais aussi à éliminer les causes d'irritation entre elles, à faire naître un esprit de concessions mutuelles, et à établir des habitudes internationales de rapports juridiques, qui sont d'un heureux augure pour la cause de la Paix."

The resolutions were carried, and the Congress adjourned till the afternoon.

PRÉCIS OF A PAPER BY MR. CREWS DUDLEY (OXFORD).

In connection with this subject, Mr. Crews Dudley (Oxford) has forwarded a paper entitled " War," the object of which is to show, first, " What War is," and, secondly, " Some of the steps which may be taken to get rid of it."

Under the first head he adduces the arguments, brought forward in other places, that war is anti-Christian and opposed to the teaching of the Church ; condemned by philosophical writers of ancient and modern

times, from whom numerous quotations are given ; and wrong in point of economic interests. He then adduces well-known arguments based on the principles of justice and morality, in that war settles no question of right or wrong. He also treats the subject historically, showing how insignificant the issues have often been, and how easily they could have been settled without war.

Under the second head, *The Remedies for War*, he refers to the education of public opinion by the action of Peace Societies ; and insists that the citizens of the several nations shall compel their Governments to seek pacific settlement. Free Trade and mutual interchange of benefits between nations are then mentioned ; and the developments and codification of international law : the creation of an "international jural organisation," consisting of a legislature, a judicature and an executive, founded upon the lines laid down by Professor Lorimer in his "Scheme for the organisation of International Government." That scheme is then examined at considerable length, and is strongly supported.

Mr. Crews Dudley, however, thinks that it would be "useless and senseless" to attempt the adoption of this scheme until the standing armies have first been reduced.

When such an organisation as that referred to has been created "an act of war" would be treated as an act of international rebellion, and the representatives of such a State would be excluded from the "International Government" during such rebellion. "There would have to be a small standing force at the seat of the International Government. It would be under the order of the President, who would be responsible for any unusual service which it might be called on to perform."

Reference is then made to Professor Bluntschli's "Europe as a Confederation," and the writer concludes by expressing his belief that by some such means as these, "as much harmony will be introduced into the life of nations as now exists in the life of cities."

FRIDAY AFTERNOON, 18TH JULY.

The PRESIDENT (Mr. Dudley Field) again took the chair.

The Minutes of the last sitting having been read and confirmed, Mr. HODGSON PRATT read selections from certain letters of sympathy which had been received.

The Congress proceeded to consider

SECTION D.
NEUTRALISATION.

Dr. CHARLES RICHEL, of the University of Paris, proposed the following resolutions :—

RESOLUTION I.
(ENGLISH.)

1. Seeing that the object pursued by all Peace Societies is the establishment of juridical order between nations ;

2. " That neutralisation by international treaties constitutes a step towards this juridical state, and lessens the number of districts in which war can be carried on ;

The Congress recommends a larger extension of the rule of neutralisation, and expresses the wish :—

" 1. That all treaties which at present assure to certain States the benefit of neutrality remain in force, or, if necessary, be amended in a manner to render the neutrality more effective, either by extending neutralisation to the whole of the State, of which a part only may be neutralised, or by ordering the demolition of fortresses which constitute rather a peril than a guarantee for neutrality.

2. " That new treaties—provided that they are in harmony with the wishes of the populations concerned—be concluded for establishing the neutralisation of other States."

(FRENCH.)

Considérant :

1. " Que le but poursuivi par toutes les Sociétés de la Paix est l'établissement de l'ordre juridique entre les Nations ;

2. " Que la neutralisation, garantie par des traités internationaux, constitue un acheminement vers cet état juridique, et diminue le nombre des lieux où la guerre pourra être faite ;

Le Congrès recommande une extension de plus en plus grande du régime de la neutralisation,

" Et il émet le vœu :

1. " Que tous les traités qui assurent présentement à certains États le bienfait de la neutralité restent en vigueur, ou, le cas échéant, soient amendés, de manière à rendre la neutralité plus effective, soit en étendant la neutralisation à la totalité de l'État dont une partie seulement serait neutralisée, soit en ordonnant la démolition de forteresses, qui constituent plutôt un péril qu'une garantie pour la neutralité ;

2. " Que de nouveaux traités,—pourvu qu'ils soient conformes à la volonté des populations qu'ils concernent,—

soient conclus pour établir la neutralité d'autres États."

RESOLUTION II.

As to the means by which a neutralised state shall protect itself against any aggression in violation of International Treaties, the Congress considers that the solution of this important and difficult problem is not sufficiently advanced for it to arrive at a formal conclusion. The Congress, therefore, commends this part of the question to the careful study of the various Peace Societies, and suggests its further consideration at the next Peace Congress.

(For final form of Resolution and French rendering see page 212.)

In doing so, he spoke as follows :--

Il n'est pas besoin de défendre ici le principe de la neutralisation des petits états, car cela constitue un des progrès les plus importants du droit public international. Il y a des peuples qui n'ont pas la bonne fortune de posséder des armées innombrables avec des impôts écrasants. Ces nations là sont tout aussi respectables que les autres, quoiqu'elles n'aient pas les moyens de se faire respecter. Et bien, c'est là, le principe de la neutralisation. Une entente commune pour le respect des faibles et des petits.

C'est ce qui a lieu dans les sociétés civilisées : Les petits sont protégés par les lois, les magistrats et la police contre les forts. Supposons un orphelin d'une douzaine d'années au milieu d'une population d'adultes vigoureux ; à la rigueur chacun de ces hommes pourra se défendre contre son voisin avec ses armes, son adresse et sa force musculaire ; mais l'enfant sera sans défense et il sera la victime du plus fort si l'on n'intervient pas pour le défendre et pour assurer ses droits.

Cette protection, cette défense, sont nécessaires ; car la vie et les droits de cet enfant sont tout aussi respectables que la vie et les droits de n'importe quel autre individu. De même qu'un citoyen Suisse ou un citoyen Belge sont des individus méritant d'être protégés au même titre qu'un citoyen Russe ou un citoyen Anglais, quoiqu'ils n'aient derrière eux pour les défendre ni la flotte anglaise ni l'armée russe.

Nous voudrions même davantage, quoi-qu'actuellement, dans l'état présent semi-barbare de l'Europe, deux nations seules aient le bénéfice de la neutralité ; nous pensons que cette neutralité pourrait s'étendre à beaucoup d'autres. On ne sait pas bien pourquoi le Danemark, dont la population est de deux millions d'habitants, n'aurait pas une neutralité comme la Belgique qui a six millions d'habitants. Les Pays Bas, le Portugal, seraient dans le même cas. Quant aux populations de la péninsule Balkanique : la Roumanie, la Serbie, la Bulgarie et surtout la Grèce, la reconnaissance de leur neutralité serait assurément un grand bienfait ; car, on peut dire qu'il y a là, dans les conflits des puissances rivales voisines, une source de guerre qui est toujours à craindre.

Il y a enfin une autre question qui touche de très près à cette neutralisation des petits états : c'est la neutralisation de l'Alsace-Lorraine. Ce n'est un mystère pour personne que la conquête de l'Alsace-Lorraine est le grand malheur qui pèse sur les destinées actuelles de l'Europe. S'il est des faits évidents c'est, d'une part que, sans cette question de l'Alsace, une paix définitive serait peut-être assurée à l'Europe et, d'autre part que, malgré tous les efforts loyaux ou déloyaux, de douceur ou de violence, de bonne ou de mauvaise administration, qui ont été faits par les allemands pour s'attacher la tendresse des populations alsaciennes et lorraines, jusqu'à présent tout a échoué. Incessamment, sans hésitation, sans fléchir une seule fois, les Alsaciens et les Lorrains ont affirmé leur volonté bien arrêtée de n'être pas allemands. Cette tyrannie exercée sur tout un peuple, nous ramène à quelques siècles en arrière ; ou, si l'on veut, à l'état contemporain de l'Afrique, où des populations tout entières sont traînées en esclavage. Le seul moyen qui concilierait des intérêts opposés en exigeant, de part et d'autre, un sacrifice moral considérable, ce serait de déclarer la neutralité de l'Alsace et de la Lorraine, avec l'abandon formel de tous les droits ou prétendus droits de l'Allemagne et de la France à la possession de ces provinces. Il y aurait ainsi une zone neutre entre la France et l'Allemagne, où l'influence commerciale, industrielle, littéraire, artistique, scientifique pourrait s'exercer en toute rivalité pacifique et loyale. Mais, en tout cas, la neutralité serait acquise et garantie solennellement par les grandes puissances européennes.

Nous nous permettons aussi d'appeler l'attention sur un des considérants de notre résolution. Nous avons voulu indiquer que la neutralisation d'un pays ne devait pas être établie sans que les populations intéressées fussent consultées. C'est là, assurément un des grands principes qui doivent dominer le droit international. Il y a

une conscience pour les nations, comme pour les individus ; et la violation de cette conscience nationale constitue un véritable attentat. De là cette conclusion que les nations dont nous venons de donner ici les noms auront à se prononcer elles mêmes, par le suffrage universel direct ou indirect, sur l'acceptation ou la non acceptation de la neutralité.

Telles sont les raisons qui nous paraissent formelles en faveur d'une vaste neutralisation des petits états : Mais, autant nous sommes affirmatifs quant au but à atteindre ; autant nous sommes hésitants quant aux moyens à employer pour y parvenir. En vain un Etat neutre a sa neutralité solidement garantie par des traités internationaux solennels, au moment d'une guerre, surtout si cette guerre comprend plusieurs nations belligérantes ; quelles seront les sauvegardes effectives ?

Pour prendre un exemple, et malheureusement cet exemple est presque menaçant depuis quelques années—Supposons qu'une grande guerre éclate entre la France et la Russie réunies contre l'Allemagne, l'Angleterre, l'Autriche, et l'Italie réunies ; quelle sera la sanction d'une violation du territoire suisse ou du territoire belge ? En vain la nation neutre violée protestera par des notes diplomatiques ou même par la résistance de sa petite armée. Il n'en sera pas moins vrai que le vainqueur aura raison et pourra se rire des protestations de la nation neutre violée, comme de la nation adverse vaincue.

Cette protection de la neutralité est d'une importance extrême : mais la question n'est pas assez avancée pour que nous proposons une solution quelconque. Donc nous nous contenterons de la signaler à l'attention des Membres du Congrès et nous proposons de la mettre à l'ordre du jour du prochain Congrès de Rome, qui devra en faire une étude approfondie.

Espérons que le droit international sera constitué, que les petites nations seront neutralisées, que les populations soumises à la tyrannie de l'étranger recouvreront leur indépendance, que leur neutralité sera garantie et garantie d'une manière si efficace que nul Gouvernement n'osera courir les risques de la violer.

Mr. HODGSON PRATT then seconded the motion and read the following paper on

NEUTRALISATION.

It will be long ere the peacemakers of the world have rendered it unnecessary to occupy themselves with international politics, and to seek to diminish the number of the causes which lead to conflict, whilst waiting for the reign of law. Yet, whilst waiting for the reign of force to be superseded, we must endeavour to mitigate the actual evils, and deal with the actual causes of war which surround us. Although it has been considered necessary to exclude existing political questions from the consideration of this Congress, still, in a general sense, we must consider what policy should be pursued in the interests of justice and of peace. I would begin by calling attention to a fact with which you are all familiar. One of the numerous causes of danger to Europe, which may at any time lead to war, is the position of some of the weaker States, which in times of conflict are liable to have their independence assailed. The historical, moral, and social life of a small nation is as valuable to it as that of a larger State ; and, therefore, its rights of independence, self-government, and national development are as sacred as in any other cases. I go further, and say that every community of men which has a history and a literature, a long individual existence of its own, is precious to the world. It has its special ideas, character, teaching, and discoveries, and therefore it has a recognised place in the economy of the human world. The progress of mankind depends upon the largest possible interchange of knowledge and experience. Who shall say that the world is not the richer for such little states as Attica, Egypt, Scandinavia, and Switzerland ? All such considerations, however, and every element of justice and every thought of what is due to mankind, are ignored and ruthlessly trampled upon in war. Belgium, Switzerland, and Holland know this. They and the states of the Balkans are alike conscious at this moment of insecurity, owing to the lawlessness and violence of other and greater states, when

once the sword has flown from the scabbard. It is necessary, therefore, that in time of peace the international politician should consider in what way those small nations may be removed from becoming a cause or pretext for war; how far it can be made impossible that they should be causes of conflict, arising out of their very weakness. Belgium and Switzerland are supposed to be protected by the joint guarantee of the Greater Powers, and yet so little confidence have they in the morality or justice of the Powers that these small states have been obliged to spend the hard-won earnings of their people in increasing armaments, more especially of late years. Revenues which ought to be devoted to works of civilization and humanity are expended in devising works of destruction. Men are called from the loom or the plough, and have to desert occupations necessary for their welfare and that of their nation. Is it outside the aims of this Congress to recognise this, and to consider how to preserve the independence of such nations by safe and efficient guarantees? Is it outside the sphere of this Congress to consider how weak peoples may be relieved from the necessity of wasting their resources in military preparations. It is an utter disgrace to the Great Powers that it should be so. The friends of peace are accused of unpractical and visionary proposals which ignore the actual state of things, and they are accused of hurting their own cause. It is necessary, therefore, that the Peace Societies should relieve themselves of this reproach by recognising actual facts and suggesting remedies for them. Let them state what they would propose to such a state as Belgium or Switzerland. Would they bring forward their theory, that even in self-defence arms may not be taken up in such a case? Would they say to Belgium and Switzerland, "Disarm, and trust in the good faith of those great military states which surround you"? For my part, I venture to think that the great Powers should by joint action relieve the states which are supposed to have their independence guaranteed from the necessity of spending their resources in self-defence. It might be done in the following manner, although many objections will be made by my hearers. The states of Europe should enter into a solemn compact, under which anyone of them violating the neutrality of a state which has been guaranteed should be responsible to the remaining states for any violation of the compact. The question becomes the more important in consequence of the present condition of Egypt, Servia, Bulgaria, and Roumania, which are under no such guarantee as is supposed to exist in the case of Switzerland and Belgium. In the interests of the people of those countries it appears to me that the peacemakers should urge the need of such a guarantee. In the first place, such a course would remove these people from the category of being sources of great danger to the peace of Europe. Secondly, it is the duty of peacemakers to enable such states to develop their prosperity, instead of ruining themselves by the maintenance of costly, and perhaps useless, armies. If the Peace Societies say that this is none of their business I am at issue with them. Peace Societies should occupy themselves with every practical question which makes for war or peace. To my mind, a great error of the friends of peace in the past has been the reassertion of general principles without attempting to recognise the obstacles, true or false, which, according to general opinion, stand in the way of their adoption. Until they meet these objections, the Peace Societies will continue to have as little influence on the public at large as they have hitherto had. They are bound to enter upon a new sphere of duty—*i.e.*, that of studying all the causes of war, direct and indirect, and of endeavouring to supply the remedies appropriate to each particular kind of case. I submit that the existence of weak States, and the necessity for preventing them from being causes of war, by guaran-

tees for their neutrality, forms a subject which it is the duty of practical men to study and discuss.

