



Interdependence vs. Independence of Nations

Author(s): PAUL S. REINSCH

Source: *The Advocate of Peace (1894-1920)*, AUGUST and SEPTEMBER, 1909, Vol. 71, No. 8 (AUGUST and SEPTEMBER, 1909), pp. 185-187

Published by: Sage Publications, Inc.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20665781>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Sage Publications, Inc. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Advocate of Peace (1894-1920)*

JSTOR

government, abolished the last vestige of human slavery from civilized lands, was first to abolish private war between men, and was also prominent in abolishing piracy upon the seas. Why should Britain as the foremost naval power and the motherland of our race hesitate to invite the other naval powers to confer with a view to peace, and as a means of securing it suggest that they combine in abolishing war upon the seas, following the British-American example? Let this be freely discussed with other suggestions. There is nothing startling or new in this plan. It would follow a highly successful precedent covering a century. Three or four powers could be named which, united to-day to ensure peace upon the seas, would be sufficient, but many more would respond to Britain's call. Surely, few, if any, would decline. Why should they? How could they, their aim being peace, as they all proclaim? Those who declined would reveal themselves the enemies of mankind. The peaceful powers accepting might so greatly preponderate as to see their way to form a League of Peace, and ships of war, except the few needed for police duty, would be unneeded, just as they have long been and are to-day upon the inland seas of North America, and would be left to rust at their docks. No nation would commit itself to anything by accepting an invitation to a conference. Any action taken could be made subject to ratification by the governments.

So easy the solution seems that to many it may appear unworthy of consideration. But great crises have usually easy solutions because, being the product of grave mistakes or great wrongs, total reversal of the policy pursued is what is needed. Here is the key to the present situation. There is nothing speculative about this proved solution of the very question which disturbs the nations to-day. Though it may be rejected now, the day will nevertheless come, and that I believe soon, when this stone which the builders reject shall become the head of the corner. It has proved itself the panacea for war upon the seas.

Has our race lost the breed of great statesmen, or is there to-day a Prime Minister and Cabinet in Britain composed of men who dare be great and thus lead the nations out of bondage to the false god of war, becoming the foremost body of statesmen of all time by having rendered mankind the greatest service? Or is such an invitation to the powers to be the beneficent act of others more zealous in the cause of peace?

Even to attempt and fail for the time in such a cause would give to the participants lasting place among those whom coming generations are to hold in honor.

The policy of conciliation pursued by Britain has recently proved its claims to favor by brilliant successes, both in South Africa and in India. She is entitled to adopt as her motto, and none is so well adapted to the present crisis, "First, all means to conciliate," Britain has also won favor in other lands by the calm, firm moderation displayed by her government and its refusal to be stampeded into unnecessary armaments, which would only add fuel to the flame abroad, and when for years to come its naval supremacy is perfectly secure. It has avoided bluster and maintained a dignified reserve.

Mr. Editor, in all truth and soberness, it should no longer be permissible for any two powers in jealous rivalry to build Dreadnaughts contingent upon what each

other may do, thus compelling all other naval powers to follow their ruinous and, in this the twentieth century, saddening example, or to become defenseless.

This is no mere German-British affair. It is a world-wide issue, and the next step, momentous as it may prove for good or evil, is apparently for Britain to take, as the inventor and first adopter of the Dreadnaught.

Whatever the final result, if Britain played the part of peacemaker, as suggested, she would have the moral support of the enlightened public sentiment of the world with her, a tower of strength. If repulsed, she would have her quarrel just. It is not for any non-citizen to advise; she will choose her own path; certain it is, however, she could play no nobler part nor one that would redound in history more to her honor and glory, illustrious as that history is, for henceforth it is the triumphs of peace through conciliation, not those of brutal war through the slaughter of our fellowmen, that are to make nations venerated in after ages.

I write as one who loves his native land.

Interdependence vs. Independence of Nations.

BY PROF. PAUL S. REINSCH OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

Address delivered at the Second National Peace Congress, Chicago, May 3, 1909.

It is one of the laws of human beings that, scarce achieving what we have striven for with might and main, we are again beckoned farther by new goals and more distant aims. For the past six centuries humanity has been working to establish nationalism — to found nations, to cement their elements into a potent unity, to concentrate their forces, to build up in all their majesty the powerful societies of to-day. They are the protectors of all we hold dear in civilization. It is not surprising that achievements demanding such efforts and sacrifices should be looked upon as the ultimate form of society. They render life rich and colored through the variety of customs and ideas which they maintain. They prevent dull uniformity; they give the human spirit a chance to manifest all its inherent possibilities of expression and life and art. Small wonder that conservative spirits look upon national life and independence as the last word of civilization. And yet we are on all hands surrounded by the unmistakable evidences that this, too, is a transitory stage — that civilization cannot content itself with a partial organization, but is tending irresistibly towards universalism.

