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THE ROAD TO WORLD PEACE.
A PLAN BY WHICH THE UNITED STATES MAY COOPERATE WITH OTHER NATIONS TO ACHIEVE AND PRESERVE THE PEACE OF THE WORLD.

In order to make any plan "the best practicable plan by which the United States may cooperate with other nations to achieve and preserve the peace of the world," it seems to the writer that the international situation should be approached with a view (1) to discover the nature of the problem of war and of the causes of war, (2) to discover the best solution for such problems, and (3) to indicate the price which must be paid for such solution, leaving to others the question of whether or not they are willing to pay the price; rather than to try to discover what price the people of the United States, or of the world, are willing to pay and then to work out a plan to fit the price. No one can be sure that any plan would be adopted. Why then should he propose any plan but one of which he wholly approves?

Approached from this viewpoint war is seen as a monster menace, not only destructive of the moral fibre of individuals, but destructive of all that is best in social life. Men once were motivated to go to war because of the sanctity involved in dying for one's country, but now they must be motivated by hate stirred up by propaganda and by bayonet practice on the vital points of dummy enemies. It is true that whenever a nation goes to war its leaders convince their people that it is a righteous war—generally that it is

1 This article is in substance a Peace Plan originally submitted for the American Peace Award. The emphasis is on Peace, but the entire international situation is treated because it is all involved. The author believes that a plan to be practicable must be one which if adopted will produce peace, not merely one which will be adopted but will not produce peace. Probably an international government is needed for the high seas and for the creation and enforcement of international law more than for any other purpose. Permission to publish this article has been given by the American Peace Award.
a war for self-defense—and the churches of every country line up in support of their country’s war. But no ultimate good is accomplished by war. The side in the right, if either side is in the right, is no more likely to win in war, than in a prize fight, or a duel, or in wager of battle, or in an ordeal. As a matter of fact in such kinds of arbitration the side in the wrong is as likely to win as the one in the right, because it is as likely to have the qualities which spell this kind of success. But it does accomplish untold immediate and permanent harm. It stops the orderly processes of production. It causes poverty, disease and crime. It breeds enmity, strife, terrorism, lawlessness, suspicion, vengeance, and unsafety. The first thing to discover and recognize, therefore, is that war, all war, is wrong, and that people no longer want it.

War is wrong intrinsically. Human life is too sacred to be taken even in battle. When an individual takes human life it is branded murder.

Why should it not be branded “murder” when, for a like motive, a nation takes human life? There is no justification for the bloodshed, destruction of property, sorrow, heartache, brutality, bestiality, corruption, hate, and other horrors of war and after-effects of war. It might be different if there was no other way of settling national disputes. But there is a righteous substitute for war. War is wrong also because, so long as it is tolerated, it will result in the periodical barbarization of the world. In the past one civilization after another—Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian, Greek and Roman—have gone down in this way. In every case the world has lost something which should have been preserved for future generations. Recently other civilizations barely saved themselves from the German menace. Today the German civilization is threatened. Tomorrow, unless the danger of war is eliminated, the entire Aryan civilization may go down; and the danger of war is now greater than ever before. There can be no
other end but war to the mad policy of militarism now dominant in Europe. War is wrong also because of its tremendous and increasing, but useless, burdens of armaments. By far the greater part of the cost of government is due to interest on war debts, pensions to war sufferers, and to the maintenance of armies and navies. Every new war adds to the expense. The burden has already become well-nigh unbearable both for the United States, with its forty-four billions of dollars incurred therefor, and for other nations which are staggering under heavier burdens. Humanity has groaned under the weight of all this too long. The money thus wasted should be spent for the progress of humanity, and soldiers should be put into productive occupations.

When it is once admitted that all war is wrong, it will follow that it will have to be admitted that it is wrong to cause war. The greatest causes of war today are armaments, diplomacy, lack of government for the high seas and for international law, and economic rivalry. The second thing to recognize, therefore, is that these things which tend most directly to cause war are wrongs and that they must be eliminated.