DISCUSSION.

M. Desmoullins proposed as an amendment to add to the first part of the Resolution the words, "*and for guaranteeing the neutralisation of Elsass and Lothringen.*"

The PRESIDENT said such a proposal was not within the scope of the Resolutions.

M. DESMOULINS said he was no revolutionary, and, in fact, 22 years ago, though he was a Republican, he advised the Emperor Napoleon not to go to war, but to set an example of disarmament. His articles were printed in 1868, two years before the war. He now had a special mandate from two Lodges in the South of France to bring forward this subject of the neutralisation of Elsass and Lothringen.

The PRESIDENT: I must rule that you are out of order. I am sorry to do it: but you are not in order in alluding to a political question that agitates Europe at the present time.

M. DESMOULINS said that Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg were neutralised, and notwithstanding the terrible war between France and Germany those territories were not violated. That was a powerful proof of the influence of neutralisation. Switzerland, with its 22 Cantons, was also neutralised, and he thought the principle of neutralisation should be extended to other districts.

The PRESIDENT ruled that it was out of order.

M. BAJER said it was not only in the interest of the small States, but also in that of the great nations to neutralise the weaker nations. The small States were very often the occasion of conflicts. The war of 1864 was the beginning of the war of 1866, which was itself the preparation for the dreadful work of 1870. The small States were like boxes of matches, which could be the beginning of very large fires.

MR. C. E. MAURICE (London) said that, unfortunately, as human nature was constituted, the right to protect almost always produced a supposed right to dictate, and he was afraid that even those States which were already neutralised had experience rather more than they liked of that right to dictate as the result of the right to protect. Shortly after the Congress of 1856 there was a meeting of the great Powers to dictate to Belgium with regard to the freedom of her Press, and Switzerland had had her right of asylum interfered with in a way which larger Powers would not have endured. It seemed to him that this neutralisation might have been an unavoidable necessity at the time when there were only great Powers to protect and small Powers to be protected or plundered, as the case might be. But since 1815 there had been seven new additions to the nations of Europe—Belgium, Italy, Greece, Roumania, Montenegro, Servia, and Bulgaria. Those States should learn to stand together, and put themselves on an equality with the great Powers, so as to be represented in Congresses. It seemed to him that they lost something for the cause of peace when they weakened the position of small States by putting them in a protected position. They felt the need of peace more, perhaps, than the great Powers, because they knew they were most likely to suffer.

M. GASTON MORIN said that, like M. Desmoullins, he had been sent to the Congress expressly to bring forward the views which that gentleman had mentioned; but, inasmuch as M. Desmoullins had been

ruled out of order, he would not detain the Congress by pressing his right to speak.

Mr. CHARLES THOMPSON thought that the second portion of the Resolution was incompatible with what went before it. It was not for the Congress to anticipate difficulties. They should rather rest upon the evidence of Switzerland and Belgium that neutralisation tended to do away with war. But their opponents would lay hold of the second part of the Resolution as an argument that they had been recommending a course which they did not see their way to. All present were thoroughly convinced that the principles of peace should be carried out in their integrity, and that they should have faith in God as an overruling power. Therefore, he did not think that, acting as men of the world, it was judicious to put into the hands of their opponents an argument which they would certainly use if the second part of that Resolution went out to the public. He, therefore, hoped that the Bureau would be authorised to withdraw the second Resolution altogether. In conclusion, he proposed that the Bureau be allowed to withdraw the second Resolution.

Mrs. BELVA LOCKWOOD seconded the amendment.

Mr. E. KIMBER was rather astonished that the mover of the amendment did not think it was judicious on the part of the Congress to anticipate difficulties. In whatever they did they should be practical, and as practical men and women they were bound to anticipate difficulties. Let opponents say what they liked, but the members of the Congress should go on in their own straitforward peaceful course. There was not the slightest necessity to fear any antagonism or hostility to their main purpose. One of the most eloquent sermons he ever heard was by the Bishop of Peterborough, who said, "Do not let us hear only abstract resolutions or your vague sentimentality, but let us come down to the sound practice of human nature, and see what we can drive home into human nature in order that human nature may practise the arts of peace and morality." His lordship said it was all very well to teach a man how to make a razor keen and sharp; it was all very well to teach a man that s-t-e-e-l spelt "steel"; but that teaching would not prevent him going home, and on the impulse of the moment plunging the razor into the bosom of his victim. What was required was not only that the neutralisation of states should be encouraged, but that statesmen should be told that it was sound morality and the truest philosophy. Statesmen should be asked "How is it that you allow in your Houses of Assembly words of war, not words of Peace? How is it in the common intercourse between statesmen and statesmen, indoors and out of doors, you allow the language, not of peacemakers, but language of the dagger and the bayonet?" He thought the representatives in the various Houses of Parliament had not the courage of their opinions. It was no use passing resolutions unless they were carried out.

Miss F. LORD ventured to say that for the Congress to make states neutral and prescribe that in the event of war certain things should not be done, would be recognising that somebody had a right to make war. These little neutral spots of land could not be considered at all on the same footing. Some had always been States; others had only been small Duchies. It was the fate of all protected creatures to be either petted or whipped as children, and the great powers were really the great War Powers.

Mr. SNAPE said that Mr. Maurice and Miss Lord supposed that the argument for the neutralisation of States necessitated, in certain eventualities, the practice of war to protect them. If he thought any such result could follow he would heartily support Mr. Maurice. The proposal, however, was that neutralisation should be extended more

than ever. His wish was that all States should be neutralised, and that no war should ever take place again. What possible objection could there be to expressing a wish that the neutralisation of States should be extended? It did not follow that because International Treaties were created, therefore war would take place. The treaties did not speak of war, nor did the Resolution. On that ground he thought they could all vote for the Resolution. Any amendment coming from such a veteran worker in the cause as Mr. Thompson was deserving of the highest consideration, but the amendment was founded on a misapprehension. Mr. Thompson supposed that the means by which a neutralised State could protect itself was war. Nothing of the kind was said in the Resolution. If difficulties were occasionally likely to arise in the observance of the treaties, was it, or was it not wise, on the part of the Peace Congress to consider how they could be met? Juridical International Courts of Arbitration could meet those difficulties. He, therefore, asked the Congress to support the Resolutions of the Bureau, because he did not want it to go forth that the only means by which International Treaties could be enforced was war. It was the duty of Peace Congresses to discover other means.

Mr. J. H. RAPER suggested the exclusion of the words in resolution No. 2 from "treaties" to "conclusion."

Mr. W. E. DARBY, on behalf of the Bureau, accepted the suggestion, and as amended the resolution was unanimously agreed to.

This resolution, therefore, read :—

(ENGLISH.)

"As to the means by which a neutralised state shall be protected against any violation of international treaties, the Congress commends this part of the question to the careful study of the Peace Societies, and suggests its further consideration at the next Peace Congress."

(FRENCH.)

"En ce qui concerne les moyens par lesquels un État neutralisé se protégera contre une agression, faite en violation des traités internationaux, le Congrès en propose l'étude approfondie aux différentes Sociétés de la Paix.

"La question reste donc au programme du prochain Congrès de la Paix."

REPORT FROM THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON MEMORIALS.

Mr. W. E. DARBY reported that the special Committee appointed for that purpose had drafted the following Memorial to the Heads of civilized States which it now submitted for adoption by the Congress.

MEMORIAL.

The undersigned have the honour to state that at a Universal Peace Congress, attended by representatives of various societies in Europe and America, and held in London from 14th to 19th July, 1890, it was unanimously resolved :

That an address should be respectfully communicated to the heads of all civilized States, the Congress desiring that by this address the attention of those who are responsible for the condition of millions of men and

women in their several States, and who administer the Governments, should be made acquainted with the purposes and deliberations of the said Congress.

The object to which the members of the Congress, both men and women, have devoted themselves, is the gradual emancipation of mankind from the terrible evil and scourge of war, which constantly threatens to annihilate the achievements of civilisation, to undermine national prosperity, to foment terrible hatreds and passions, and to bring fear and suffering into the homes of millions.

The Congress especially desire to call the attention of those who preside over the affairs, alike of Empires, Monarchies, and Republics, to the fact that this great and terrible evil is not inevitable or irremovable. Wise and experienced men, trained in juridical science, and in the administration of national affairs, in many countries, have pointed out practical modes by which the disputes and contending interests of States may be settled without a resort to force, and by a resort to the same principles of law, equity, and arbitration, which have been long since adopted in the case of the conflicting claims of individual citizens.

The Congress desire further to call attention to the fact that this resort of law, instead of force, is no longer a matter of mere theory or conjecture. During the present year, various States of America, represented by their Delegates, have concurred in the principle of concluding treaties, whereby any two States shall bind themselves to refer all differences to Arbitration, on the condition that no such reference shall affect the independence or sovereignty of either State. As it is expected that such Treaties will come into force throughout North, Central, and South America, there is every reason to believe that war, throughout that great portion of the earth, will ultimately cease for ever.

The Congress also desire to call attention to the fact that the Congress of the United States has adopted resolutions under which the President of that great nation is requested to invite other nations to enter into treaties of arbitration with the United States of America. That Congress has further adopted resolutions declaring that such arbitration treaties, coupled with the creation of permanent international tribunals,

are essential to deliver nations from the evils which now threaten them.

The Congress believe that, according to the extent to which such tribunals and treaties are adopted, disarmament may at once be proceeded with.

The Congress have especially desired to express their profound conviction that the highest interests of mankind are involved in efforts to terminate the cruelty and wickedness of war. They believe that the purposes of the Divine Ruler will not be accomplished so long as this great wrong endures. They are assured that those national chiefs who show themselves sensible of their responsibilities in this matter will not only receive the eternal gratitude of men, but the blessing of Almighty God.

A DELEGATE : By the "Heads" of the various States do we mean the heads of the different Ministries, or the Sovereigns of the States and Presidents of Republics ?

The PRESIDENT said he took it for granted that what was meant was the Representative of the Executive Government, whether it was a President, Emperor, King, Duke, or anything else.

A DELEGATE : Will this address be signed by the President of this Congress ?

The PRESIDENT : I cannot answer that.

Mr. INSULL : I would suggest that those words be added.

Mr. J. B. WOOD : I will second that.

The memorial was approved of.

SECTION J.

INTER-PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE.

Mr. W. E. DARBY submitted the Report of the Sectional Committee appointed to consider this subject, as modified by the Procedure Committee in the following Resolutions :—

(ENGLISH.)

I. The Congress expresses its opinion that the Annual Peace Congress should be held either immediately before or immediately after the Annual Inter-Parliamentary Conference, and in the same town.

II. The respective resolutions, and various proceedings of the Congress and Conference which are of a nature to be taken into consideration by either body, should be officially brought to the knowledge of each.

(FRENCH.)

" Le Congrès émet le vœu que :

I.—" Le Congrès annuel de la Paix se tiendra immédiatement avant ou immédiatement après la Conférence Inter-Parlementaire Annuelle et dans la même ville."

II.—" Les résolutions et les diverses transactions adoptées respectivement par le Congrès et par la Conférence

qui sont de nature à être prises en considération par les deux assemblées devront être officiellement portées à la connaissance de chacune d'elles."

The Report was adopted.

SECTION K.

FEDERATION OF PEACE SOCIETIES.

Mr. DARBY reported : The Committee recommends the adoption of the following Resolution :—

(ENGLISH.)

"That the Congress resolves, that inasmuch as for some time past a desire has been expressed by several Peace Societies for some organised union or federation between them, and such union for the purpose of frequent interchange of information and suggestion, and for common action, when necessary, is desirable, this Congress expresses its opinion in favour of the proposal, and trusts that the societies of Europe and America may enter into correspondence on the subject with the view to the adoption of a practical scheme for that purpose."

(FRENCH.)

"Que, plusieurs Sociétés pour la Paix ayant exprimé depuis quelque temps le désir de voir s'organiser entre elles une union ou fédération, et cette union étant à souhaiter pour favoriser un échange fréquent d'informations et de suggestions et pour aider à une action en commun en cas de besoin, le Congrès se prononce en faveur de cette proposition, et émet le vœu que les sociétés d'Europe et d'Amérique entrent en correspondance à ce sujet dans le but d'adopter des moyens pratiques d'action en commun."

Mr. HODGSON PRATT moved the adoption of the report, and it, having been seconded, was carried unanimously.

The following communications on this section had been received :—

PROJET DE RÉOLUTIONS À PROPOSER AU CONGRÈS DES 14-19 JUILLET, 1890.

Par F. BAJER, Copenhagen.

Programme lit. J. et K.

I.

Le Congrès annuel de la paix doit être considéré comme une réunion préliminaire de la Conférence interparlementaire annuelle. Il doit se tenir immédiatement avant celle-ci et dans la même ville.

II.

Les résolutions et les divers travaux du Congrès de nature à être pris en considération par la Conférence, doivent être portés officiellement à la connaissance de celle-ci.

III.

Il sera établi un bureau international permanent commun aux Congrès annuels de la paix et aux Conférences interparlementaires annuelles.

PROPOSITION DE L'ORGANISATION PROVISOIRE DU BUREAU
INTERNATIONAL DE LA PAIX.

Par M. F. BAJER, Copenhagen.

Art. 1. Si le Bureau réussit à être mis sous le protectorat du Président de la Confédération Suisse, il sera établi à Berne. Si non, le Chef du Bureau (v. art. 3) pourra déterminer le domicile provisoire de celui-ci.

Cependant, lors de la tenue des Congrès annuels de la paix et des Conférences interparlementaires annuelles, le Bureau doit être considéré comme établi par *interim* dans la ville où ces réunions ont lieu.

Art. 2. Au fur et à mesure que les circonstances le permettent, le Bureau contiendra un :—

A. Département de *droit* international (arbitrage, neutralisation, codification du droit des gens, etc.).

B. Département de *statistique* (listes des associations de la paix existantes, forces et dépenses militaires des divers États, etc.).

C. Département d'*histoire* (extraits des imprimés et de la correspondance des associations de la paix, de la presse, etc., afin d'être en état de donner des renseignements sur les progrès du mouvement pacifique, surtout sur les Congrès et sur les Conférences.

D. Département d'*éducation* (religion, morale, droit, histoire, pédagogie pacifique).

E. Département d'*archives* et de *bibliothèque*, chargé de classer et de conserver les imprimés et les manuscrits envoyés au Bureau, et de fonder une "Bibliothèque universelle de la paix."

