

CHAPTER XXVII

THE NEW INTERNATIONALISM

In the opening chapter the new economic internationalism, which has changed the face of the world during the last fifty years, was described as the ultimate background of the war. It came into conflict with the narrow nationalistic conception of the state which controls the foreign ambitions and policies of the greater Powers. As was there stated:

“Our ideas of the state are still those of earlier generations. We trace the limits of a state as they appear on the map. We think of England, France, Germany, Russia, and Austria-Hungary as confined within eighteenth-century borders. This was the Europe of yesterday. It is not the Europe of to-day. States have burst their political confines. They live outside their territorial boundaries. Their economic interests are as wide as the world. Their foreign connections are only less vital to their lives than their internal affairs. Nations have become international. Their wealth is scattered all over the world. Their life is interlaced with the life of other states. And the sovereignty of states has gone out with

their wealth to the most distant parts of the world. It has penetrated into every continent and to every sea.

"The outside connections of states are as sensitive as the old national boundaries. Trade, shipping, and finance have interlocked the divided world into a world-state. But the old political concepts remain. The new is in conflict with the old. Any threat to economic connections or distant relations is immediately registered in the Foreign Office. It becomes a matter of diplomacy. The existence of a nation may be threatened by failure to safeguard economic connections. That is one reason for war. The world we assume to exist has passed away. The rulers of Europe, trained in the old nationalism, met this economic change by imperialism. They could only think in imperialistic terms. They viewed distant territories as they viewed their lands at home. They keep other Powers out. That is the way rulers had done for hundreds of years. That was the only way the ruling classes, for the most part still feudal, knew how to adjust the old nationalism to the new internationalism. The need of food, of raw materials, of markets, of opportunities for trade, of strategic routes and harbors, could only be secured by possession."

The French Revolution destroyed the old régime. It was a régime of privilege, monopoly, caste, and the subordination of classes and in-

dividuals to the ruling aristocracy. It also destroyed the endless restraints and restrictions which confined classes, groups, individuals, and all industry. There was no freedom, either political or economic, and there was no belief in freedom. Individuals were born into a caste from which they might not emerge. Everything was fixed by laws and traditions in the interest of the old aristocracy. The economic life was restricted and regulated as minutely as were persons. There were tariff barriers within and without the country; there were monopolies of food, of the highways, of the grinding of flour and the making of wine. All life was interlaced with privileges of every kind to industry, to agriculture, to the professions. The assumption was that the state, the peasant, and the worker belonged to the ruling class to do with as it liked.

For hundreds of years the ruling classes had been creating one privilege after another; burdens had been added to burdens and regulations to regulations until the workers and the peasants had become little better than beasts of burden. Such was the feudal régime against which Rousseau, Diderot, Turgot,

and Quesnay protested. Such was the régime which the French Revolution on the continent and the writings of Adam Smith, and the idealism of Cobden and Bright in England forever shattered. And the freeing of the world from the constrictive laws and regulations made possible the marvellous advance which followed.

During the nineteenth century the feudal idea of the state was applied to the outside world. It was treated as a private possession. It was constricted by the idea of exclusive possession. Now, in the twentieth century, a war-weary world waits on another renunciation of privileges, monopolies, spheres of influence, and the limitations which the greater Powers have imposed upon the world. It waits on the renunciation of imperialism, on the ending of control of other peoples' lands, of trade routes, of strategic points and harbors, of tariffs, of trade, of commerce, of the relations of peoples. The twentieth century calls to freedom in international affairs as the nineteenth century called to freedom in domestic affairs. And just as the release of continental Europe resulted in the freeing of ability and talent and awakened the marvellous develop-

ment of the past century, so the freeing of the world in its international relations will lead to a similar development of nations, races, and peoples.

This new freedom in international relations should include:

One, the freedom of the seas and the water and land routes of trade and commerce in every portion of the earth.

Two, freedom of markets, of trade, of commerce and the substitution of the open door for spheres of influence and preferential tariffs in all exploited territories and especially in Africa, Asia, and the islands of the Pacific.

Three, free and equal access to raw materials in all dependent and subject territories.

Four, equality of opportunity of investment, of development, of "exploitation," and of economic contact with backward peoples and the protection of such peoples by international agreement through a tribunal pledged to equality of opportunity and the safeguarding of the subject world from oppression.

Five, and most important of all, the razing of all tariff barriers and the adoption of free trade by all of the greater Powers.

To Richard Cobden free trade would end wars. It would weaken the nationalistic chauvinism that for fifty years has gone hand in hand with militarism in all of the great Powers.