Hence there is a social interest which demands the abolition of war, and of the causes of war. There is a social interest in the preservation of the peace between nations the same as there is in the preservation of the peace between individuals. The problem of war, therefore, is the same problem, only on a larger scale, which existed in the case of conflicts between individuals and families, and it should be solved in the same way that this other problem was solved, by the creation of rights and duties to protect such social interest and of legal remedies enforced by government for the redress and punishment of violations of such duties and for the settlement of international disputes. This would mean, not only the frank recognition that all war is unsocial and wrong and that all people are
under duty to refrain from war and from all conduct likely to result in war, but that in the case of national wrongful conduct or international disputes no resort shall be had to war but that law shall be substituted for force, and that there shall be established an international government, a federation of nations, to give meaning and effect to the new international order.

Men, in their national relations as much as in their individual relations, instead of fighting out their differences, should submit them to a judicial tribunal for decision and should abide by its decision. There was a time when the conduct of individuals was not regulated by law. Then, each individual did—what the nations now do—that which "was right in his own eyes." Violence and bloodshed, vengeance and self-help, were the consequence. Private warfare was continuous. All felt apprehensive and unsafe. Such a condition could not endure. Something had to be done to preserve the peace between individuals. This was the origin of law and law meant government. At first individuals, as nations now, did not welcome interference. Consequently, at first, government only regulated vengeance and self-help; it did not dare to prohibit them; but the time came when it not only prohibited them but substituted the reign of law for the reign of lawlessness. Dueling was one form of self-help which lasted longer than most other forms, but in the course of time even dueling was outlawed and state action was substituted for this form of private action. What has happened in the case of individual vengeance and self-help, must happen in the case of national vengeance and self-help. They must go. The social interest in the preservation of the peace between individuals was no greater surely than the social interest in the preservation of the peace between nations. That means law—international law—and international law means international government. A moral sentiment against public war would be no more self-executing than a moral
sentiment against private war. An international criminal law would be no more self-operative than would a national criminal law. Hence, any practicable peace plan requires an international government to preserve the social interest in world peace by providing the requisite machinery for the enforcement of law.

The price which must be paid for such a program as here-in indicated is the surrender of the emotion of hate, the control of the brutal cave instinct of conquest and the giving up of some of our so-called national sovereign powers. This would seem a very small price to be paid for such things as would be obtained.

Hence, acting on the precedent of the Washington Limitation of Armament Conference, the United States should call another conference of representatives of all the free nations of the earth.

I.

I. To Adopt Resolutions, (a.) Outlawing war with its recurrent barbarizations of the world and its ever increasing burden of armaments; (b.) Advocating the removal of the causes of war; and (c.) Substituting law for force in international relations.

The outlawry of war should be in the nature of international legislation. Such action might be left for the legislative body, to be advocated in the second part of this plan, except for the fact that it is so basic and indispensable a condition to world peace and so vital a part of this plan, that the plan should begin with it, and no chances taken with the uncertainties of future legislation.

No progress toward world peace can be made until there is a change of world sentiment with reference to warfare. Until the people of the earth take the position that war is wrong and must stop, it will be useless to plan for peace. Peace cannot be expected to come so long as war is glorified.
If peace is to come it must be glorified, and those who serve mankind must be made heroes. Peace on earth can come only to men of good-will. There must be a moral sentiment against war.

There is every reason why there should be this moral sentiment. The outlawry of war would tend to create the desired moral sentiment. The moment such action was taken the moral sentiment of the world would begin to crystallize around it. Teachers would start a campaign of education against war. Preachers would preach against it. Missionaries would carry the message from country to country. And last, and best of all, the churches would be mobilized for a task they should have initiated and undertaken long ago. Money would be forthcoming for preparedness for peace as it is now forthcoming for "preparedness for war." People would soon begin to look upon war as they now look upon dueling, vengeance and other forms of outlawed private warfare.