F. Département de *renseignements*, chargé de répondre, autant que possible, aux questions faites par les autorités, associations et autres qui soutiennent, subventionnent ou protègent le Bureau.

G. Département de *réaction*, chargé de publier des journaux, des revues et d'autres écrits au service de la propagande pacifique, et d'influencer la presse à cet égard ; et

H. Département des *finances*, chargé de tenir un compte exact non seulement des recettes et des dépenses du Bureau, mais aussi des fonds communs à plusieurs ou à toutes les associations de la paix, des donations et des legs en faveur d'un des buts des autres départements (A-G) ou d'un autre but pacifique, dont les moyens seraient confiés à l'administration du Bureau par le Congrès annuel, la Conférence interparlementaire, les associations de la paix ou des personnes privées. (Conf. l'art. 4.)

D'autres Départements pourront être établis par le Chef du Bureau (v. l'art. 3) s'il le trouve nécessaire, mais ils seront supprimés, si un Congrès ou une Conférence à venir en désapprouve l'établissement.

Art. 3. Le *Chef du Bureau*, supérieur à tous les départements (v. l'art. 2) sera nommé par la Conférence interparlementaire annuelle parmi les personnes qui auront sollicité cet emploi du Président du Congrès annuel, et que le dit Congrès, en assemblée générale, à la pluralité des voix et au scrutin secret, en aura trouvées dignes.

De la même manière sera nommé un *Secrétaire Général* qui assistera le Chef du Bureau et le remplacera en cas d'absence.

Des suppléants devront être élus à l'un et à l'autre de ces deux emplois.

Les autres personnes attachées au Bureau seront engagées et congédiées par le Chef du Bureau.

Art. 4. Les salaires du Chef du Bureau et du Secrétaire Général, fixés pour chaque jour qu'ils sont présents au Bureau, seront votés par une *Commission commune* à laquelle le Congrès annuel élira cinq et la Conférence annuelle cinq de ses membres pour un an ou jusqu'à la réunion prochaine du Congrès et de la Conférence. La même Commission votera aussi le reste du budget du Bureau, après avoir entendu le Chef et le Secrétaire Général qui viennent d'être élus, s'ils sont présents. La commission se réunira immédiatement après son élection. Avant d'ajourner sa réunion, la Commission chargera au moins deux de ses membres d'examiner le département des finances du Bureau, de faire la révision de ses comptes, etc., et d'en faire rapport à la Conférence et au Congrès prochains. De même, le reste du matériel du Bureau est soumis à l'examen de la Commission.

Art. 5. Aussitôt que possible il sera créé un *Fond international de la Paix*, dont seulement les intérêts pourront être appliqués aux dépenses annuelles du Bureau.

Cependant, si celui ou ceux qui sont chargés par les derniers Congrès et Conférences de convoquer et d'organiser les suivants, n'avaient pas rempli ce devoir pendant le cours de l'année où leur réunion aurait lieu, le Chef du Bureau le fera pendant le cours

de l'année suivante et, en ce cas il pourra, si les Fonds votés par le Bureau ne suffisaient pas, entamer le capital dans ce but, à condition qu'il en rende un compte exact aux prochains Congrès et Conférences.

Art. 6. La présente organisation restera en fonction jusqu'à ce que le Congrès et la Conférence d'une même année se soient entendus pour en nommer une autre. Si la Conférence modifie une nouvelle organisation acceptée par ce Congrès, l'ancienne restera en vigueur, à moins que la Commission commune (v. Art. 4) ne juge d'urgence que quelques uns des amendements contestés seront valables provisoirement jusqu'à la prochaine réunion du Congrès et de la Conférence. En ce cas, le protocole de la Commission, qui toujours pourra être examiné par les prochains Congrès et Conférences, sera examiné par un Comité spécial nommé par le Congrès.

Practical suggestions given at the end of a paper by
Signor GIUSEPPE SALMERI, (Palermo), on

FEDERATION OF PEACE SOCIETIES.

1. The Universal Congress held at London should elect a Commission authorised to draw up Statutes or Rules : since no vital energy can exist without order, and the Federation (of Peace Societies) cannot be carried on without rules by which its proceedings may be regulated. Without statutes, therefore, neither concord or unity of aim and action will be evolved.

2. The date and place of meeting of a new Universal Congress should be decided, at which should be convoked all the representatives of the Peace Societies in Europe and America, in order that they may undertake fresh work ; re-arrange every article of their Statutes which requires re-construction ; and definitely form the Federation of Peace Societies.

3. Existing Societies shall form Sub-Committees in order to enlarge the sphere of action throughout the world, and more especially in Europe, where, owing to old and rooted prejudices, grounded in ignorance, and the influence of interested persons, the resistance to the Peace Propaganda is great. The fact of the Sicilian Union is an example.

4. Subscription lists should be opened, in order to secure the means necessary to diffuse the ideals of the movement ; and such subscriptions should be either large or small, so that people of all classes without distinction should be induced to give.

5. A journal, the organ of the Federation, should be founded, which should give information as to all its actions ; and also of the persecutions, direct and indirect, levelled against the Federation by interested persons. This journal, following the example of Herr Herrman Molkenboer, of Bonn, should be published, as his is, in English, French, Italian and German.

6. The Universal Congress should nominate a Central Executive Permanent Council, which, until the new Universal Congress, shall charge itself with the care of promoting the foundation of an International Tribunal.

7. Each Federated Society shall pay an annual sum towards the expenses of printing the Journal and Statutes, and each shall be entitled to one copy.

8. The amount of an annual Subscription shall also be stated for those who do not belong to a Peace Society or Peace Committee, should they wish to receive the Journal of the Federation.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS.

Dr. BOARDMAN brought up the report of the Committee on Miscellaneous Business, which was to the following effect :
" The Sub-Committee to whom was referred the miscellaneous business coming before the Peace Congress respectfully submit the following : We recommend :—

I. That the next Congress be held immediately before or immediately after the next session of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference, and at the same place.

II. That the question of an international Peace Emblem be postponed *sine die*.

III. the adoption of the following resolution:—

(a) Resolved, that we express our satisfaction at the formal and official overtures of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, addressed to the highest representatives of each church organisation in Christendom, inviting the same to unite with itself in a general conference, the object of which shall be to promote the substitution of international arbitration for war :

(b) That this Congress, assembled in London from the 14th to the 19th July, desires to express its profound reverence for the memory of Aurelio Saffi, the great Italian jurist, a member of the Committee of the International League of Peace and Liberty.

IV. That the Memorial to the various Heads of the Civilised States adopted by this Congress and signed by the President should so far as practicable be presented to each Power, by an influential deputation.

V. That the Organisation Committee be empowered to make the needful verbal emendations in the papers and resolutions present.

VI. That the following resolutions be adopted.

(a) A resolution of thanks to the Presidents of the various sittings of the Congress :

(b) A resolution of thanks to the Chairman, the Secretaries, and the Members of the Bureau of the Congress :

(c) A resolution of thanks to the conveners and members of the Sectional Committees :

(d) A resolution of thanks to Rev. Canon Scott Holland, Rev. Dr. Reuen Thomas, and Rev. J. Morgan Gibbon, for their pulpit addresses before the Congress, and that they be requested to furnish copies of the same for publication ; and also to the Authorities of St. Paul's Cathedral, the City Temple, and Stamford Hill Congregational Church for the use of those buildings for public services :

(e) A letter of thanks to Her Majesty for permission to visit Windsor Castle.

(f) And also a resolution of thanks to the Lord Mayor and Lady Mayoress, to Mr. Passmore Edwards, and other friends who have extended their hospitality to the members of the Congress.

In conclusion he moved the adoption of the report.

Mrs. LOCKWOOD seconded the resolution and suggested the addition of a vote of thanks to the Press.

This was agreed to.

Signor MONETA, in supporting the adoption of the report paid an eloquent tribute to the memory of Signor Aurelio Saffi.

The report was unanimously adopted.

RECOGNITION OF HONOURS.

Mr. HODGSON PRATT: The next resolution which I move is:—
“ That this Congress expresses its great satisfaction that Mdlle. Julie Touissant, member of the Central Committee of the International League of Peace and Liberty, and one of the most active champions of

the cause of peace for many years, has been made a member of the Legion of Honour."

Mr. J. G. ALEXANDER thought that it was scarcely dignified on the part of the Congress to congratulate one worker in the cause of Peace because a decoration had been conferred upon her.

M. LASSASIE said that such a thing had never happened before in human history. Formerly only the big butchers had been recognised, but lately one lady and two gentlemen had received decorations from the President of the French Republic for their efforts on behalf of Industry and Peace, namely, the lady who had just been referred to, Mr. Hodgson Pratt, and Mr. Cremer, M.P.

M. PASSY thought it would be better to express in general terms :

"That the Congress was happy to know that such distinctions were now given for peaceful working, both to ladies and gentlemen."

This proposal was agreed to.

INVITATION TO AMERICA.

Rev. R. B. HOWARD (Boston, U.S.A.) said that in 1892 it would be four hundred years since America was discovered by Columbus, and on behalf of the United States he asked the Congress to meet there in connection with the Columbian Exhibition, 1892-93.

Mrs. COLLINS, New York (World's Women's Christian Temperance Union), urged the members of the Congress to exert their influence amongst all classes to show the advantages of continued peace throughout all lands.

RESOLUTION OF GRATITUDE AND FAITH.

Dr. GRAMMER (Baltimore) expressed his assured confidence in the perfect consummation of the objects of the Congress. He had not the slightest doubt that in years to come they would look back to this Congress and say, "This is the Lord's work and it is marvellous in our eyes." He proposed that :

"This Congress places on record a heart-felt expression of gratitude to Almighty God for the remarkable harmony and concord which have characterised the meetings of the Assembly, in which so many men and women of varied nations, creeds, tongues, and races have gathered in closest co-operation, and in the conclusion of the labours of the Congress ; it expresses its firm and unshaken belief in the ultimate triumph of the cause of Peace, and of the principles which have been advocated at these meetings ; and the delegates present pledge themselves to redouble their efforts and to do all in their power to bring about this happy consummation."

Dr. THOMAS NELSON PAGE (Richmond, Virginia) in seconding Dr. Grammer's motion, and supporting Rev. R. B. Howard's invitation, said that when the Congress opened he was afraid that there would not be much harmony, but the discussions had passed off most harmoniously. He would have been sorry to report on his return to the State of Virginia which accredited him to the Congress, unless this resolution had been brought forward and passed. While holding the Brotherhood of Man, he also recognised even more firmly the Universal Fatherhood of God.

The first thing he remembered was the thunder of war, but he was happy to say that there were no scars remaining, and in the United States all were for Peace. They would be glad to unite in any effort towards bringing about universal peace, which could only be secured by the universal reign of law—the law referred to by the old English Bishop, when he said that its home was the bosom of God, and its voice was the harmony of the universe.

[An interesting incident here occurred. On the conclusion of Dr. Page's speech, Rev. R. B. Howard, of Boston, stepped forward and congratulated him, and for a short time they stood together before the Congress—North and South clasping hands in the holy work of Peace.]

Mr. HENRY WIGHAM (Dublin) supported the resolution. He said that in 1849 he had the honour to be a delegate to the Peace Congress in Paris, presided over by Victor Hugo. He was also a delegate at the London Congress in 1851, and the memories of that time were fresh within him. He united most heartily in gratitude to Almighty God that they had had such a happy time at the present Congress, and in the earnest desire that the time would soon come when the nations of the earth should be united in peace and love.

M. VASSEUR appealed to the ladies present to combine what he described as the characteristic of women, sentiment and obstinacy, in their work on behalf of peace.

Miss LOUISA BIGG offered as a practical suggestion, that each member of the Congress should call together three or four men or women and form them into a Peace Society in their particular neighbourhood.

Miss DE BROEN (Paris) gave a few particulars with regard to her work at Belleville. She hoped that some representatives from the revolutionary quarter of Belleville would be present at the next Congress.

The Resolution was heartily accepted, and unanimously adopted.

The minutes of the present sitting were then read and confirmed.

VALEDICTORY BY PRESIDENT.

The PRESIDENT: The Session now is, I understand, terminated, of which I perceive, you are very glad, as I am. We have done, I think, good work. We have not done all that some of the more sanguine would have wished, but we have done more probably than some of the more timid would have liked. We have, I am sure, taken a step forward in the road towards peace and goodwill among men. That is good work enough, and I am proud of it. I am proud to have been here, proud to have done the little that I could do, and I have to thank you for your courtesy and indulgence. Nothing therefore, remains for me but to say that this Congress is closed, and Farewell.

SATURDAY MORNING, 19TH JULY.

VISIT TO WINDSOR.

The morning was occupied by an excursion to Windsor. About 170 delegates and their friends indulged in this relaxation after the close and prolonged labours of the week. Through the courtesy of Her Majesty the Queen, special permission was given to the party to visit Windsor Castle, over which they were personally conducted. It was arranged that the party should return to town in time for the closing festivities.

SATURDAY EVENING, 19TH JULY.

BANQUET AT THE HOLBORN RESTAURANT.

These festivities took the form of a banquet, presided over by the Hon. DAVID DUDLEY FIELD, which was attended by more than a hundred guests.

After dessert had been placed on the table the PRESIDENT in a brief but appropriate speech, proposed the toast of "Her Majesty the Queen," which was enthusiastically received. Mrs. BELVA A. LOCKWOOD interpellated a compliment to the "Rulers of the Countries represented at the Banquet," which was also loyally responded to.

The toast of "The Universal Peace Congress" was proposed by the PRESIDENT, who took the opportunity of expressing his sense of the importance as well as the success of the Congress. In response, M. SARRAZIN (Guise) spoke for France in place of M. Passy, who had been associated with it, but who with characteristic and generous grace, deferred this duty to his colleague; Don ARTURO DI MARCOARTU alluded to the work which had been accomplished by the Congress in glowing terms; Signor MONETA was eloquent on behalf of Italy and its part in the cause of Peace; and the Rev. Dr. REUEN THOMAS spoke for the States.

Dr. THOMAS said: "It has been with very great pleasure that I have attended the meetings of this Congress, and as I have attended at Westminster from day to day, I have been struck with the fact that, after all, we of various nationalities, are very much alike. I have also been struck with the ability of the President in bounding and limiting speeches which would have lasted a whole week if they had not been cut short. Remembering this fact, I shall not trespass on your attention

further than to say that I hope the day is not far distant when men shall learn the art of war no more, and shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning-hooks.

A letter was then read from Signor Ruggiero Bonghi, the distinguished Italian Economist, regretting that he had been unable to visit England on the occasion of the Congress, and expressing a hope that it would meet next year at Rome.