The generous ideal of world unity and peace is still looked upon by many practical men as a golden dream. Even the president of the second Hague Peace Conference spoke of it as "the bright star of universal peace which we shall never reach, but which will always guide us." The cosmopolitan ideal has indeed in the past been often displayed in a form that had little connection with living men and institutions. It has set up an abstract conception of humanity by which men were supposed to be directly impelled and actuated towards world unity. The national state was looked upon as an obstacle. War was personified into an evil entity that must be combated directly and subdued by inhibition, as demons and monsters were exorcised in ages past. Such abstractions

may, indeed, have a prophetic force; they may forecast the future of our race. Yet by men of affairs they are looked upon as fanciful until the detailed forces can be pointed out by which we may approach ourselves to the ideal conditions thus foreshadowed. Our age is realistic and practical; so our cosmopolitanism has become concrete. It rests upon the idea of coöperation in constantly-widening circles. Universal coöperation is the watchword which stands for positive action, for the development of concrete facts in human life which correspond to the actual needs in our economic and social order. For this purpose adequate institutions are to be created, so as to take international action out of the field of resolutions and to make it a part of the realities of human life. The void which the old cosmopolitan ideal left between the individual and humanity is being filled up by the creation of institutions through which the individual may gradually be raised, by almost imperceptible degrees, from the narrow limits of personality to the broad aims of civilization.

The most important fact which we have become conscious of in our generation is that the unity of the world is real. The most remote parts of the earth are being made accessible. The great economic and financial system by which the resources of the earth are being developed is centralized. Our destiny is a common one; whatever happens to the nations of Africa and Asia affects our life. Should great material disasters devastate or wars disorganize these distant societies, we ourselves must bear a part of the burden. Nor is there any development or advance in the perfected arts of civilization, the conditions and processes which make industry profitable and life agreeable, but that we ourselves shall share in the benefits. Science knows no national boundaries. What is achieved in Berlin, Paris or Rome to-day is to-morrow a part of the scientific capital of all the world. The positive ideal of the world to-day is undoubtedly that the whole earth shall become a field of action open to every man, and that all the advantages which may be secured by the efforts of humanity throughout the world must accrue to the citizens of each individual nation. In this new grouping of social and economic life the national state will indeed continue to hold a prominent place, but public and associative action will dominate by forces and considerations which are broader than national life. Coöperation is the key to life and society. Neither the individual nor the nation is self-sufficing. There is a broader life, there are broader interests and more far-reaching activities surrounding national life in which it must participate in order to develop to the full its own nature and satisfy completely its many needs. Even as the individual receives from society both protection and stimulus, so the nation would suffer intolerable disadvantages were it to exclude itself from world intercourse.

Numerous public unions and associations have recently been created for the purpose of organizing interests which transcended the boundaries of national states. The absolute necessity of mutual intercourse and communication has led to the founding of unions for postal, telegraphic and railway communication, and for the protection of the means and methods employed by these. No state can completely protect itself against the inroads of epidemic disease nor against the plottings of criminals without the

coöperation of other governments. Unions have thus been established for mutual police assistance and for the development of international sanitation. In order that industrial competition may be raised to a plane where the individual laborer or manufacturer is protected against intolerable conditions, nations unite and follow a common plan of economic and labor legislation. For the common development of such interests there have been founded the International Institute of Agriculture, the International Association of Labor Legislation, and many semi-public associations designed to realize the idea of a world unity in the great field of economic life. But we must not proceed to an enumeration. It is only our purpose to point out the significance of these great positive movements. When we once appreciate the sweep of the forces involved, we are impelled to the conclusion that world organization is no longer an ideal, but is an accomplished fact. The foundations in international life have been laid by the slow working of economic and social causes; not guided by the conscious will of man, but responding and logically expressing the deepest needs of human life.

The international organization of to-day respects ethnic entities as essential forms of social organization within their proper limits, just as the modern state respects the autonomy of towns, provinces and member states. We are not able to dispense with the psychic unities which at the present time lie back of sovereignty and give it force. While the internationalism of to-day looks far beyond the narrow ideal of exclusive and independent national sovereignty, it is no less hostile to an artificial world state, the fruit of military conquest, forcing upon the world a rigid uniformity, a dull and deadening monotony. Instead of this, it would develop international life through the fostering of actual forces that manifest themselves and secure an expression broader than national life. Where men are impelled to coöperate, organizations will be constructed to make their coöperation easy and regular. Upon this foundation the great meetings of the Hague Conference will most readily be successful in building legislation and adjudication of world-wide application. Let us abandon theoretical construction. We shall not have far to seek for positive interests, in all the many occupations of human life, which feel the inherent need of a strong international organization. Building up from the ground, we shall thus erect a structure upon whose unshaken support the general idea of internationalism may be reposed.

The development we are considering will exercise a profound influence upon the attitude of mankind toward war. The warlike spirit presupposes a misunderstanding of the aims of other nations. How can we key up ourselves to the dread purpose of taking the life of fellow beings unless our feelings are worked upon by the idea that they are anti-religious, despotic, immoral, cruel,—in a word, enemies of civilization? But will such designs be conceived by a merchant against those with whom he has met in an international body discussing the interests of commerce and industry? Will a physician desire to kill the sanitary official of another nation who is protecting us from the inroads of epidemic and plague? Will the man of science conceive a murderous desire to take the life of those who are searching for the truth in the laboratories of Germany or of France? War becomes

criminal, a perversion of humanity, in such cases. No higher ideal can be appealed to for the killing of those with whom we cooperate for the ideals of humanity.