Yet, the outlawry of war, without an attempt to remove the causes of war, would not make a practicable plan for the abolition of war. If war is recognized as wrong, those things which tend most directly to cause war must also be recognized as wrongs and the nations must feel that they are under duty to eliminate them. As we have seen, the greatest causes of war are armaments, diplomacy, lack of government for the high seas and for international law, and economic rivalry. This plan proposes to remove the causes of war through an international organization, and therefore their further consideration will be postponed until we consider such international organization; but the Conference should go on record in advance as favoring such policy.

Likewise, the outlawry of war, without providing a substitute for war, would not make a practicable peace plan. Such a substitute is law. This leads us again to the second part of our peace plan, but before taking that up for con-
sideration let us consider whether or not there are any possible objections to the first part of our plan as it has now been set forth.

OBJECTIONS.

It is believed that no lover of world peace could object to the first part of our plan, which includes the outlawry of war, the removal of the causes of war and the substitution of law for war. Therefore, it will be assumed that there are no objections to it. But there are some lovers of world peace who think they are advocating this, or a similar plan, when in reality they are not, and a word should be said about these. There are some advocates of the outlawry of war who propose to outlaw war in general—which no one wishes to wage—but to legalize certain specific wars—which are always the ones wished to be waged. Such a thing should never be called the outlawry of war. Suppose dueling in general had been outlawed, but specific duels legalized? Duelling would never have been outlawed nor stopped. By the same token war would not. There are other advocates of the outlawry of war who propose to accomplish their result by pacifism, or by some other means than government. I do not wish to discourage this sentiment. It is too bad the churches have not already done more along this line. If the churches had excommunicated war, we should not need to urge that it be outlawed by political action. But to think of excluding political action is foolish. The outlawry of war could no more be enforced by voluntary action than could the outlawry of homicide, or assault and battery. Not until men will govern themselves voluntarily in their individual relations can we expect them to govern themselves voluntarily in their national relations.

II.

After the Conference had voted to outlaw war, to remove the causes of war and to substitute law for war, for the pur-
pose of achieving and preserving the peace of the world, it should, for the purpose of putting these principles into operation, vote and proceed to draft and to refer to the several nations for their adoption a constitution—either by revising the covenant of the League of Nations or by drawing a new constitution for,

A federation, or commonwealth, of nations with jurisdiction over international affairs, especially the matter of permanent world peace.

A. Which would be composed of the people of all the free nations of earth who would join it voluntarily upon the conditions set forth below.

B. Which would be a representative form of government, composed

1. Of a legislative branch (to take the place and be substituted for all systems of diplomacy),
2. Of a judicial branch (already existing in the present world court), and
3. Of an executive branch; each with powers and duties defined.

This government should be an international government, and all the free nations of the earth should be invited to become members of it. A representative form of government has so vindicated itself that it should be chosen. It should be composed of three branches, legislative, judicial and executive. A law to be applied implies a law making body to make it, a court to apply it, and an executive to enforce it. Fortunately the court exists already in the World Court of the League of Nations.

But the different branches of a government are only the machinery through which it functions. The essential features of a government are the so-called sovereign powers with which it is endowed. What it is believed these should be will now be set forth.

2 Reasons will be given later.
C. To which every member thereof, upon admission, would surrender 1. The power to declare war, and 2. The power to raise and support an army and the power to provide and maintain a navy and an air force; for the undertaking of the federation of nations to guarantee it against invasion and to provide and maintain an armament sufficient for that purpose and to compel the nations to resort to law instead of to force.

One of the best ways to help abolish war is to abolish the causes of war. One of the chief causes of war is competition in armaments. The world is now threatened in this way as never before. Poland, Russia, France, and the small nations of Europe are maintaining armies many times as large as they can afford. France has out-distanced all other nations in acquiring the mastery of the air. Until the labor ministry came into power Great Britain was trying to retain her supremacy on the seas by building an arsenal in Singapore. Hence, the abolition of the right to maintain armies, navies and air forces would be a great help to the cause of peace. The establishment of an international government would make possible the elimination of armaments. All that would need to be done would be to require that all other governments surrender to this government the sole power to maintain an army, navy and air force, and the sole power to declare war. One government could not declare war on itself. There would be no other force to fight. The only force the international government would have to maintain would be one sufficient for police purposes. There would, of course, be the possibility of rebellion. All other risks of war would be destroyed. This was what the states of the Union did. There is no better way.