In proposing the next toast, "The Chairman of Committee and the Officers of the Congress," the PRESIDENT spoke in genial terms of the admirable arrangements which had been made, both for and at the Congress.

MR. W. EVANS DARBY (Secretary of the Peace Society and Joint Secretary of the Congress) responded. He said that they all felt and deplored the absence of their Chairman of Committees, Mr. Hodgson Pratt, who had written to say that now the strain of the Congress was over, he had completely broken down. He would take the opportunity, in his absence, of bearing testimony to the indefatigable labours and valuable services rendered by Mr. Pratt, both to the Congress and to the cause of Peace generally, and also to the high personal character of Mr. Pratt, who well represented the grand old name of gentleman, and who, the more he had become known by them, as was necessarily the case in the associated labours of the last few months, the better he was loved. He was sure they would all wish for him a speedy restoration to health.

MR. DARBY, referring to the allusion of the Chairman, said that their work had been twofold during the week, to keep the Congress strictly to its object and to the work it had to do, and also to get through a very long and crowded programme. That had to be done, else they would have been exposed to the taunt, "These men began to build and were not able to finish; these men who sometimes venture to express opinions on questions of State policy were not able to conduct their own business." He was glad they had succeeded. Not having the fear of the programme and of that grim guardian of order, the Secretary of the Congress, before his eyes, he would venture to speak freely as to the position held by himself and other members of the Congress with regard to some of the questions which had come before them. He wished to do this that he might be understood, and the future intercourse he hoped to maintain with their visitors might be more sympathetic and effective. He then referred to such questions as the solidarity of the race, the Fatherhood of God, and the brotherhood of man as taught and illustrated by Jesus Christ, as the basis of their work.

Mr. J. F. GREEN (co-secretary) also responded to this toast, and bore testimony to the unity which had existed between himself and Mr. Darby as secretaries. He added his expression of deep regret at the absence of Mr. Pratt, of whom he spoke very highly.

Mr. PERCY W. BUNTING (editor of the *Contemporary Review*) next proposed the toast of "The President of the Congress." Mr. Bunting said he was proud to belong to the profession which Mr. Field adorned, for he had stretched his hand through time, and drawn for the world the law of the future.

Rev. Dr. MOXOM (Boston, U.S.A.), in supporting this toast, gracefully alluded to the tact which had distinguished the President in his conduct of business, and spoke of the high aim and character of the work of Peace.

The Hon. D. D. FIELD responded to this toast, which was received most enthusiastically, with characteristic brevity—his final words being, "We have now come to the conclusion of the Congress, of which I, as well as you, am heartily glad. I have now but two words to say—one of thanks to you all for your kindness, and—Farewell."

Three hearty cheers for the veteran President, who with remarkable energy at his advanced time of life had laboured so heartily and happily for the success of the Congress, were the final notes of the Universal Peace Congress of 1890.

Addenda.

The following paper was not received in time to admit of its insertion in its proper place in the Proceedings, page 89.

RAPPORT PRÉSENTÉ PAR P. A. DOYEN, EMPLOYÉ AU FAMILISTÈRE DE GUISE, AISNE (FRANCE), SUR LA QUESTION DE LA PAIX, CONSIDÉRÉE AU POINT DE VUE DE L'ÉDUCATION.

Quoique n'ayant pas d'idées bien nouvelles à faire connaître au Congrès, nous avons cru qu'il était de notre devoir d'indiquer ici notre manière de voir sur cette importante question : d'abord, pour pouvoir permettre au Congrès d'étudier les différents moyens proposés, et, ensuite, pour prouver notre ardent désir de voir adopter par les amis de la paix une ligne de conduite pratique, pouvant permettre d'atteindre plus promptement le but poursuivi.

La question de l'instruction et de l'éducation de l'enfant est de la plus haute importance. Il est prouvé que dans les cerveaux malléables des jeunes élèves, les premières idées reçues se gravent plus facilement, se conservent longtemps et même souvent pendant toute la vie. La méthode d'enseignement de l'histoire, adoptée aujourd'hui dans presque toutes les écoles, fausse complètement l'intelligence de l'enfant. Tous les livres en usage dans nos classes exaltent l'héroïsme du soldat, parlent longuement des batailles sanglantes, des tueries hideuses qui ont déshonoré l'humanité, et entretiennent ainsi dans le cœur de l'élève ces sentiments de chauvinisme, de faux patriotisme qui ont tant fait de mal jusqu'à ce jour. Les maîtres eux-mêmes, par suite de cette fausse éducation, sont imbus, en majorité, de ces idées fausses et dangereuses, qui poussent à croire que la dignité d'un peuple consiste à faire massacrer des centaines de mille de leurs semblables, pour venger une soi-disant offense qui, souvent, n'est qu'une maladresse d'un diplomate incapable.

Pour apporter un remède à ce mal moral, si préjudiciable à la cause sacrée des principes de paix et de fraternité, de respect de la vie humaine, que nous défendons avec toute l'énergie dont nous sommes capables, nous croyons qu'il serait très utile que les sociétés de paix agissent par tous les moyens en leur pouvoir pour faire reformer, sous ce rapport, les programmes adoptés dans les écoles ; soit en engageant les maîtres à montrer à leurs élèves tous les maux causés par les guerres, soit internationales, soit civiles, et, surtout, en provoquant soit par voie de concours, soit par tout autre moyen dont on pourra disposer, l'impression de livres classiques, surtout ceux concernant l'histoire, écrits d'une manière plus conforme à la vérité, c'est-à-dire faisant ressortir tous les maux inséparables de la guerre, montrant tous les guerriers célèbres, tous les grands conquérants, non comme des modèles à imiter, mais comme de véritables fléaux de l'humanité, qu'il importe d'écarter pour le plus grand bien de tous. Il faudrait, au contraire, raconter avec plus de détail, la vie des hommes qui ont sacrifié leur fortune et leur vie pour doter l'humanité—d'une connaissance nouvelle, d'une vérité inconnue, d'une invention précieuse pour la cause du progrès. L'histoire, si instructive, de la plupart de ces hommes de bien, est complètement inconnue des élèves, et même, parfois, hélas ! des maîtres eux-mêmes.

On trouve depuis quelques années, certains almanachs qui dans le calendrier remplacent le nom des saints, par le nom d'hommes ayant par différents points de vue, été des ouvriers du progrès.

Il nous semble que l'instituteur qui, muni d'un de ces almanachs trop peu connus, voudrait faire chaque jour une courte leçon d'histoire à ses élèves en leur racontant, plus ou moins brièvement suivant leur degré d'instruction, la vie de ces bienfaiteurs de l'humanité, ferait une œuvre d'une utilité incontestable. Nous croyons que tout le monde y gagnerait et le maître et les élèves.

Nous soumettons, Mesdames et Messieurs, cette idée à votre haute appréciation, persuadés que si elle était mise en pratique, elle aiderait puissamment à atteindre le but que nous poursuivons.

Pour habituer, dès l'enfance, les hommes à l'horreur des batailles et à l'amour de la paix il serait bon de provoquer, autant que possible, dans toutes les écoles, l'établissement de petits tribunaux d'arbitrage, tels qu'ils sont établis depuis bien longtemps, par l'éminent Monsieur Godin dans les écoles du Familistère, tribunal nommé par les élèves eux-mêmes, ainsi que nous avons eu l'honneur de le faire connaître l'année dernière au Congrès de Paris.

Nous croyons devoir arrêter ici ce mémoire sommaire, parceque nous croyons que de plus longs développements feraient perdre au Congrès un temps précieux, et nous nous résumons par les deux propositions suivantes :

(1). Les sociétés de paix, devront faire tous leurs efforts, pour faire composer et éditer, des livres classiques et des *images-bons points*, présentant les hommes de guerre tels qu'ils sont réellement, c'est-à-dire des êtres nuisibles au bien de l'humanité, au bonheur de tous ; faisant au contraire l'éloge des hommes utiles, dont la plupart sont complètement oubliés dans les livres d'histoire actuellement en usage dans les écoles.

(2). Créer dans toutes les écoles des tribunaux d'arbitrage, destinés à habituer les élèves, sous la présidence du maître, à régler par l'arbitrage, tout différent pouvant s'élever entre-eux et les familiariser ainsi aux principes d'arbitrage, qui un jour, nous n'en doutons pas, résoudront toutes les questions internationales pouvant diviser les peuples, créés pour s'aimer et s'aider mutuellement.

En terminant notre rapport, nous envoyons à tous les membres du Congrès réunis à Londres, nos vœux les plus ardents pour la mise en pratique des idées de paix et d'arbitrage ; nos félicitations aux organisateurs du Congrès, pour leur zèle et leur dévouement, et nos sincères salutations à tous.

Appendix.

PRELIMINARY ARRANGEMENTS.

October 21st, 1889—Meeting of Representatives of the Peace Society and the International Arbitration and Peace Association. The following Circular issued to Peace Societies :—

47, NEW BROAD STREET,
LONDON, E.C.,
25TH OCTOBER, 1889.

DEAR SIR,

At a representative meeting of the Peace Society and the International Arbitration and Peace Association, held to consider the time and place of the next Peace Congress, which it was determined by the recent Congress in Paris should be held in 1890, it was thought desirable to consult the principal Peace Societies before any action be taken.

Will you kindly therefore ascertain the opinion of your Society on the following points :—

1. Whether London is preferred by it as the next place of meeting ?
2. If not, what town would it suggest in preference ?

It was felt that the town indicated by the majority of replies to these questions should be considered the one chosen.

If London be the choice of the majority, the Societies represented by us will do their best to make its meeting successful.

And in that case the time of the meetings would be practically settled by the date of the Interparliamentary Conference, which has been fixed for the end of July, 1890, as many of the delegates would naturally be anxious to attend both.

An early reply will oblige,

Yours very sincerely,

W. EVANS DARBY,

Secretary of the Peace Society.

J. FREDK. GREEN,

Secretary of the International Arbitration and
Peace Association.

December 10th, 1889—Second meeting of above. Circular issued inviting formation of a General Committee :—

47, NEW BROAD STREET,
LONDON, E.C.
16th December, 1889.

DEAR SIR,

At a meeting of Delegates representing the London Peace Societies, held on the 10th instant, it was resolved, in accordance with suggestions received from the various Peace Societies which had been consulted, that the next Peace Congress should be held in London in the summer of 1890.

It was also determined that, in order to make arrangements for this Congress, a *General Committee* should be constituted, consisting of not more than *four* Delegates from each of the regularly organised Peace Societies in London and the Provinces.

Will you kindly bring the matter before your Committee, and forward us the names of your Delegates at the earliest opportunity.

The first Meeting of the General Committee will be held at the Office of the Peace Society, 47, New Broad Street, London, E.C., on the 15th January next, at 5 p.m., when we hope your Society will be represented.

We remain,

Yours very sincerely,

W. EVANS DARBY, }

J. FREDK. GREEN, } *Secretaries.*

The General Committee of Organisation, elected in response, consisted of the following Representatives :—

Peace Society—Sir JOS. W. PEASE, Bart., M.P., WALTER HAZELL, C. C. MORLAND, F. G. CASH, and W. EVANS DARBY ; Local Peace Association (Auxiliary of Peace Society)—Mrs. H. RICHARD, Mrs. A. W. BENNETT, Miss M. E. PHILLIPS, and Miss R. B. BRAITHWAITE ; International Arbitration and Peace Association—HODGSON PRATT, W. MARTIN WOOD, FELIX MOSCHELES, W. H. SANDS, and J. FREDK. GREEN ; Women's Committee of the International Arbitration and Peace Association—Miss ANGELE

FREIX, Mrs. DRUGMAN, Mrs. SCHACK, and Miss MONICA MANGAN : Luton Branch of the International Arbitration and Peace Association — Miss LOUISA BIGG, and MICHAEL COOK : Women's Peace and Arbitration Association—Mrs. COLE, Mrs. WATES, Miss MILLS, and Mrs. SOUTHEY ; Liverpool Peace Society—THOMAS SNAPE, THOMAS CROSFIELD, MARK HOWARTH, and S. W. DAVIES ; Manchester Auxiliary of Peace Society—WILLIAM BRADSHAW, JOHN MATHER, Rev. J. FREESTON, and WILLIAM POLLARD ; Birmingham Auxiliary of Peace Society—Rev. ARTHUR O'NEILL ; Dublin Peace Society—Mrs. HANNAH M. WIGHAM, W. H. HAYDOCK, JOHN COOKE, B.A., and HENRY WIGHAM ; Friends' Committee—Mrs. E. R. RANSOME, E. R. RANSOME, WILLIAM RANSOM, and GEO. GILLET ; Christian Union for the Promotion of International Concord—Rev. H. W. WEBB-PEPLOE, Rev. J. P. GLEDSTONE, PERCY BUNTING, and W. C. BRAITHWAITE ; Newcastle and Gateshead Ladies' Peace Association—Mrs. R. SPENCE WATSON, and Mrs. ANN RICHARDSON.

January 15th, 1890. First Meeting of the General Committee-Appointments :—

Chairman of Committees, HODGSON PRATT ; Treasurer, WALTER HAZELL ; Secretaries, W. EVANS DARBY and J. FREDK. GREEN ; Executive Committee, the above, Mrs. SCHACK, Mrs. SOUTHEY, Miss R. B. BRAITHWAITE, Miss MONICA MANGAN, Miss MILLS, Miss P. H. PECKOVER, and Messrs. W. C. BRAITHWAITE, F. G. CASH, G. GILLET, C. C. MORLAND, F. MOSCHELES, W. H. SANDS, T. SNAPE, and, subsequently, W. MARTIN WOOD, vice W. H. Sands, resigned.

A List of Vice-Presidents was opened, in connection with which the following circular was issued :—

UNIVERSAL PEACE CONGRESS, 1890.

47, New Broad Street, London, E.C.
1890.

At the Universal Peace Congress which was held in Paris last June, a resolution was adopted that a similar Congress should be convened in 1890. In pursuance of this resolution, a Conference was held between the Peace Society and the International Arbitration and Peace Association, at which it was resolved to consult the principal Societies in Europe and America as to where this Congress should be held. This was done, and an almost unanimous decision was expressed in favour of London. Accordingly a Committee has been formed, consisting of representatives of the Peace Societies of Great Britain and Ireland, to make the necessary arrangements for its meeting, which it is proposed to hold during the approaching summer.

The Committee, at a recent meeting, unanimously decided that you should be invited to become one of the Vice-Presidents of the Congress. We have great pleasure in conveying this decision to you, and hope that you will kindly accede to their request.

Yours faithfully,

W. EVANS DARBY, Sec. of the Peace Society.	} Hon. Secs. of Congress Committee.
J. FREDK. GREEN, Sec. I.A. & P.A.	

April 16th, 1890 :—Following circular of Invitation to Societies issued, with accompanying Programme.

