

RESUME OF
WORDL-PEACE THROUGH
EDUCATION

by
Dr. phil. AXEL DAM

The possibility of world-peace depends upon the question: Is war a necessary consequence of unalterable elements of human nature or due to causes that can be altered by education?

Even if the causes may be ascribed to existing systems and institutions, these have been created by men and can be altered by men. In the human beings, not in impersonal physical powers of nature are the causes of human actions to be found.

Mind and character can be influenced through education, but only within the limits of human nature. Now anger and antipathy as well as love and sympathy will continue to exist as long as mankind. But the anger and the hatred *that lead to war* spring in civilized nations from a real or supposed injustice.

As long as justice is a vague word with no distinct universal meaning there will be no possibility of preventing arbitrary decisions giving pretext for war. Not until the education of the individuals has proceeded so far that no honest person can be in doubt what sentence a just court must pass in any given case, the award of an international court will get the same authority among the nations as the voice of conscience has in the individuals.

Therefore the first condition of world-peace is not the establishment of an international court of arbitration but of universally recognised principles of justice. If these had to be created by way of voting they would lack the character of self-validity. Real principles of justice must be self-evident rules in human nature.

The general sense of justice has been atrophied through public legislation, where the principles of justice have been confounded with the principle of public utility or made subservient to the rule of the majority. As long as this be the case and people think themselves entitled to promote the welfare of others without or against their wishes, they bear the germ of war in their hearts.

The utilitarian principle that the end justifies the means is the most unjust of all principles, because justice is quite the opposite of this principle. Any end and purpose is legitimate in as far as it can be realised by legitimate means, and as soon as other means are used, no reference to the purpose is necessary for their condemnation.

Utilitarianism as a fundamental or leading principle for politics is a hindrance to world-peace. As long as the nations trust to utilitarianism instead of justice within themselves there is no possibility of seeing it triumph in international relations.

These relations cannot be based upon justice, upon right instead of might until the whole national organisation has been based upon the same principle.

The theory of a state based upon such a policy of justice has been published some years ago here in Denmark and has to be mentioned here as the necessary intermediate station between the final end, world-peace, and the first step to the realisation of this

end: an education of individuals enabling them to distinguish to a certainty between right and wrong, not only in private intercourse but also in public affairs.

But is it possible to foster such infallible sense of justice?

If universal and unerring it must root deeply in human nature and cannot be an artificial result of education, and if eternal rules of natural right — or the germ of such — are inherent in human nature why have they not long ago been disclosed and become principles of international intercourse?

Fortunately we can answer this question. The sense of justice roots deeply in human nature, but its development is influenced by social experiences and by education, and the prevailing confusion and indistinctness in the conception of right and wrong is due to a deficiency in education, the lack of a pure cultivation of the sense of justice as separated from other motives of valuation. In most cases where the sense of justice is appealed to, other motives are concurring causes, e. g. sympathy, and antipathy, notions about public utility, aesthetical taste, admiration of technical skill etc.

This confusion of different motives of valuation can be prevented through education, if the educators themselves have a clear understanding of the difference between justice and utility etc.

The principle of justice limits or circumscribes the liberty of the individuals or their freedom of action not out of regard to public utility, but in view of the corresponding liberty of other individuals.

Mutual respect for the right of free action is the condition of peaceful intercourse of men. Only by avoiding violations of this right or by compensating violations committed can fighting and war be prevented.

The problem of lasting peace is the problem of universal righteousness. And this problem has to be solved in a manner that can be accepted by all men apart from race, nation or religion according to a universal sense of justice, brought to consciousness through an education that aims at the same end in all nations, viz: to clear the judgements of right and wrong from all irrelevant regards to anything but strict justice.

Respect for the liberty or freedom of action, restricted only by the equal liberty of all others is the only kind of 'friendliness' between men and between nations that can be universal, because it is the only kind of friendliness that does not imply personal or private sympathy between the individuals concerned, but only presupposes mutual understanding between them.

The best education to justice would be living under social conditions where justice reigns and all kinds of injustice are universally condemned. But until a reform of the communities and the laws has been realized in this direction — and in order to get it realized — the education of the new generation must include an artificial training of the sense of justice.

I. In the first place the principle of justice must be applied to the adjustment of differences between children themselves, between school-fellows, between pupils and teachers etc.

New schools have already been founded on this theory of freedom, and as far as it will be possible to realise it, it will be effective as a training in the duty of respecting the liberty of others in peaceful intercourse.

II. In the second place the prin-

ciples of justice must be *taught* to the new generation. Simple and plain as are these principles, most people have no difficulty in distinguishing between right and wrong in cases that are pure questions of right and wrong and nothing else.

In cases where injustice appears in connection with egoism the impartial spectator will have no difficulty in recognising the wrong. But in cases where wrong is allied with altruism, serving useful or supposedly good ends, confusion is very common. Therefore the failing of the sense of justice must be prevented by training the judgement in exercises of this kind. (Examples will be given).

III. In the third place all instruction, primary and secondary — in History, Sociology, Political Economy etc. — must be interpenetrated by the spirit of justice.

As to such problems as the questions of property in land (the arrangement of the relation between men and land, the question of free trade or protection etc.) it is the lookout of the educator to make the new generation *capable* of solving them by training the sense of justice according to which they have to be solved, if the solution shall be a guarantee for lasting peace all over the world.

Justice is and will always remain the foundation of peace. No condemnation of war on account of its atrocity will ever prevent men or nations from defying with force what is — or seems to be — evidently unjust. The appeal to altruistic and tender emotions may be a corollary means of the proposed education, but without the predomination of justice over all other virtues — in public as in private intercourse — the feelings of brotherhood will remain as powerless to establish peace as churches and sermons have hitherto been.