But suppose some of the nations of the earth should refuse to join the federation? Still it would be better to have a federation of nations with them out than no federation at all. Any nation could safely and wisely join the federation
of nations if enough more would join to make it stronger than any nation or group of nations outside. Of course then the federation of nations would have to maintain an armed force superior to that of these outside nations, but that would be better for the members of the federation than for each to maintain a separate force of its own, or to enter into a balance of power scheme with all of its pitfalls; and it would ensure peace, for no one would dare to make war on such a federation, as Italy did on Greece under the League of Nations.

D. Which would be given exclusive jurisdiction in all cases whatsoever over the high seas, over the air above the high seas, and over such other places on land as might be necessary for a seat of government and for its army and navy and air force (or police force).

Other causes of war are crimes, disputes and wrongs on the high seas and over the freedom of the seas, for which at the present time there is no adequate method of prevention, punishment, or redress. Yet these causes of war can be eliminated by the simple expedient of creating an international government for and giving it jurisdiction over the high seas and over the air above the high seas.

The high seas and the air above them need a government as much as does the land. On the seas and in the air above them are found the same human beings who need government on land. People are demanding the freedom of the seas, and violations of this are likely. These things threaten the peace of the world. Yet there is no government to stop them. It is true that, though former claims to ownership of parts of the high seas have been abandoned, the nations still pretend to govern them through the fiction of extra-territoriality and the self-application of certain so-called rules of international law. Of international law later. So far as concerns extra-territoriality it is sufficient to say that it should no more be applied to ships than to airplanes or to automobiles; when applied it is not a success,
as witness the enforcement of our prohibition laws and such a case as the killing of a citizen of one nation on a ship of another nation by a citizen of a third nation on another ship, both ships perhaps within the territorial waters of a fourth nation; and as operations on the high seas become conducted on a larger scale and traffic in the air increases, the fiction of extra-territoriality will fail more miserably. The simple and correct solution is to make the high seas, with the air above them, a great international domain, unowned and uncontrolled by any one nation or set of nations; but free to all peoples and with a government of their own. All of the inhabitants of the earth either traverse the seas or should have the right to do so. Hence all should be citizens of this new government, and owe allegiance to this new sovereignty. In this way, and this way alone, will the international interest in the preservation of the peace on the high seas and the air above them receive protection.

E. Which would be given jurisdiction over inter-nation commerce; including tariffs and subsidies.

Another great cause of war has been economic rivalry. Therefore, the social interest in world peace includes economic peace.

In the past nations and the citizens of nations have pursued their international commercial policies almost unhampered. Nations have voted tariffs and subsidies. Wealth in one country has combined against wealth in another for the business of a third. Control of the means of transportation has been sought as an aid to competition. Production has been artificially stimulated in fields where there were no natural qualifications for it. This economic rivalry is now becoming keener than ever. The scale of industry is becoming frankly national. Mr. Hoover has called public attention to the situation. Devices for obtaining unnatural advantages only provoke counter devices. Barriers to trade erected by one nation only bring
retaliatory barriers by others. The same commercial rivalries which threatened to alienate the colonies, and which brought on the World War, are sure, unless something is done, again to alienate the nations and bring on another war. Even now the peace of the world is threatened by such struggles as that over the Mosul oil fields. Inter-nation commerce must be taken out of the realm of self-help and vengeance, and put into the realms of law. Both the social interest in world peace and good business require it. Only a common world business policy can long succeed. This, again, means an international government.

F. Which would be given a sufficient revenue power.

No state could long endure which did not have a revenue power of its own. Hence, the federation of nations should be given some power of taxation, or other independent means of financing itself. What form this should take is a part of the work for the conference.