UNIVERSAL PEACE CONGRESS, 1890.

47, NEW BROAD STREET,
LONDON, E.C., APRIL, 1890.

DEAR SIR,

We have the pleasure to inform you that a General and an Executive Committee have been constituted in order to make arrangements for the Second Annual Peace Congress, to be held, as decided by the Congress in Paris last June, in London in July next, from the 14th to the 19th inclusive. The meetings will be held at the Westminster Town Hall, London, W.

It is desirable that the General Committee should comprise among its Vice-Presidents well known and distinguished friends of international concord, belonging to different nationalities. We shall, therefore, be particularly obliged if you will indicate the names of any representing your country who might fitly be nominated, and we shall be glad to have this information at your earliest convenience.

Being anxious to facilitate the attendance of a large number of guests from

foreign countries, we shall endeavour to secure for many of our visitors, if not all, a home with some of our London friends during the week of the Congress.

A fund will be raised to meet the expense attending the organisation of the Congress, and the arrangements for the convenience of visitors—English and Foreign.

We hope that your Society will be largely represented at the Congress, and that in due course we shall receive from you an intimation of the number of members of your Society, both ladies and gentlemen, whom we shall have the pleasure of seeing, together with their names and addresses.

We shall be happy to afford any information you may desire, and to receive any suggestions which your Committee may offer in connection with the Congress.

It has been considered advisable to draw up a programme of the subjects to be discussed at the Congress, copies of which are sent herewith, and we shall feel obliged by your making its contents known as widely as possible.

You will observe that our Committee have excluded from this list of subjects every question of international politics which involves pending controversies. We have thought this course necessary in order to secure calm deliberation and to avoid debates which might wound national susceptibilities.

We hope that competent members of your Society may be induced to furnish carefully prepared written communications on any of the subjects specified in the programme. It will be readily understood that as such papers will require careful selection and classification, it will be desirable that they should be forwarded as early as possible for the consideration of the Committee. Such communications will be received up to the 14th June. Meanwhile we shall be glad if you will kindly bring the matter before your members, and invite their co-operation. Each communication should be accompanied, if practicable, by a *précis* of its contents.

We are, DEAR SIR,

Very faithfully yours,

HODGSON PRATT,

Chairman of Executive Committee.

W. EVANS DARBY, }
J. FRED. GREEN, } *Secretaries.*

Please send word how many more copies of the programme you will require.

PROGRAMME FOR THE UNIVERSAL PEACE CONGRESS,

to be held at the WESTMINSTER TOWN HALL, LONDON, W., July 14th to 19th, 1890.

SUBJECTS FOR CONSIDERATION.

A.—THE CHRISTIAN AND OTHER RELIGIOUS ASPECTS OF THE QUESTION OF PEACE AND WAR.

- I.—The Sacredness of human life.
- II.—The brotherhood of man, and of nations.
- III.—God's teaching to the Jews in the Old Testament.
- IV.—Christ's teaching to the world in the New Testament.
- V.—Duties of ministers of religion with regard to peace and war.
- VI.—Religious instruction in reference to peace and war.

B.—INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

- I.—Principles of Arbitration.
 - a. Difference between Arbitral and purely legal decisions.
 - b. Cases, if any, to which Arbitration is not applicable.
 - c. Cases, if any, in which Mediation is preferable to Arbitration.
- II.—Arbitral Treaties.
 - a. Question of declaring in any such Treaties that no decision shall be binding which affects the independence and liberty of the nations concerned.
 - b. A condition to be inserted in any such Treaty that no territory shall be transferred from one Power to another without the sanction of the majority of the inhabitants of such territory.
 - c. Means of overcoming the difficulties in the way of the adoption of such Treaties and reservation, if any, of the class of questions to be submitted to the Arbitrators.

III.—ARBITRAL TRIBUNALS—

- a. In what respect do Courts of Arbitration differ from ordinary Courts of Law ?
- b. Means of securing an acknowledgment by the Governments of the need of such Tribunals ; and difficulties impeding their establishment.
- c. Question as to the mode of constituting such Tribunals : Professor Leone Levi's project that Governments should appoint an equal number of Jurists to sit for a fixed term of years as members of a High Court of Nations.
- d. Mode of convening such a High Court whenever its services are required ; its place of meeting ; by whom to be convened, etc., etc.
- e. Procedure of the High Court in nominating from among its members the Arbitral Court or Tribunal : should the High Court, on being constituted, appoint a Committee to draft a system of Procedure ; Procedure of the Arbitral Court, etc., etc.

C.—INTERNATIONAL LAW.

I.—Reforms required.

II.—Formation of a Code.

- a. What steps is it desirable to take for the preparation of such a Code ?
- b. Consideration by the Congress of the materials for such a Code which were published by the late Leone Levi and Bluntschli, by D. Dudley Field, and others.
- c. What course should be adopted for securing the acceptance of such a Code ?

D.—NEUTRALISATION.

- I.—Reasons which render the Neutralisation of States, territories, rivers, canals, &c., desirable : how to render the same effective ?
- II.—Plans to be adopted whereby neutralised Provinces or States may be able to dispense with the necessity of maintaining defensive forces ?

E.—DISARMAMENT.

- I.—Is any scheme for disarmament practicable at the present time ?
- II.—Under what conditions, and by what arrangement would such disarmament be practicable ?
- III.—Gradual, simultaneous, and proportional disarmament.

F.—NATIONAL CONTROL OVER DECLARATION OF WAR.

- I.—The expression of the National Will as a necessary condition of a Declaration of War.
- II.—Methods of securing this result.
 - a. Is it practicable to constitute an organisation whereby responsible and permanent functionaries must consider and report on any international dispute before the Government can declare war ?
 - b. How should such an organisation be constituted, and with what functions ? Should it take the form of the English Privy Council, or of a permanent and independent body created by Parliament ?
 - c. What are the difficulties which lie in the way of such an organisation, and how can they be met ?
- III.—How far should the sanction of Parliament, or other representative Assembly, be necessary to a Declaration of War.

G.—RELATIONS OF CIVILISED STATES TOWARDS WEAKER RACES.

- I.—In what manner can the protection of the latter from aggression, and from an invasion of their rights, be best secured ?
- II.—The relations of civilised States towards each other in territories belonging to weaker races.

H.—INDIRECT CAUSES OF WAR, AND REMEDIES FOR THE SAME.

- I.—Causes :
 - a. Prejudices and traditions.
 - b. Misrepresentations and exaggerations of Legislative Assemblies, the Press, and Platform.
 - c. Alleged influence of protective and discriminating Tariffs or Duties.
 - d. Other causes of alienation.
- II.—Remedies for the above.
 - a. The moral responsibilities of Statesmen in reference to this question.

I.—EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF THE QUESTION.

I.—Methods whereby the attention of the young in Primary Schools may be directed to the importance of Peace, alike to nations and to mankind.

- a.* Suggestions for giving greater prominence to the value of moral and civic heroism, as compared with that of military courage and warlike distinction.
- b.* Injury to the cause of Peace arising from the attractiveness with which the war system is presented to youth.
- c.* Military drill in schools.

II.—Provisions for instruction in questions relating to International Arbitration, Tribunals, and a Code of Law, in High Schools, Colleges, and Universities.

III.—Introduction of historical text-books, calculated to show :

- a.* The wastefulness of War and its failure to secure a just settlement of disputes.
- b.* The advantages of Industry and Peace to human progress and national development.

J.—INTER-PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE.

I.—In what form can co-operation be effectively established between the Annual Inter-Parliamentary Conference and the Universal Peace Congress.

K.—FEDERATION OF PEACE SOCIETIES.

I.—Is it desirable to create a Federation of all Peace Societies in Europe and America?

II.—If so, what steps should be taken to carry it out ?

SUBSEQUENT APPOINTMENTS :—

PROCEDURE COMMITTEE :

HODGSON PRATT, W. HAZELL, W. EVANS DARBY, J. FREDK. GREEN, GEO. GILLETT, W. C. BRAITHWAITE, and THOMAS SNAPE.

FINANCE COMMITTEE :

The TREASURER, Mr. F. G. CASH, and Mr. WILLIAM RANSOM.

RECEPTION COMMITTEE :

The OFFICERS, Mrs. H. RICHARD, Mrs. A. W. BENNETT, Miss M. E. PHILLIPS, Miss R. B. BRAITHWAITE, Miss ANGELE FREIX, Mrs. DRUGMAN, Countess SCHACK, Miss M. MANGAN, Miss L. BIGG, Mrs. COLE, Mrs. WATES, Miss MILLS, Mrs. SOUTHEY, Mrs. H. M. WIGHAM, Mrs. E. RANSOME, Mrs. R. SPENCE WATSON, Mrs. A. RICHARDSON, and Messrs. E. R. RANSOME, W. MARTIN WOOD, C. C. MORLAND, and PERCY BUNTING,

AND BY THE CONGRESS ITSELF.

BUREAU :

Consisting of PRESIDENT, CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES, TREASURER, SECRETARIES, Sir JOS. W. PEASE, Bart., M.P. (England), Rev. R. B. HOWARD (America), M. FREDERIC PASSY (France), M. FRED. BAJER, M.P. (Denmark), M. F. T. BORG, M.P. (Sweden and Norway), Frau FISCHER-LETTE (Germany), and Signor E. T. MONETA (Italy).

PROCEDURE COMMITTEE :

The above, together with Messrs. W. C. BRAITHWAITE, GEO. GILLETT, and T. SNAPE.

Universal Peace Congress, 1890.

President.

THE HONOURABLE DAVID DUDLEY FIELD.

Treasurer.

WALTER HAZELL.

Chairman of Committee.

HODGSON PRATT.

Secretaries.

W. EVANS DARBY.

J. FRDK. GREEN.

Vice-Presidents.

THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF ABERDEEN.

WILLIAM ABRAHAM, ESQ., M.P.

THE MARQUIS ALFIERI DI SOSTEGNO, *Rome.*

M. G. BLET D'ALVIELLA, *Belgium.*

MRS. SHELDON AMOS.

M. LE BARON THOMAS DE ST. GEORGES-ARMSTRONG, *Paris.*

M. K. P. ARNOLDSON, M.P., *Stockholm.*

REV. CANON BENJAM. B.D.

REV. GEORGE A. BOARDMAN, D.D., *Chicago, U.S.A.*

M. F. BAJER, M.P., *Copenhagen.*

SIGNOR R. BONGHI, *Député, Rome.*

J. BEVAN BRAITHWAITE, ESQ.

JACOB BRIGHT, ESQ., M.P.

MRS. JACOB BRIGHT.

MRS. THE MARQUIS OF BRISTOL.

REV. PHILLIPS BROOKS, D.D., *Boston, U.S.A.*

PROFESSOR DR. LUDWIG BUCHNER, *Darmstadt.*

M. CH. BELS, *Belgium.*

PERCY BUNTING, ESQ.

THOS. BURT, ESQ., M.P.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL, M.P.

LADY CARLISLE.

ANDREW CARNEGIE, ESQ.

REV. PROFESSOR PAULUS CASSEL, D.D., *Berlin.*

HON. JONATHAN CHACE, *Rhode Island.*

HON. J. B. CHAMBERLIN, *Denver, U.S.A.*

MRS. ORMISTON CHANT.

REV. FRANK G. CLARK, *Plymouth, N.H.*

DR. G. B. CLARK, M.P.

JAMES CLARK, ESQ., J.P., *Paisley.*

REV. JOHN CLIFFORD, M.A., D.D.

MISS JANE CORDEN.

DR. STANTON COIT.

J. J. COLMAN, ESQ., M.P.

REV. JOSEPH COOK, *Boston, U.S.A.*

HANDEL COSSHAM, ESQ., M.P.

M. AUG. COUVREUR, *Belgium.*

M. L'ABBE DEFOURNY, *Villepinte, France.*

M. A. DESMOULINS, *France.*

RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF DURHAM.

JOHN E. ELLIS, ESQ., M.P.

PETER ESSELMONT, ESQ., M.P.

SIGNOR C. FACELLI, *Rome.*

JOSEPH STORRS FRY, ESQ.

REV. PRESIDENT A. M. FAIRBAIRN, D.D.

JAMES FLEMING, ESQ., J.P., *Glasgow.*

SIR WALTER FOSTER, M.P.

HON. AND REV. CANON FREMANTLE, M.A.

THEODORE FRY, ESQ., M.P.

HON. PHILIP C. GARRATT, *Philadelphia, Penn.*

REV. J. MORGAN GIBBON.

DR. J. H. GLADSTONE, F.R.S.

MADAME MARIE GEGG, *Geneva.*

PROFESSOR HENRY GOUDY, *Edinburgh.*

LEONARD GOW, ESQ., J.P., *Glasgow.*

G. LEVESON GOWER, ESQ., M.P.

REV. H. R. HAWES, M.A.

M. T. A. HEDLUND, M.P., *Gothenburg.*

JAMES HENDERSON, ESQ., *Glasgow.*

ALFRED F. HILLS, ESQ.

REV. CANON H. SCOTT HOLLAND, M.A.

G. J. HOLYOAKE, ESQ.

C. H. HOPWOOD, ESQ., Q.C.

REV. R. B. HOWARD, *Boston, U.S.A.*

REV. HUGH PRICE HUGHES, M.A.

W. HOLMAN HUNT, ESQ.

TIMOTHY B. HUSSEY, ESQ., *North Bewick, U.S.A.*

ALFRED ILLINGWORTH, ESQ., M.P.

HON. JOHN JAY, *New York.*

VERY REV. G. W. KITCHIN, D.D., *Dean of Winchester.*

Vice-Presidents—continued.

