

7X 4320
11-9

ORGANIZE THE WORLD!

BY EDWIN D. MEAD.

Price, 10 cents.

LEND-A-HAND OFFICE, 1 Beacon Street, Boston, and
AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY, 31 Beacon Street, Boston.

JX1963
M48



Organize the World!

BY EDWIN D. MEAD.

WE have come to a time in human history when there is imperative call for a vision and courage in the field of international affairs as great as the vision and courage of Washington for America a hundred years ago. When the War of the Revolution was over and the independence of the United States was secure, the mind of Washington turned immediately to the great West. Before the Revolution, indeed, his mind had turned to the West and the question of its development and its relation to the East more seriously than that of any other man in America. At the time of the outbreak of the war no other man in America controlled so much land west of the Ohio as he. The moment that the war was ended, even before the terms of peace with England had been definitely arranged, his interest came back to this commanding subject of the West. He knew now, as he had known when, years before the Revolution, he had written of channels for "the trade of a rising Empire," that the great question for America was the opening of the West and the binding of East and West together; and he knew that it was a far greater question now than then. He left his camp at Newburg on the Hudson, and made on horseback an exploring expedition of three weeks through the State of New York. He proceeded up the Mohawk to Fort Schuyler, surveyed the water communication with Ontario, and then traversed the country to the eastern branch of the Susquehanna, considering the subject of the best lines of communication with the West. "Prompted by these actual observations," he wrote to the Marquis of Chastellux, "I could not help taking a more contemplative and extensive view of the vast inland navigation of these United States, and could not but be struck with the immense diffusion and importance of it and with the goodness of that Providence which has dealt his favors to us with so profuse a hand. Would to God we may have wisdom enough to improve them! I shall not rest contented until I

Reprinted from the "Editor's Table" of the *New England Magazine* for December, 1898. This leaflet may be procured for \$1.50 per hundred copies, or \$10 per thousand, from the Peace Crusade Committee, 14 Bedford Street, Boston.

have explored the western country and traversed those lines, or a great part of them, which have given bounds of a new Empire." "The honor, power, and true interests of this country," he wrote at the same time to Lafayette, impatient with the petty jealousies and ambitions of the states, "must be measured on a continental scale."

A year later came the more important ride up the Potomac and over the Alleghanies, in pursuance of the same great interest. This had been the dominant interest of his mind in his retirement at Mount Vernon, following the resignation of his commission, and the theme of earnest correspondence with Jefferson. He was absent from home more than a month on this new western tour, riding nearly seven hundred miles, through a country where the Indians were still dangerous, the country known to him so well in his youthful days. As he lay down to sleep at night by his camp-fire in the woods, under the silent stars which, looking down on him, also looked down on the Atlantic and the Pacific and the Mississippi, he thought of the thirteen disordered states waiting to become a nation, and of the great West waiting to be born. There still exists a map of the country between the Potomac and the Ohio waters, as sketched by Washington himself while on this expedition in 1784; and his journal minutely records his conversations with every intelligent person whom he met, respecting the facilities for internal navigation afforded by the rivers. The routes to the Ohio which Washington selected at that time as the best routes are to-day substantially the lines of the great railroads from Washington and Baltimore to Pittsburg, Parkersburg, and Wheeling.

The first-fruit of this expedition was the famous letter to Benjamin Harrison, then Governor of Virginia, upon the whole question of communication between the East and the West, which was one of the most remarkable letters that Washington ever wrote, and which proves him the most far-sighted and sagacious man in America at that time so far as concerns American expansion and development. The next fruit was the Potomac Company, of which Washington was the president, for the opening up of a route to the West by way of the Potomac. Washington's interest in this important enterprise — an enterprise whose benefit, as he wrote to Jefferson just before his inauguration, "would not be confined to narrower limits than the whole western territory of the United States" — was his most engrossing interest during the whole period between the Revolution and the Constitutional Convention. Indeed, it was at a little meeting of the Virginia and Maryland

P.

Author.

(Person).

22Jan'03

commissioners at Mount Vernon — for the Potomac Company was chartered by the concurrent acts of Virginia and Maryland — to concert commercial regulations for those two states that the suggestion was first made, probably by Washington himself, of a national convention, to concert uniform commercial regulations for the whole country, which convention, meeting at Annapolis in 1786, gave birth to the great convention at Philadelphia the next year, which gave us our present Constitution.

Washington's work as president of the Potomac Company was largely that of overcoming jealousies and making men look at things in a large way instead of a small way. Virginians were jealous among themselves, lest one part of the state should obtain an advantage over another. He showed them that the benefits of trade were diffusive and beneficial to all. He showed that his own interest in the Potomac scheme did not interfere with his patriotic interest in every similar scheme. He praised the enterprise of New York and Pennsylvania. "The more communications we open to the western country," he said to a citizen of Maryland, "the closer we bind that rising world — for indeed it may be so called — to our interests, the greater strength we shall acquire." "I wish," he said to a member of Congress, "that every door of that country may be set wide open, and commercial intercourse rendered as free and easy as possible. That is the best, if not the only, cement that can bind these people to us."