G. Which would be given exclusive jurisdiction to formulate all the rules and to adjudicate all the questions of international law, together with the power to enforce its decrees.

Secret treaties, diplomatic correspondence and the absence of international law have been other fruitful causes of war. While competition in armaments and economic rivalry are given as the causes of the World War, diplomacy may be said to have been another cause of it. There are many other sins to be laid at the door of diplomacy. One of these is the plight of Armenia today. Another is the opium traffic. Hence, there is an international social interest in the abolition of diplomacy and the substitution for it of the reign of international law.

The appropriate body for the formulation of the rules to govern the nations in their international relations is not ministers and ambassadors but a legislative body. A treaty at best is only a contract. A multitude of treaties between a multitude of separate nations, each working independ-
ently, could never develop an adequate body of rules for international conduct. Every embassy and legation should be closed and all ministers and ambassadors called home. Then representatives of the nations should be sent to one common place to formulate the rules of international law by legislation. At the present time we have something which is called international law. It is not the product of legislation, or of judicial decisions, but of treaties, promulgations, treatises and a few precedents of voluntary tribunals. Different rules have been adopted by different nations. No one can be sure of many principles of international law, as, for example, what constitutes citizenship and the status of the Monroe Doctrine. What is wanted is Tennyson’s “parliament of the world,” or Spencer’s “federation of the highest nations—exercising supreme authority,” which by “forbidding war between any of its constituent nations,” will put an end to it.

At present, except for the World Court, the only method of enforcement of what is called international law is by making it a part of the municipal law of a state, which the state may impose upon itself and those within the jurisdiction of its courts. A real international law is something more than auto-limitations imposed by a sovereign state upon itself. The notion must go that a nation is a personality without the limitation upon its powers of jural principles. This finite earth is too small for more than one infinite nation. We must have a true reign of international law in the realm of international law. That means every nation must keep within its own jurisdiction and out of international affairs, and the creation for international affairs of an international government with jurisdiction over international law.

H. Which, if the conference should deem best, would be given jurisdiction over such other matters of international interest as immigration, conditions of labor, traffic in drugs and intoxicating liquors, traffic in women and children,
trade in arms and ammunition, prevention and control of disease, standard weights and measures, boundaries, right to secede, right of revolution; control of raw materials, access to sea, rights of minorities, status of colonies and property rights of foreigners, citizenship and reparations.

There are many matters of international interest besides those named in sections C, D, E, F, and G, and most of them are liable to be causes of war. The conference should settle the question of whether any or all of them should be delegated to the international state or left to the national states, or left for later amendments to the constitution, or perhaps to be covered by the inter-nation commerce clause.

When it should become binding and how it might be amended.

Provision should be made for the minimum number of nations with which it would be deemed safe to start the federation; for the beginning of the government as soon as such number had manifested their assent, but with the right for others to join always left open; and for amendment, the last in order to avoid the possible danger or necessity of revolution.

Objections.

One objection, which will be made to the foregoing plan, is that it involves a delegation of sovereign powers and the creation of a "super-state."

Sir Frederick Pollock has truly said: "There is only one material out of which commonwealths or associations of any kind, starting from independence, can make an effective power for handling affairs of common interest, and that is individual power surrendered on equal terms by all of them." Because this was not done, the Articles of Confederation failed and the Covenant of the League of Nations will fail. Because it was done the Constitution of the United States has succeeded.
Why should anyone object to the delegation to a federation of nations of the powers herein named? The power to declare war, to rebarbarize the world, to maintain armies and navies, any nation should be willing to surrender if all or a majority of the others would, and all should be willing to give them up for a reign of law. Are wars so dear and military establishments so pleasant that people cling to them? People were glad to get away from private warfare to law; they would be more glad to get away from public warfare, with its greater danger, horror, brutality and degradation. If any nation was slow to see the light, the United States is in a position to help it. If the United States should ever forgive a part or all of its war debts it should be upon the express condition that the nations surrender these powers to an international government. Power over inter-nation commerce, the high seas, the air above the high seas, and international law, are powers which the nations do not today legally possess, except in a hypothetical sense. In giving such powers to a federation of nations, they would not be giving up but would be creating powers where none existed before. The revenue power would be a partial delegation of power, but the nations would still have their own revenue powers, and the people would have no greater burden of taxation under an additional government than they are carrying under the present regime.