- M. EMILE DE LAVELEYE, *Belgium*.
 REV. T. J. LAWRENCE, M.A., *Cambridge*.
 SIR WILFRID LAWSON, BART, M.P.
 M. G. LORAND, *Belgium*.
 PROFESSOR J. R. LUMBY, D.D.
 HON. AND REV. A. T. LYTTON, M.A.
 W. A. MCARTHUR, ESQ., M.P.
 WALTER S. B. McLAREN, ESQ., M.P.
 MRS. EVA McLAREN.
 M. CHARLES LEMONNIER, *Paris*.
 HIS EXCELLENCY, DON ARTURO DI MARCOARTU, *Senator, Madrid*.
 WILLIAM MATHER, ESQ., M.P.
 SIGNOR A. MAZZOLENI, *Deput, Milan*.
 REV. A. A. MINER, D.D., *Boston, U.S.A.*
 F. D. MOCATTA, Esq.
 M. HERMANN MOLKENBOER, *Amsterdam*.
 SIGNOR E. T. MONETA, *Milan*.
 THE RIGHT HON. A. J. MUNDELLA, M.P.
 REV. DR. OLIVER, *Ealing*.
 HON. ROBT. TRANT PAINK, *Boston, U.S.A.*
 DR. PANKHURST.
 REV. JOSEPH PARKER, D.D.
 M. FREDERIC PASSY, *Membre de l'Institut, etc., Paris*.
 ARTHUR PEASE, ESQ., J.P.
 SIR JOSEPH W. PEASE, BART, M.P.
 MISS P. H. PECKOVER.
 FREDK. PENNINGTON, ESQ., J.P.
 REV. JOHN PERCIVAL, D.D., *Rugby*.
 BENJN. PICKARD, ESQ., M.P.
 J. ALLANSON PICTON, ESQ., M.P.
 M. VAN PUT, *Belgium*.
 HON. WILLIAM L. PUTNAM, *Portland, Maine*.
 MRS. HENRY RICHARD.
 JOSHUA ROWNTREE, ESQ., M.P.
- RIGHT REV.] THE LORD BISHOP OF RIPON.
 MISS ELLEN ROBINSON, *Liverpool*.
 SIR CHAS. RUSSELL, Q.C., M.P.
 SIGNORA PAULINE SCHIFF, *Milan*.
 REV. H. C. SHUTTLEWORTH, M.A.
 M. JULES SIMON, *Senator, Paris*.
 VERY REV. DR. PAYNE SMITH (DEAN OF CANTERBURY).
 SAMUEL SMITH, ESQ., M.P.
 HON. P. STANHOPE, M.P.
 HALLEY STEWART, ESQ., M.P.
 THE BARONESS BERTHA V. SUTTNER, *Austria*.
 MISS ANNA SWANWICK.
 GEORGE TATHAM, ESQ., J.P.
 REV. CHAS. F. THRING, D.D., *Mimeapolis, Minn.*
 HON. EDWARD S. TOBEY, *Boston, U.S.A.*
 MISS ISABELLA M. A. TOD.
 COUNT L. N. TOLSTOY, *Moscow*.
 THE COUNTESS TOLSTOY, *London*.
 MADLLE. JULIE TOUSSAINT, *Paris*.
 M. V. ULLMAN, M.P., *Christiania*.
 PROFESSOR ANGELO UMITA, *Neuchatel*.
 CAPT. EDMUND H. VERNEY, M.P.
 SIGNOR PROF. FRANCESCO VIGANO, *Milan*.
 M. C. DE VOS, *Belgium*.
 R. SPENCE WATSON, ESQ., LL.D., *Newcastle*.
 ALFRED WEBB, ESQ., M.P.
 JOHN G. WHITTIER, ESQ., *Amesbury, U.S.A.*
 H. J. WILSON, ESQ., M.P.
 JOHN WILSON, ESQ., M.P.
 HON. ROBT. C. WINTHROP, *Boston, U.S.A.*
 CALEB WRIGHT, ESQ., M.P.

Universal Peace Congress, 1890.

LIST OF DELEGATES.

ENGLAND.

THE PEACE SOCIETY.

George W. Alexander.
 A. W. Ballard.
 J. G. Barclay.
 W. L. Barclay.
 Francis Bassett.
 A. W. Bennett, M.A.
 Wm. Bond.
 William Bradshaw.
 Henry Brown.
 Thomas Burt, M.P.
 George Cadbury.
 F. G. Cash.
 R. D. Catchpool.
 William Catchpool.
 Henry Catford.
 Thos. Chambers.
 Mrs. Ormiston Chant.
 James Clark.
 J. O. Cooper.
 W. E. Corner.
 James Cropper.
 Thomas Crosfield.
 Frederick Crowley.
 W. Evans Darby.
 Rev. P. H. Davies.
 Alexander Eddington.
 William Edwards.
 Mrs. Fox.
 J. Hingston Fox.
 J. Hoyland Fox.
 Francis H. Fox.
 John Gill.
 George Gillett.
 J. W. Graham.
 Frederick Graveley.
 Edward Gripper.
 Daniel Hack.
 Rev. Newman Hall, LL.B.
 John Harlock.
 Theodore Harris.
 Walter Hazell.
 James Henderson.
 A. F. Hills.
 J. B. Hodgkin.
 William Holmes.
 John Horniman.
 Alfred Illingworth, M.P.

THE PEACE SOCIETY—cont.

William Jones.
 Robert Kell.
 Walter Lean.
 Richard Littleboy.
 George Livesey.
 Frederick Longdon.
 Mrs. Duncan McLaren.
 M. P. Manfield.
 John Mather.
 John Messer.
 G. W. M. Mills.
 M. M. Monro.
 Charles C. Morland, J.P.
 Felix Moscheles.
 Rev. W. Mottram.
 Rev. Arthur O'Neill.
 Alfred Palmer.
 A. T. Palmer.
 George Palmer.
 G. W. Palmer.
 W. I. Palmer.
 Miss Pease.
 Arthur Pease.
 H. Fell Pease, M.P.
 Sir J. W. Pease, Bart., M.P.
 Alexander Peckover.
 Algernon Peckover.
 Miss Algerina Peckover.
 Miss P. H. Peckover.
 Miss Wilhelmina Peckover.
 Frederick Pennington.
 P. P. Perry.
 Geo. Pitt.
 William Pollard.
 Edward Priestman.
 Albert Prust.
 J. H. Raper.
 Mrs. Henry Richard.
 Dr. Robertson.
 Joshua Rowntree, M.P.
 Joseph Rowntree.
 William Rowntree.
 Robert Sells.
 Rev. R. Shaen.
 Samuel Smith, M.P.
 Thomas Snape.
 Rev. R. Spears.

THE PEACE SOCIETY—*cont.*

V. H. Stanton.
 S. B. Stephens.
 Edmund Sturge.
 William Tallack.
 Rev. Urijah R. Thomas.
 Professor Sylvanus P. Thompson.
 W. P. Thompson.
 J. F. Thurstield.
 Rev. William Tyler, D.D
 W. H. Tyndall.
 M. Vasseur.
 R. S. Watson, LL.D.
 Joseph Wells.
 Samuel Wells.
 Ebenezer West.
 Fredk. Wheeler.
 Mrs. Wise.
 C. C. Wise.

THE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION
AND PEACE ASSOCIATION.

J. Abbot.
 Miss Bigg.
 Anguste Desmoulins
 Fredk. Dohnan.
 Mrs. Drugman.
 Wm. Fooks.
 Miss Angèle Freix.
 J. Frederick Green.
 Dr. Gwyther.
 Spencer L. Holland.
 T. Holmes.
 J. R. Knight.
 W. Lovell.
 Miss M. Mangan.
 C. E. Maurice.
 Miss M. A. Mills.
 F. D. Mocatta.
 Miss Monck.
 Tito Pagliardini.
 Dr. Pankhurst.
 Miss A. E. Peppercorn.
 Madame Pognon.
 Hodgson Pratt.
 Countess Schack.
 Russell Scott.
 Mrs. Southey.
 Richard Stapley.
 Mrs. Weiss.
 Major de Winton.
 W. M. Wood.
 Thos. Wright.

YEARLY MEETING OF THE SOCIETY OF
FRIENDS.

J. B. Braithwaite.
 John Gayner.
 George Gillett.
 William Jones.

YEARLY MEETING OF THE SOCIETY OF
FRIENDS—*continued.*

Caleb R. Kemp.
 H. Stanley Newman.
 William Pollard.
 Edward Priestman.
 Alfred Ransom.
 Joshua Rowntree, M.P.
 Fredk. Sessions.
 William White.
 Henry Wigham.
 J. Jowitt Wilson.

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION LEAGUE.

Howard Evans.
 W. J. Hewitt.
 S. F. Kaufman.
 G. J. Knight.
 J. F. de Lassasie.
 J. Morgan.
 J. Morrison.
 J. D. Nieass.
 Tito Pagliardini.
 J. Procter.
 D. Stainsby.

BRISTOL LOCAL PEACE AND ARBITRA-
TION SOCIETY.

F. F. Cotterell.
 H. F. Cotterell.
 J. L. Daniel.
 Sparke Evans.
 J. Storrs Fry.
 John Gayner.
 C. Keene Lewis
 T. H. O. Pease.
 Miss Emily Sturge.
 Rev. U. R. Thomas.
 Mark Whitwill.

LANCASTER AND DISTRICT PEACE
ASSOCIATION.

Thomas Barrow.
 J. W. Pickard.

MIDLAND INTERNATIONAL ARBITRA-
TION ASSOCIATION.

Arthur Albright.
 Rev. J. J. Brown.
 Councillor Bloor.
 Barrow Cadbury.
 Joseph Constantine.
 Frank Davis.
 Alderman Edwards.
 Sir Walter Foster, M.P.
 F. H. Fox.
 Mrs. Fox.
 William Gilliver.
 Henry Hawkes.
 Councillor Lancaster.
 Councillor H. J. Manton.
 Councillor R. F. Martineau

MIDLAND INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION
ASSOCIATION—*continued.*

Alfred Morgan.
William Morgan.
Rev. Arthur O'Neill.
Miss G. Southall.
Rev. P. T. Stanford.
Miss Sturge.
Richard Tangye.
E. L. Tyndall.
Councillor Whately.
Alderman White.
Frank Wright.
Thomas Wright.

BIRMINGHAM WORKMEN'S PEACE
ASSOCIATION.

William Gilliver.
Robert H. Kirton.
Richard Sanders.
John W. Shorthouse.
Joseph Sturge.

LONDON LOCAL PEACE ASSOCIATION.

Mrs. E. Appleton.
John D. Appleton.
Miss R. Cross.

BRITISH WOMEN'S TEMPERANCE
ASSOCIATION.

Mrs. Atkinson.
Miss M. E. Docwra.
Mrs. Gregson.
Miss J. A. Fowler.
Mrs. H. W. Smith.

LIVERPOOL AND BIRKENHEAD WOMEN'S
PEACE AND ARBITRATION
SOCIETY.

Miss Ellen Robinson.
Miss Frances Thompson.

FALMOUTH PEACE SOCIETY.

Miss A. M. Fox.

DUBLIN PEACE SOCIETY.

Henry Wigham.
Mrs. H. M. Wigham.
Leonard Wigham, B.A.

CALNE LOCAL PEACE ASSOCIATION.

Mrs. Edwards.

WISBECH LOCAL PEACE ASSOCIATION.

Pasteur A. Cadot.
James Kerridge.
George W. Miller.
Miss P. H. Peckover.
Charles H. Piper.
Mrs. Elizabeth Pollard.
J. T. Tyars.

PETERBOROUGH BRANCH LOCAL PEACE
ASSOCIATION.

Rev. T. Barrass.
B. Dennison.

SPALDING BRANCH LOCAL PEACE
ASSOCIATION.

C. Dalrymple Hall.

WEDNESBURY PEACE ASSOCIATION.

Rev. H. E. Crofts.

TOTTENHAM AND EDMONTON PEACE
SOCIETY.

Rev. D. Fotheringham.
H. J. Pollard.
Mrs. H. J. Pollard.
Rev. D. Russell.

SUNDERLAND LOCAL PEACE ASSOCIA-
TION.

William Jones.

LONDON LOCAL PEACE AND ARBITRA-
TION AUXILIARY.

Rev. G. D. Bartlett.
Miss Anne Collings.
Miss M. L. Cooke.
Rev. James Craig, D.D.
Rev. P. Gast.
Rev. W. H. King.
Rev. W. H. J. Page.
James D. Penrose.
Miss M. E. Phillips.
Mrs. E. R. Ransome.
Mrs. Henry Richard.
Miss Tylor.

WOOD GREEN BRITISH WOMEN'S TEM-
PERANCE ASSOCIATION.

Rev. H. J. B. Heath.

PLYMOUTH LOCAL PEACE ASSOCIATION

Miss Isabel Bishop.

KILMARNOCK PEACE ASSOCIATION.

Thomas Hannah.
William McMean.

GLASGOW PEACE AND ARBITRATION
ASSOCIATION.

James Clark.
John Wilson, M.P.

LANCASHIRE AND YORKSHIRE INTER-
NATIONAL ARBITRATION ASSO-
CIATION.

William Bradshaw.
Rev. J. Freestone.
Rev. J. W. Kiddle.
John Mather.

LANCASHIRE AND YORKSHIRE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION ASSOCIATION—*continued.*

William Pollard.
H. Slatter.
Thomas Snape.

BELFAST PEACE SOCIETY.

Rev. John Donald, D.D.
John Greenhill.
J. C. Marsh.
Miss Isabella M. T. Tod.

MERE AND GILLINGHAM LOCAL ASSOCIATION.

E. Bracher.
Mrs. Bracher.
M. Leatherdale.
Hubert L. Rutter.

MORAL REFORM UNION.

Mrs. Fischer-Lette.
Miss Frances Lord.
Mrs. Southey.
Miss E. Abney Walker.

BUNHILL FIELDS LOCAL PEACE ASSOCIATION.

W. K. Baker.
R. B. Hay.
Miss Robins.

WANDSWORTH LOCAL PEACE ASSOCIATION.

Miss Cooke.
Mr. Milligan.
Mrs. Milligan.
Mrs. Preece.
E. R. Ransome.
Mrs. E. R. Ransome.
Miss Ransome.
Mrs. Schardt.
Miss Scoles.
Mr. Talfourd.

YORK WOMEN'S PEACE SOCIETY.

Mrs. Henry Richardson.

LIVERPOOL PEACE SOCIETY.

Thomas Crosfield.
Samuel W. Davies.
Mark Howarth.
Thomas Snape.

YORKSHIRE QUARTERLY MEETING.

Joseph Firth Clark.
Mrs. E. Latchmore.
Joseph Latchmore.
Isaac Pickard.
Mrs. Maria Richardson.
Mrs. Celia Walker.

SUSSEX, ETC., QUARTERLY MEETING.

Richard Binns.
Albert J. Crosfield.
Mrs. A. J. Crosfield.
Mrs. Hack.
Daniel Hack.
Mrs. Newman.
T. P. Newman.
R. P. Rickman.

HULL PEACE ASSOCIATION.

James Thorp.

ESSEX AND SUFFOLK QUARTERLY MEETING.

George Barratt.
Miss Mary J. Doewra.
Joseph Gripper.
Mrs. Rebecca Matthews.
Arthur Midgley.
Joseph Smith.

LANCASHIRE AND CHESHIRE QUARTERLY MEETING.

Mrs. Ann D. Barrow.
Thomas Barrow.
Samuel W. Davies.
George French.
Alfred Fryer.
John Holdsworth.
Theodore Neild.
Joseph W. Pickard.

NORFOLK AND CAMBRIDGE QUARTERLY MEETING.

Francis Dix.
Mrs. Annie Hohnnden.

WESTERN QUARTERLY MEETING.