The older pacifism was purely negative in character. It looked upon war as an evil being to be combated directly. Yet war is only the symptom of a general condition in which too great emphasis is still laid upon local interests. It is evident that the only effective manner to remove the conditions to which the occurrence of war is due lies in the building up of an international consciousness; but such a consciousness cannot be arrived at out of nothing—there must be back of it a development of a real unity of interest and feeling. We must realize our interdependence in practical affairs. It is through the creation of international organizations for all the interests of human life that a positive content of the feeling of a common humanity is being provided. The incentive to war will become weaker and weaker as the bonds of community between nations increase, such as are provided by communication agencies, by economic and industrial ties or by scientific cooperation. How intolerably painful will be the ruthless interruption of all such relations and activities! There are only two alternatives, either the ties which are thus being created will in time become so strong that no nation will think of interrupting them by war, or, should war continue, these relations will have to be exempted from its operations. Such an exemption would tend to confine the sufferings and dangers of war more and more, and would thus be in accord with the dictates of humanity.

Universal cooperation is a future ideal. The world is full of conditions and activities in which nations are not self-sufficing, in which we instinctively look beyond the boundaries of the national state. The nation that would be independent in isolation will condemn itself to be a Venezuela, will cut itself and its citizens off from the advantages of civilization to which all human beings are entitled. By realizing its interdependence with the other civilized nations of the world, it will only strengthen itself as does the individual who plunges with full energy into the life of his society, being stimulated thereby and having all his faculties developed. The great fact that the world is a unit rests upon the underlying conditions of modern invention and science which the dictum of no national government can destroy. International cooperation points the only way in which humanity may continue to develop without wasting its energy and ultimately falling prey to triumphant militarism. Between such alternatives it is not difficult to choose, but it is difficult to believe that humanity should be so perverse and misguided as to prefer the waste and suffering of military competition to the joy of normal activity—the development of all that is great and strong through international cooperation. On the one hand lies barbarism, on the other the hope of continued progress.

The Evolution of World Peace.

BY LEVI T. PENNINGTON, EARLHAM COLLEGE, RICHMOND, IND.

[This oration won first prize in the Intercollegiate Peace Association Contest held at the University of Chicago, May 4, at the time of the second National Peace Congress. It is published as a sample of what young men in the universities and colleges are thinking and writing.—ED.]

In the progress of the world, the dream of yesterday

becomes the confident hope of to-day and the realized fact of to-morrow. As old systems fail to meet new conditions and new ideals, they are discarded, and into the Limbo of worse than worthless things is passing the system of human sacrifice to the Moloch of international warfare. For centuries world peace has been the dream of the poet, the philanthropist, the statesman and the Christian. That dream is becoming a confident hope. This generation should see it an accomplished fact.

There was a time when individual prowess determined the issue of every difference. Might made right, so it was thought, and the winner in any controversy was he who had the heaviest club, the strongest arm or the thickest skull. Man's inter-relationships multiplied as humanity advanced; with each new relation came new causes for quarrel; and for a time advancing civilization brought but an increase in murders and assassinations.

We know the process by which personal combat ceased: how the duel replaced murder and ambush and assassination; how courts of law replaced the duel. The dreamer saw the day when personal combat should be no more; the man of mind refuted all the arguments in favor of the duel of men; the constructive statesman of that early day instituted courts of law and equity. Men who had a difference insisted that it was their quarrel and they alone could settle it; but reason saw that two combatants inflamed by passion are least fitted of all men to see where justice lies. Many held that where honor is involved, no one can adjust the difficulty but those most directly concerned; but reason saw that a man's honor cannot be vindicated by killing his enemy or being killed by him. Men said, "If personal combat is abolished, courage and strength will perish from the earth." But reason saw that personal combat in a selfish cause does not bring out the highest type of courage; but that there are opportunities enough for the exercise of the highest and best moral and physical courage to keep valor alive forever. It was finally urged that there would be no power to enforce the decree, if personal differences were left to the adjudication of others; but reason said, "That power will come with the need for it." And so courts of law and equity arose, based on the need of humanity; laws were passed defining rights and limiting aggression; and when one man wronged another that wrong was settled in court, by the power of the whole people, and not in personal combat with the bludgeon or the knife.

For similar reasons wars between states and tribes have ceased; and face to face with the inevitable logic of past progress stands the world to-day. Though humanity has been slow to see it, the truth has begun to dawn in the hearts of men, that international wars are no more to be justified than civil strife, tribal warfare or personal combat. Gradually the omnipotent power of right is overcoming the inertia of humanity, and the world is moving. One by one the awful truths concerning war are forcing themselves upon the consciousness and consciences of men. The mighty power of fact is beating down the opposition to world peace.

Men have begun to realize the terrible cost, the unbelievable wastefulness of actual war and the preparation for possible war. When we read that the armed peace of Europe the past thirty-seven years has cost \$111,000,000,000, nearly as much as the aggregate value of all the resources of the United States, the richest nation on earth,