Talk of a "super-state" is only a bugaboo to frighten the timid and to enable the selfish, nationalistic, imperialistic politicians to carry out their design. War is more terrible than a super-state. A super-state is not terrible at all. People should desire it for international affairs the same as they desire a national state for national affairs, and local government for local affairs. The United States could probably join a federation of nations under the treaty-making power. It ought by treaty to be able to abolish
war and armaments as it by treaty limited armaments. It may by treaty deal with any matter which is an appropriate subject of international agreement, so long as it does not contravene any express provision in the Constitution, even though it deals with a matter reserved to the states.\textsuperscript{3} In any event, the United States could join a federation of nations under the power to amend the Constitution;\textsuperscript{4} and members of the League of Nations could become members thereof by the means of amendment provided for in the Covenant of the League. Such a constitution as suggested herein for a federation of nations, would not, like the United States Constitution, be a revolutionary document; and its sponsors would not, like the fathers of the Constitution, run the risk of being traitors.

Another objection, and a serious objection, is the inequality of the peoples of the earth intellectually and morally. One answer to this objection is that we have in the United States already dealt with the same peoples with whom we should have to deal in a federation of nations, and that a federation of nations would work as well on all the peoples of the earth as the United States government has worked on the peoples of the United States. But if this answer is not deemed sufficient, there is a sufficient answer in the fact that we and every other nation must have international relations with all other nations, backward as well as forward, and that a federation of nations would work better in handling these than our present method of diplomacy. To prove this we need only to call attention to the success in diplomacy of the forward nations with the backward nation of the Turkish Empire.

Another objection, sure to be made, is that the United States should avoid European entangling alliances, and that the federation of nations would be such. A complete answer to this objection is that, instead of being an entang-
ing alliance, a federation of nations is the one sure way of keeping us out of them. After the World War France almost inveigled us into such an alliance. Even now Great Britain, confronted with a choice between the old balance of power scheme and a federation, is at least hinting that we should form an alliance with her. During the World War we actually entered into such an alliance, and we are not yet altogether free from its entanglements and are liable to be enmeshed further before the problem of reparations is settled. As sure as there is another World War we will be drawn into another entangling alliance. Hence, the only way to keep us out of European entangling alliances is to create and join a federation of nations opposed to and above all alliances.

An objection, which some will make, is that if we are going to join any association of nations it should be the League of Nations, whose objects are the same as those advocated by this plan. The answer to this objection is two-fold. The League of Nations has failed and will continue to fail, (1) because of the inefficiency of the machinery of government which it has set up, and (2) because its method of securing world peace is impractical.

(1) The League of Nations is not a true international government, but merely an alliance, or league. It does not include all the nations nor open its membership to all. Its principal purpose is to protect the allies and to preserve the Treaty of Versailles. It has no sovereign powers. It has no legislative body, and no real executive body. It has a judicial body, if the World Court is called its judicial body, and to this extent it can make a valuable contribution

Because of the general political situation and because of the agitation caused by the Bok Peace Prize, there is not much possibility of our country's taking the lead in the establishment of a federation of nations at this time. It may be best at first to join the League provided the worst evils of the Covenant are eliminated. But there will be no ultimate solution in this. If the peace of the world is to be achieved and preserved, some day there will have to be further international reorganization. Then the suggestions made herein may be of use.
to a real government, but a judicial body alone can never make an effective instrument for the achievement and preservation of the peace of the world. As a welfare and educational commission the League is entitled to credit. As a government it stands condemned forever. It has been disgraced by the situation of the Armenians. The Greek-Italian dispute came squarely within its jurisdiction, but instead of settling it it tried only to save its face. The dispute between France and Germany is a dispute between a member state and a state not a member, and under Article 17 the League should have invited Germany to accept the obligations of membership, after which the situation would have been covered either by Article 13 or by Article 16. The Covenant seems to have been drawn so as to be applicable precisely to this situation, yet the League has done nothing though fifty of the nations of the earth are in its membership! As a factor for peace, except in minor disputes, it has ceased to function. Its organization is not efficient.