George Baker.
Mrs. George Baker.
Alfred W. Brown.
H. S. Newman.
Miss Elizabeth Southall.
Miss Eliza Mary Stürge.

DERBY, LINCOLN, AND NOTTS QUARTERLY MEETING.

Charles Leslie Gilpin.
Joseph Sturge Gilpin.
George Arthur Pickard.

WESTMORELAND QUARTERLY MEETING.

C. J. Holdsworth.
Charles Thompson.
John Jowitt Wilson.

LONDON AND MIDDLESEX QUARTERLY MEETING.

Mrs. A. C. Aggs.
Thomas Aggs.

LONDON AND MIDDLESEX QUARTERLY
MEETING—*continued.*

J. Gundry Alexander.
Mrs. Maria Alexander.
Mrs. Sarah A. Baker.
Benjamin Candler.
Richard Dell.
John Hilton.
Walter Lean.
Bedford Marsh.
C. C. Morland.
Miss M. E. Phillips.
Miss C. E. Ransome.
E. R. Ransome.
Mrs. J. H. Ransome.
J. Fyfe Stewart.
John Taylor.
Henry Tylor.
Mrs. C. F. Wells.
Thomas Wright.

WOMEN'S YEARLY MEETING SOCIETY OF
FRIENDS.

Mrs. K. Bennett.
Miss R. B. Braithwaite.
Mrs. S. E. Fox.
Mrs. Charlotte Marriage.
Miss Charlotte Pease.
Miss P. H. Peckover.
Miss Sarah E. Penrose.
Mrs. A. M. Richardson.
Miss Ellen Robinson.
Miss Gulielma Stephens.
Mrs. Margaret Tanner.
Mrs. H. M. Wigham.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN ARBITRATION ASSOCIATION.

Samuel Insull.
J. M. Klenck.
Edmund Kimber.

KELVEDON PEACE ASSOCIATION
Miss Constance Docwra.

FETTER LANE MORAVIAN CHURCH.
T. G. Gardner.
W. Müller.

HITCHIN MONTHLY MEETING.

William Ransom.
Isaac Robinson.
Joshua Whiting.

WESTMINSTER AND LONGFORD MONTHLY
MEETING.

A. W. Bennett, M.A., B.Sc.
Mrs. Emma Dell.
J. Hagen Dell.
Mrs. Helen S. Dyer.
J. D. Swinborn.
Alfred Wright.

MID-SOMERSET MONTHLY MEETING.
Miss Esther Clark.

WOMEN'S LIBERAL ASSOCIATION, WELLS
DIVISION OF SOMERSET.
Mrs. Margaret Tanner.

CROYDON PEACE SOCIETY.

Mrs. Josephine Alexander.
W. Alexander.
Miss C. Candler.
W. C. Reed.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE REFORM AND
CODIFICATION OF THE LAW OF
NATIONS.

J. Gundry Alexander, LL.B.
Hon. D. Dudley Field.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION FOR THE PROMOTION OF INTERNATIONAL CONCORD.

William Allen.
Rev. Dr. Angus.
W. King Baker.
Rev. G. D. Bartlett.
Rev. A. H. Baynes.
Dr. S. H. Booth.
W. C. Braithwaite.
B. Broomhall.
Dr. R. Bruce.
Rev. F. M. Cameron.
Rev. Dr. Clifford.
Rev. James Craig, M.A., D.D.
Rev. William Cuff.
Dr. Thain Davidson.

George Gillett.
Rev. J. P. Gledstone.
H. B. Gurney.
Rev. Canon Scott Holland.
Rev. R. F. Horton.
Hon. and Rev. A. T. Lyttleton.
Rev. F. B. Meyer.
R. C. Morgan.
Rev. H. C. G. Moule.
Rev. W. H. J. Page.
Rev. Dr. Paton.
Rev. Dr. Percival.
Rev. Dr. Reynolds.
Rev. J. F. B. Tinsling.

WARWICKSHIRE NORTH MONTHLY MEETING.

Barrow Cadbury.
Fredk. H. Fox.
Mrs. Anna Fox.

John H. Lloyd.
John W. Shorthouse.
Joseph Sturge.

UNITED STATES.

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

Rev. J. Q. A. Brackett.
Rev. J. H. Allen.
Rev. M. Mc G. Dana, D.D.
Judge Charles Devens.
Rev. S. F. Dyke.
Hon. David Dudley Field.
Philip C. Garrett.
Rev. R. B. Howard.
Otis McGow Howard.
Augustine Jones.
S. A. Keen.
Rev. A. A. Miner, D.D.
Rev. P. S. Moxom, D.D.
Hon. Robert Trante Paine.
Rev. Charles B. Smith.
Rev. Renen Thomas, D.D.
Rev. J. R. Wilson.
Robert M. Woods.

CHRISTIAN ARBITRATION AND PEACE
SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

Rev. Samuel H. Anderson.
Alfred Andre.
Madame Alice Andre.
Señor Manuel Arragon.
Rev. W. McAll, D.D.
Rev. J. M. Gibson, D.D.
Rev. Donald McLeod, D.D.
Thomas A. Denny.
Sir S. A. Blackwood.
Frederick Blake.
Mrs. George D. Boardman.
Rev. George D. Boardman, D.D.,
LL.D.
John P. Branch.
Rev. Edward Braislin, D.D.
Rev. L. M. Cowardin, D.D.
B. Bromhall.
Percy W. Bunting.
George Cadbury.
Rev. W. A. Campbell, D.D.
Alfred C. Champney.
James H. Chase.
Simeon Clayton.
Hon. Chauncy M. Depew.
J. Taylor Ellyson.
Professor George Emmott.
Rev. Donald Fraser, D.D.
Rev. Julius E. Grammer, D.D.
W. S. Grammer.

CHRISTIAN ARBITRATION AND PEACE
SOCIETY—*continued.*

Rev. T. S. Hamlin, D.D.
A. C. Barrow.
Rev. W. Blakie, D.D.
F. N. Charrington.
George Holland.
George S. Innis.
Rev. John J. Luce.
James L. Maxwell.
Theodore Monod.
Richard C. Morse.
Miss B. St. C. Morton.
Rev. P. S. Moxon, D.D.
Rev. W. U. Murkland, D.D.
H. S. Newman.
Paul Passy.
Rev. John Brown Paton, D.D.
Reginald Radcliffe.
Robert Scott.
Isaac Sharples.
Rev. J. Hudson Taylor, M.D.
Rev. William Taylor, D.D.
W. P. Thompson.
Benjamin Trueblood.
Rev. P. Wroth.
G. Van Der Beken.
Rev. F. S. Webster.
William White.
Rev. J. Wilkinson.
James Wood.
J. B. Wood.
Richard Wood.
Sarah C. Worthington.

NEW YORK YEARLY MEETING OF
FRIENDS.

Francis J. Baines.
Richard S. Collins.
Mrs. Richard S. Collins.
Miss Collins.
James Wood.

CHURCHES AND CITIZENS OF RICHMOND,
VIRGINIA.

Thomas Nelson Page, LL.D.

NEW ENGLAND YEARLY MEETING OF
FRIENDS.

James H. Chace.
Mrs. Lucretia G. Chace.
Augustine Jones.

RHODE ISLAND PEACE SOCIETY.

James H. Chace.
Augustine Jones.
Levi K. Joslin.

UNIVERSAL PEACE UNION OF PHILADELPHIA.

F. Bajer.
John Branson.
Levi K. Joslin.
Mrs. Rose C. Joslin.
Eli M. Lamb.
Charles Lemonnier.
Mrs. Belya A. Lockwood.
Alfred H. Love.

UNIVERSAL PEACE UNION OF PHILADELPHIA—*continued.*

Rev. J. H. O'Hara, D.D.
Fredk. Passy.
Hodgson Pratt.
Judge M. P. Morton.
Mrs. Jane Roberts.
Conrad F. Stollmeyer.
Simon Wolf.

THE WORLD'S WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION, PEACE DEPARTMENT.

Mrs. Sarah Collins.

FRANCE.

SOCIÉTÉ FRANÇAISE DE L'ARBITRAGE.

Baron de St. Georges Armstrong.
Henri Ferrari.
Léon Marillier.
Frédéric Passy.
Dr. C. Richet.

LA SOCIÉTÉ DE LA PAIX PERPÉTUELLE PAR LA JUSTICE INTERNATIONALE.

Gaston Morin.

EGLISE BAPTISTE DE CHAUNY.

Pasteur A. Cadot.

JEUNES AMIS DE LA PAIX (NIMES).

J. Dumas-Faucher.
Dr. Julia Mitchell.
Anton Meidell.

FAMILISTÈRE DE GUISE.

Ernest Allart.
Jules Ernest Sarrazin.

LA LIGUE UNIVERSELLE DU BIEN PUBLIC.

E. Potonié-Pierre.
Madame la Comtesse Schack.

BELGIUM.

M. Edouard Séve, Consul-General for Belgium, Ramsgate, Kent.

HOLLAND.

DUTCH PEACE SOCIETY.—Herr D. Van Eck, M.P., The Hague.
Herr A. J. E. A. Bik, The Hague.

DENMARK.

DANISH PEACE ASSOCIATION.—F. Bajer, M.P.
Madame Bajer.
Mlle. Johanne Meyer.
M. Stürrip.
Mlle. Dagmar Symmestvoft.

SWEDEN.

SWEDISH PEACE ASSOCIATION.—F. T. Borg.
Madame Borg.

ITALY.

PEACE ASSOCIATION (ROME).
 Marquis Alfieri.
 Count Pandolfi.

COMMITTEE FOR PEACE AND INTERNA-
 TIONAL ARBITRATION PRATO
 (TUSCANY).
 Hodgson Pratt.
 Italo Tempestini.

LOMBARDY PEACE ASSOCIATION (MILAN).
 E. T. Moneta.

GERMANY.

FRANKFORT PEACE SOCIETY.—Madame Fischer-Lette.
 Gustav Maier.
 Adolf Wolf.

AUSTRIA.

Le Chevalier Vladimir de Bolesta-Kozlowski.

ASIA MINOR.

MARSOVAN.—Mme. Thounaïan

SERVIA.

Hon. Emil Mijatovich.

SPAIN.

Don Arturo de Marcoartu.

INDIA.

Chunder Sen.
 Raffiudin Ahmad Mouly
 Hira Sing Puri.

INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE OF PEACE AND LIBERTY.

M. Arnaud.
 F. Bajer.
 Madlle. Julie Toussaint.

M. de Montluc.
 Major de Winton.

INDEX.

A Section of Programme (The Christian and other religious aspects of the question of Peace and War)	25
Aberdeen, Earl of, Opinion of	158
Abijah, War in Reign of	39
Aborigines' Friend, Paper in	139
Aborigines' Protection Society	130, 136
Addresses by Representatives of various Countries	14
Advocates of Arbitration	199
Africa and Australia, Missionary effort	134
Africa, English and German claims in	10
African Problem	139
Ahaz, Character and Conduct of King	42
Ahaziah, Reign of King	41
Alabama, Arbitration	65
Alcohol and War, Connection between	155
Alexander, J. G.	151, 189, 200, 203, 219
Alexandria, Bombardment of	202
Alsace and Lorraine, Neutrality of	207, 210
Amaziah, Military action of	41
America, Invitation to	219
America—Twenty-five years of Peace	101
American Example of Arbitration	9
American Revolutionary War	100
Amphictyonic Council	125, 175
Appendix	227
Appleton, Lewis	3
Arbitral Clauses in Treaties of Commerce	10
Arbitral Tribunals	194
Arbitration, Antiquity of	10
Arbitration before War	9
Arbitration between States of America	10
Arbitration and Disarmament	11
Arbitration, International	7, 189
Archibald, Hon A. G., Testimony of	134
Armstrong, Baron de St. Georges	26, 126, 197
Army, Hebrew, Organisation of	38
Arnaud, M. Emile	125, 126, 198
Arrangements, Preliminary	224
Arthur, Rev. W., Tongue of Fire	62
Asa, Military preparations of King	39
Athaliah, Usurpation of	41
Athenagoras, to Aurelius	69
B Section of Programme (International Arbitration)	189
Bajer, Fredrik	5, 12, 20, 147, 162, 190, 210, 215, 216
Banquet by Mr. Passmore Edwards	6, 105
Banquet at Holborn Restaurant	221
Bartlett, Rev. G. D.	81
Beaconsfield, Lord	158
Belgium and Treaty of Neutrality	171
Belligerency and Neutrality	192
Billigerent Rights	112
Bible of Peace	20
Bigg, Miss Louisa	220
Bik, Herr	188
Blaine, Secretary, Speech of	10, 68, 172
Bluntschli's Europe as a Confederation	205
Board, International Treaty	192
Boardman, Dr. Geo. Dana	178, 186
Body Guard of Hebrew Kings	38
Bolesta-Kozlowski, Chevalier V. de	51, 106, 160, 166
Bonghi, Signor	22, 84, 222
Bourne, Fox, Paper by	136, 139
Borg, E. T.	5, 21
Boys' Brigade	97
Boy Soldiers, Paper by J. P. Gledstone	96
Brace, Loring, his "Gesta Christi"	66
Braithwaite, J. B.	69, 181
Braithwaite, W. C.	5, 21, 130
Brazil and Treaty Clause	179

Brazza, De	151
Bristol, Marquis of	186
Bright, John. Force no Remedy	66
Britain. Government of, Proposal to	7
Broen, Miss de	220
Broome, Sir Frederick	134
Brotherhood of Man, Paper	30
Brotherhood, Our Paper	32
Brotherhood as taught by Christ	32
Brussels Anti-slavery Conference	130, 136, 151, 192
Brussels Convention	192
Brussels Conference of 1874	201, 202, 203
Brussels International Juridical Conference	198
Bunting, Percy	223
Bureau of the Congress	5, 218, 228
Butler, Edward, Paper by	30