Peace should recognize that the old narrow nationalistic order is gone. Nations are no longer local territories, places upon the map. They are interrelated with the whole world. Their food and their raw materials, their goods, their wealth, and their ships are scattered on every sea. The life of the modern state is dependent upon free contact with other peoples.

All this should be recognized. Previous peace congresses were inspired by the old dynastic, imperialistic, restrictive idea. They distributed the world in the interests of the ruling classes. There was no concern for little states, for subject peoples. There was no thought of freedom, liberty, equality of opportunity. Rather the motive was monopoly, privilege, exclusive possessions. The peace which is to come must end this old order as the French Revolution ended the old order in the internal life of Europe. It must free the world from the idea that peace is possible

with might. It must be a "Pax Economica" which frees trade and commerce, the sources of raw materials, and the waterways of the earth, and opens them up to all on equal terms.

A peace inspired by such ideals would be so just it would live by its own justice. It would enforce itself as does a just contract. An imperialistic peace, on the other hand, will lead to imperialistic controversies just as it has in the past, for injustice always leads to conflict. It cannot be otherwise. Should a league to preserve the peace be created, its burdens would be greatly lightened under such a peace. The controversies to be adjusted would be negligible in comparison with the maintenance of a world divided among the greater Powers. And such a division of the world cannot endure. It ought not to endure. It is merely a "Pax Romana," however disguised under high-sounding names it may be.

Moreover, a peace with freedom would make disarmament easy. There would be nothing to call peoples to arms if the world were open to all on equal terms. It would not then be necessary to maintain great navies to protect imperialistic possessions and investments if they

do not exist. The trade, commerce, and activities of the world would move freely if the world were free to receive them.

Economic and political freedom will do to the twentieth century what the French Revolution did for the century just closed. It will stimulate the production of wealth. It will promote trade and commerce. It will encourage friendly relations. It will redound to the material profit of the greater states as well as the lesser ones. This has always been the result of the ending of privilege, of the razing of tariff walls, of the ending of monopoly in any form.

Such a peace would be supported by the moral forces of the world. It would have the support of democracy, of the small nations and of a world-wide public opinion that will be of great force in the years to follow.

Such a peace should be stated in simple terms. There should be no weasel words to lead to controversy. There should be no secrecy about it. It should be open and public. There should be guarantees that no subsequent engagements would be entered into by individual nations to violate its terms. And

the treaty should be given broadcast to the world. It should be known to the peasant and the worker. Every appeal should be made to public opinion to support it. And public opinion is a great force in international relations when the facts are known. Even to-day the Powers are seeking to satisfy the neutral world as to the propriety of their violations of other peoples' territories, while in the face of the most grim necessities Switzerland, Holland, and Denmark have been protected against occupation. They have known no foreign troops. The three-mile limit on the high seas is observed. There are no naval battles within it. There are many instances of international freedom and equality, and they have made for peace in the main. There is still much sacredness about neutral soil and there would be far greater sacredness about free soil.

A peace designed to make the world free involves a new diplomacy, a new kind of congress of nations, a new attitude of mind on the part of those who rule. It means an end of imperialism, the recognition of the principle of self-determination; it means that all states,

great and small, shall be encouraged to develop their institutions unmenaced by any other Power. It means that economic internationalism shall be extended to the world, and that those principles which we accept as the guiding rule of individual development shall be applied to states, races, and peoples as well.

Such a peace means that the doors of the peace congress shall be open, that the discussions shall be public, that small states shall have full and adequate representation of their own choosing. It means that the old secret diplomacy shall be abandoned, and that the world shall no longer be parcelled out as it was by the treaties of Vienna and Berlin. It means that the contribution of all peoples shall be encouraged, that free trade shall be promoted, that the seas and waterways to the seas shall be free. It means that a congress of peoples will seek to end wars by ending the cause of wars. For we are beginning to see that previous peace congresses laid the mines of war in the dishonest arrangements which they made for the power and profit of those who rule.

With principles such as these animating a

peace conference, a true congress of nations would be possible; a congress inspired by the doctrine of equal rights for all and exclusive privileges for none. It would be a congress interested in recognizing right rather than might, in the redemption of waste places, the reclamation of exploited lands, the development of the world's resources. It would be a congress dedicated to the remaking of a civilization which for twenty centuries has been subject to the greed and power of the ruling classes of the earth. Such a congress would be interested in advancing the culture and civilization of the world rather than the promotion of the ambitions of the greater Powers or the ruling classes within these Powers. Such a peace would be a peace of idealism, of democracy, of liberty. It would be a peace that would survive by its own justice, and justice is the most enduring sanction that can be invoked in the world.

FEB 17 1919