(2) It undertakes to abolish war, not by trying to remove the causes of war, but by a plan to substitute for war a complicated scheme of arbitration after war has begun or become inevitable. The chief causes of war are diplomacy, commercial competition, lack of government for the high seas and for international law and competition in armaments, together with the right to declare war. The Covenant does not undertake to abolish diplomacy. It merely takes a step in the regulation of this form of self-help by requiring that it shall be open instead of secret. It is silent upon the subjects of commercial competition and government for the high seas and for international law, which omissions alone are enough to condemn it. It provides no practical means for stopping competition in arma-

ments and declarations of war. It is true, in Article 8, a reduction in armaments is proposed "so far as consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations"; but it is inconsistent to propose to reduce armaments at the same time that it imposes the obligation on the several nations to preserve the peace of the world by the use of armaments, and one nation's safety requires armament in proportion to the armaments maintained by other nations. Yet this theory is found; not only in Article 8: it runs throughout the entire document—in Article 13, Article 16, Article 17, and the famous Article 10. While this may be an attempt to regulate it certainly is not an attempt to abolish armaments and declarations of war. To this extent the League is calculated to destroy instead of to preserve the peace of the world. World peace will never be obtained on the road of the present Covenant of the League of Nations. It is hopelessly entangled in the European war system. Entanglement of the United States in it would mean the entanglement of the United States in a war system. But if international relations were put upon the new basis outlined herein, all these objections would disappear.

Finally, it may be objected, that this plan would never be adopted, or if adopted that it would never succeed. The world situation now is very similar to the situation in this country at the time of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States. As a result of the changed economic and political conditions, the relations between the nations now are comparable to those between the states then. The Covenant of the League of Nations is comparable to the Articles of Confederation. The opportunity for the champions of a federation of nations is comparable to that of the champions of a federation of the states. It was then said that the Constitution would never be adopted, or if it was adopted that it would fail. Prophesies of doom failed
then. They might fail again. If no other plan offers hope, should it not at least be given a trial with the hope that it would succeed?

The people of the United States fought in the last war, or at least a majority of them, not only to defend their country and its civilization, but to make that war a war to end war and to make the world safe for democracy. The war was won. But the world was never more unsafe for democracy, war was never more imminent, and we were never in greater danger of losing our civilization. Yet, without war, there is still time to end war and to make the world safe for democracy and to save civilization. We believe that the adoption of the plan outlined above would accomplish all this. We believe that it would save the United States, save Europe, save the world. Will the United States champion this international reorganization? The voice of the people who urged Woodrow Wilson and Elihu Root on to their tasks answers, Yes. Will the nations of the earth respond to such leadership? The voice of humanity, knit into a common brotherhood the world around, answers, Yes.

Some day, if not now, we believe that the free peoples of the earth will draw together in a "common covenant, some genuine and practical cooperation that will secure peace and justice in the dealings of the nations with one another." Some day, we believe that the "brotherhood of man no longer will be a fair but empty phrase, but given a structure of force and reality," so that the nations may "realize their common life and effect a workable partnership to secure

7 In this connection we should recall the lofty words of George Washington (in Constitutional Convention): "It is too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If we offer what we ourselves disapprove how can we afterwards defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the just can repair. The event is in the hands of God."
that life against the aggressions of autocratic and self-pleasing power.\textsuperscript{8}

\textbf{Hugh E. Willis.}

Indiana University School of Law,
Bloomington, Indiana.

\textsuperscript{8} In closing, we quote the immortal and inspiring words of the late President Woodrow Wilson, who died a martyr to the cause of international justice and goodwill.