C Section of Programme (International Law)	200
Cadot, M. C. Pasteur	80, 181
Cadet Corps in Public Schools	90, 97
Cameron, Rev. F. M., Paper by	75
Campbell, Dr. W. A.	193
Carnot, President	172
Causes of War. Indirect (Section H.)	151
Celsus and Origen	71
Chace, James H.	189
Chalmers, Dr., Quotation from	67
Channing, Dr. W. Ellery... ..	54
Chariots, Absence of, among Israelites	36
Chicago, World's Fair at Chicago	172
Chili and Treaty Clause	179
Christ's Teaching about War	75
Christian Church, Active co-operation	68
Churchill, Lord Randolph	181
Clemenceau, M.	118
Clement of Alexandria	71
Cobden, Richard, and International Commerce	66
Code, International	11, 68, 199
Colenso Bishop	134, 150
Colenso, Miss, Speech	150
Coleridge, S. T., quoted	132
Collet, Mr.	125
Collins, Mrs. (New York)	219
Colonies and Native Races	132
Colonizing Law of Rome and Venice	148
Commerce, International and Peace	66
Committees of Conciliation	153
Commonwealth, International	193
Committee of Organisation	3, 218
Committee of Procedure	5, 164, 188, 228
Committee, Sectional	5, 218
Concert of Nations, Paper by Dr. Pankhurst	190, 191, 192
Conditions of Disarmament, Paper by Rev. R. B. Howard	167
Conference, Interparliamentary	1, 12, 214, 217
Conference, International American	2, 8, 9, 68, 101, 172, 179, 181, 189, 196
Congress, Annual	1, 12, 214
Congress and Interparliamentary Conference	12, 214
Congress, Monetary, Proposed	172
Congress, Paris (1890)	1, 7, 8, 12
Congress of United States	3, 178
Congress of United States, Memorial to	7
Conquests of Modern Civilization	149
Constantine, Emperor	74, 79
Conversazione, The... ..	23
Cooke, Miss M. L., Paper by	32
Council, or High Court of International Causes	115
Country People and War... ..	87
Courts of Arbitration	67, 194
Court of Nations	7, 195
Crews Dudley, Paper by	204
Crosfield, Thomas, Paper by	153
Crown, Prerogative of the... ..	110
Cyprian referred to	73

D Section of Programme (Neutralization)	206
Dale, Dr. R. W., and Cadet Corps	97
Dale's, Dr., Congregational Church Polity	61
Danish Women's Peace Society	162
Darby, W. Evans 3, 5, 11, 23, 25, 29, 34, 68, 83, 84, 89, 103, 108, 129, 136, 164, 165, 181, 182, 194, 212, 214, 222	222
David's (King) Militia	38
Davies's Outlines of International Law	110
Deborah and Barak, Victory of	37
Decimal Coinage, A Universal	153
Declaration of War, National Control over	108, 164, 188
Declaration of War by the People	68
Defourny l'Abbe	47, 112, 114, 116, 126
Delagoa Bay Arbitration	10
Delegates, Admission of	3
Delegates, List of	234
Delegation to the Queen suggested	69
Depraz, Dr. Chas.	176
Desmoulins, M. Auguste	52, 106, 163, 181, 210
Disarmament	7, 11, 68, 166
Disarmament, Conditions of	168
Donatists of Phrygia	66
Doyen, M., Paper by	89, 224
Drill, Military, in Schools	89
Drill, Military, Inadequate and injurious	91
Drill Sergeant, in Elementary Schools	90
Droits des Races inferieures	141
Dumas, Faucher, M. J.	151, 180
Duties towards Weaker Races	140
E Section of Programme (Disarmament)	166
Early Christians and War (Paper)	69
Educational Aspects of Question (Section I.)	85
Edwards, J. Passmore	6, 105, 106, 218
Edwardes, Sir Herbert, and the Punjaub	66
Egyptian Church and Military Service	74
Elementary Education Act, 1870, and Military Drill	91
Embassy, Fecial	112
Emblem, Peace	217
Emerson and English passion for utility	111
Engelhardt, Rules by	147
Eucher, St., Bishop of Lyons	58
Evening Recreation Movement	97
F Section of the Programme (National Control over Declaration of War)	108
Facelli, Signor	84
Farrer, J. Anson (Paper)	200
Fecial College	112, 120, 125
Federation, Imperial	67
Federation of Peace Societies	215, 217
Ferrer, Jean Baptiste de (Paper)	170
Field, Hon. D. Dudley	3, 7, 23, 105, 107, 164, 188, 206, 220, 221, 223
Fiji Islands, Annexation of	135
Finance Committee	228
Fischer-Lette, Madame	5, 87, 95
Foreign Affairs and Peace Societies	152
France and Germany Appeal	11, 168
Franco-German War	168, 193
Fraternity of Nations	48
Frederick the Great	20, 83
Free Trade, Remedy for War	205
Free Trade, Resolution on	160, 166
Friends, American	66
Friends, Irish	64, 66
G Section of Programme (Relation of Civilized States towards Weaker Races)	130
Gambetta on Physical Superiority of Germans	90
Geneva Arbitration	101, 157, 178
Geneva Convention	19, 200

General Committee of Organisation	3, 218, 221, 227
German Emperor	11, 168, 172
Gibbon, Rev. J. Morgan, Sermon by	187, 218
Gideon's Victory	37
Gillett, Geo.	5, 36, 51, 127, 186
Gillett, Geo., Papers by	36, 51
Gilliver, William	159
Gledstone, Rev. J. P. (Paper)	96
Good Samaritan, Parable of	67
Gordon, Sir A., Governor of Fiji	135
Governments and Religion	53
Gover, J. M., L.L.D. (Paper)	200
Gradual Disarmament	168
Grammer, Rev. Dr.	5, 15, 219
Grant, President, on Arbitration Courts	67, 158
Gratitude and Faith, Resolution of	219
Greece, Arbitration in Ancient	10
Green, J. Fredk.	3, 23, 163, 223, 229
Gymnastic Exercises in German Schools (Paper)	95
H Section of Programme (Indirect Causes of War and Remedies)	151
Hall, W. E., Jurist	201
Hall's Treatise on International Law	109, 111
Harrison, President, Words of	68, 172
Health of Queen (Toast)	105, 221
Heads of Civilised States (Memorial)	84, 212, 218
Henry of Navarre, Advocate of Arbitration	10
Heyward, R. O.	91
Hezekiah, Deliverances of	42
Hilton, John (Paper)	155
History in Schools, Paper on	87
Holland, Canon Scott (Sermon)	1, 218
Honours, Recognition of	218
Horner, Francis	111
Howard, Rev. R. B.	5, 165, 166, 170, 219, 220
Howarth, Mark	26, 80, 194
Hudson's Bay Company	133, 135
Hughes, Rev. H. P. (Reference to)	63
Human Life, Inviolability of	34
Hume on Needless War	88
I Section of Programme (Educational Aspects of the Question)	85
Iceland—no Army	172
Instruction of the Young (Paper)	89
Instruction relating to Arbitration	99
Insull, S.	214
International Arbitration (Resolution and Papers)	189
International Law (Section C.)—Papers and Resolutions	200
International Commission	195
Inter-Parliamentary Conference	1, 2, 12, 214, 217
Invitation to America	219
Invitation, Circular of	225
Ireneüs, Testimony of	70
Irish Friends, Preservation of	64, 66
Israelites at Red Sea	36
Italian Independence	55
J Section of Programme (Inter-Parliamentary Conference)	214
Jahn Ludwig	95
Jehoram, Wars and Wickedness of	41
Jehoshaphat, Military Forces of	40
Jeremiah, a Political firebrand	62
Jerusalem, First Destruction of	44
Jews, the Instructors of the World in Religion	46
Jews, Lord Mayor on the treatment of	184
Joan of Arc	115
Joash, Nemesis overtakes	41
Jones, Augustine	84, 126, 194
Joshua, Command to	37
Josiah, Death in battle	44
Joslin, Levi K.	100, 178
Jotham, Piety and Prosperity of	42
K Section of Programme (Federation of Peace Societies)	215

Kidnapping Acts	134
Kimber, Mr	3, 211
Kirk, Sir John	136, 137
Labouchere—morals of Army	68
Lambert, Baron	136
Las Casas	131
Lassassie, M.	181, 219
Law, International (section of Programme)	200
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid	25, 26
Lawrence, Rev. T. J.	14, 111
Lemoumier, M. Charles	11, 197
Levi Leone	195, 200
Letters, Apologetic and Congratulatory	11
Lockwood, Mrs. Belva	171, 197, 211, 218, 221
Lord, Miss F.	127, 211
Lorimer, Professor, Scheme, &c.	205
Love, Alfred H. (Paper)	155
Maier, Herr Gustav, Address by	19
Maitland, Sir Perrigrine, and Missionary	66
Mamicani, "A New European Law"	202
Mancini, Signor	10
Manasseh, Character and Action of	43
Mansion Hou "Reception"	183
Marcoartu Don Arturo di	84, 105, 193, 221
Marion, Mons. Henri	99, 226
Martin of Tours	66
Martyr, Justin, Testimony of	63, 69
Matabele Land	150
Mather, John (Paper)	156
Maurice, C. E.	210
Maximilian of Numidia	66, 73
Mayor, The Lord	183, 218
Mazzini, Joseph	46, 55, 202
Mazzoleni, Signor A.	102, 147, 159, 170, 198
Mediation of Neutral Powers	67
Mediation between Nicaragua and Costa Rica	198
Memorial, Committee on	26
Memorial to Heads of Civilized States	84, 212, 218
Meyer, Madame	162
Mijatovitch, Emil	182
Miles, Dr.	203
Minier, G. W. (Paper)	55
Ministers of Religion, Duties of, with regard to Peace and War (Paper)	55, 61
Militia of King David	38
Military Drill in Schools (Paper)	89
Miscellaneous Business	217
Moffat and War	68
Mohammedanism and War	181
Moltke, Count Von	157
Moneta, Signor E. T.	5, 21, 53, 83, 84, 93, 106, 218, 225
Monroe Doctrine	11
Montluc M. De (Paper)	139
Moral Effects of Military Drill	92
Morin, M. Gaston	81, 161, 171, 210
Moulvi, Raffuddin Ahmad	180, 183
Moxon, Dr. (Boston)	223
Minucius Felix, Testimony	70
Murkland, Rev. Dr.	18, 181
Mutiny, Indian	64
Mutual Disarmament	168
Napoleon, Testimony to Christ	66
National Control of Declaration of War (Section F.)	108, 164, 188
Native Races, Reasons for preserving	131
Navy of United States	172
Neild, Theologian	99

Raper, J. H.	213
Reading of Papers (Suggestion)	108
Reception Committee	23, 222
Rehoboam, King of Israel	39
Religions, Common Substratum	53
Remedies for War	205
Report of Committee of Organisation	3
Richard, Mrs. H.	23
Richardson, Mrs. (Paper)	147
Richet, Dr. Charles	206
Robinson, Miss Ellen	127, 136, 163, 230
Rome, Next Congress at	221
Rome—Peace Society	163
Romano-Germanie Empire	190
Rosebery, Lord, Proposal of	67
Ross, Captain John	112
Roundell, Mr. Chas.	11
Ruchonnet, M. Louis (Letter)	12
Russell, Earl (Opinion)	157
Ryswick, Treaty of	191
Saffi, Aurelio	218
Saint Paul's Cathedral, Service in	1
Saint Pierre, l'Abbe	175
Salmeri, Signor (Paper)	217
Samson's Victories	38
Samuel making a King	38
Sanction du devoir moral	143
Sargeant, Dudley A. (Quotation)	91
Sarrazin, M.	34, 221
Saul, Equipment of Israel in time of	38
Schwartz and Hyder Ali	66
Scherzer, Dr. Carl Von	13
Sessions, Frederick (Paper)	61
Sève, M. Edouard (Speech)	196
Siccardi, Captain	171
Slaveholders' Rebellion	101
Smith, Rev. C. B. (Speech)	51
Snape, Thomas	5, 106, 151, 154, 161, 163, 164, 165, 166, 188, 211
Société de la paix perpetuelle, &c.	171
Society of Friends, History of	64
Soldiers' Pocket-Book	97
Solidarity, Amendment to Substitute	52
Solidarity of Mankind, taught by Christ	67
South African Company	150
Southey, Mrs.	23, 228
Spanish Conquest of America	131
Spanish Senate, Resolution in	189, 193
Stanford Hill Congregational Church	187, 218
Stanford, Rev. Mr.	127
Standing Army in Israel	38
Statesmen, Responsibility, &c.	156
Stephen's Commentaries	111
Students' Blackstone	110
Sturge, Joseph	93, 124
Sunday School-boys under Military Drill	69
Suttner, Baroness Von	84
Sweden	172
Switzerland, Treaty with U.S.A.	171
Tariff Bureau, International	192
Territorial Acquisition	108
Tertullian	63, 70, 71
Thanks Resolutions of	210
Thiers, M.	118
Thomas, Dr. Renen	163, 218, 221
Thompson, Charles	104, 126, 181, 211
Thomson, Joseph, Testimony of	137, 131
Thoumaian, Madame	193
Toussaint, Mdle. Julie	218
Travelling Scholarships	99
Treaties, Arbitral	196, 199, 200
Treaties of Arbitration	8
Treaties of Arbitration, Way opened by America	173
Treaty, Arbitral, between Great Britain and U.S.A.	7
Treaty Bureau, International	193

Treaty System, &c.	199
Tribunals, Arbitral... ..	194, 199
Tribunal, International	190, 193
Tribunes of the Plebeians	138
Trueblood, Benjamin	179
Unione Lombarda (Letter)	12
United States, Army of	8, 168, 172
United States, Constitution of	9
United States House of Representatives	199
United States Navy	172
United States Supreme Court	9
University Courses of Lectures	98
Upton's Manual	91
Urquhart, Mr.	126
Utrecht Treaty	191, 192
Uzziah, Military Forces, &c., of	42
Valedictory by President	220
Vambery, Professor	181
Van Eck, Heer	188
Van Put, Heer... ..	188
Varro	121
Vasseur, M.	125, 180, 220
Vattel... ..	109, 114, 120
Vice-Presidents of Congress	228, 232
Vienna, Treaties of	192, 200, 202
Vivian, Lord	136
Wallace, on Darwinism... ..	85
War (Paper), by Crews Dudley	204
War of 1870	8
War of 1812-14... ..	101
War between Paraguay, Brazil, &c.	101
War, Indirect Causes of	151
Washington, Geo., and Standing Armies	101
Washington International Conference	9
Washington, Treaties of	200
Waterloo, Battle of	156
Weaker Races, Treatment of (Resolution and Papers)	130
Weaker Races, Causes of destruction	131
Weiss, Dr. A.	114, 122
Westcott, Bishop (Quotation from)	67
Westminster Catechism	61
Westminster Monthly Meeting	188
Westphalia, Treaty of	191
Wigham, Henry	26, 220
Wigham, Mrs.	45, 182
Wilson, John, M.P.	179
Windsor Castle Visit	6, 218, 221
Wolseley, Lord, and education	90
Wolseley, Lord, and Soldiers' Pocket Book	97
Women's Liberal Federation	13
Women's Work for Peace	161
Wood, J. B.	79, 214
Wood, James	106
Wood, W. M., Paper by	109
Wright, Mr.	128
Zanzibar, Sultan of and English	137



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

50m-7,69(N29684)—C-120

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 000 517 829 8

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
THIS BOOK CARD



University Research Library

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55
GLOBE 42145-0



CALL NUMBER

JN1930 058 1890

VOL | Pt | COP

AUTHOR

UNIVERSAL PEACE CONF