Washington was the great promoter of the settlement of the West by the best men, the most influential friend of Rufus Putnam and the New England men who went to Ohio. It was he who first pointed out the Ohio valley to the pioneers as a favorable location, and he who was the chief mediator between them and Congress. He knew many of the founders of Ohio personally. "No colony in America," he wrote, "was ever settled under such favorable auspices. There never were men better calculated to promote the welfare of such a community." Were he a young man, he declared, he knew of no country where he would himself rather go than to the Ohio country. He was interested in the success of General Putnam and those who followed him to Marietta, because they were men of character and their settlement was of the sort he wished to see in the West. He did not wish, he said, to see the great West overrun with "land jobbers, speculators, and monopolizers, or even scattered settlers," — "a parcel of banditti," he called them, "who will bid defiance to all authority, while they are skimming and disposing of the cream of the

country." "Compact and progressive settlement" was what would give strength to the Union.

The more we study Washington's relations to the great West, the extent of his services in opening it up, his anxious interest to bind it closely to the East, his endeavors to have it settled and controlled by men of character, his perception of the commanding place it was soon to hold in the country, his prophetic words, more than realized to-day, concerning its great future, the more deeply we feel that, of all the far-seeing men of that critical and heroic period, he was the most far-seeing, the man of most sagacity and shrewdness, the most practical man, the man of most vision, the man of most constructive power. And this is what we feel as we study his work as president of the Constitutional Convention and as president of the United States. Here at last was an American, a man who calculated his politics and measured the true interests of this country on a continental scale. Men had said America before. It was sturdy Christopher Gadsden, of South Carolina — a voice by strange irony from precisely that state which was destined to deal the worst blows to the nation — who in the Stamp Act Congress at New York in 1765 spoke that memorable word: "There ought to be no New England man, no New Yorker, known on the continent, but all of us Americans." America to Christopher Gadsden was a little strip along the Atlantic coast. America to George Washington, riding over the Alleghanies into the West, was a continent. He lived in the future. No Virginia could bound his vision nor accommodate his patriotism nor his organizing power. He needed a larger unit. Madison and Jefferson might write Virginia and Kentucky resolutions. "Think of your national Union," was Washington's farewell word and the great legacy of his life, "as of the palladium of your safety and prosperity." His vision and his virtue, more than conventions or than laws, made America a nation; and that contagious vision, measuring our power and our true interests more and more upon a continental scale, pushed the nation on and on to broader horizons, to larger tasks, and to a more perfect union. The French philosophers of the last century declared that there could never be a large republic, because that close relation, common feeling and common public spirit necessary to a strong and vital republican life were not possible over large areas. But large and small are purely relative terms; and the inventions and incalculable changes of the century have brought it about that for all political purposes our American republic is vastly smaller than the republic organized by the convention of 1787, Boston and San

Francisco far closer together than Washington's Philadelphia and Mount Vernon. Each period of expansion and of progress has found us more neighborly, more intimate, and more organic, a better family, than the period before; the larger, the closer; the farther circumference, the more dynamic centre; the broader life, the more perfect union and more general welfare. The English historian, Freeman, has written of Washington as "the expander of England,"—because it was he who taught England in a way she did not forget the necessity of that attitude toward her colonies which has made her subsequent expansion and her great empire possible. He was the true expander of America, because he first and most influentially conceived our empire on a continental scale, because he had the insight into the federal principle and the genius for organization which commanded the republic into being and made the conditions of its great progress possible and sure.

To-day, a century after Washington, we are called to a vision as inspiring and imperative as that which came to him as he rode up the Mohawk, and to a greater organizing work than that which he performed with such wisdom, courage, patience and success. He was commanded to organize a nation: we are commanded to organize the world. He saw that the time had come when our power and our true interests must be measured on a continental scale: we are warned that the time has come when we must conceive of our power and our true interests by the measure of mankind. Let no man think of himself any longer in the first place as a New England man, as a New Yorker, as a Virginian, but all of us Americans,—that was the vision and message of Washington; and that insight and that law, coming to petty, prejudiced, jealous, and disordered states, put an end to chaos and brought peace, prosperity, strength, largeness of life, and an ever-broadening horizon. Let no man think of himself any longer in the first place as an American, as an Englishman, a Spaniard, a Frenchman, a German, a Russian, but all men in the first place citizens of the world,—that is the message which has been thundered in the ears of Washington's America in this eventful and surprising year as it was never done before. It took a civil war to teach Gadsden's Carolina and Washington's Virginia that the interests of the nation are above those of the state, and that a state can only then be true to itself and its duty when it remembers that there is a lower and a higher, and knows well what that lower and that higher are. Virginia and Massachusetts have no less genuine and worthy pride as states, they do not put to smaller or less vital use their sacred

history and heritage, their great sons are no less their sons, when they bow their heads to baptism in the vision of Washington and Webster of a nation which must measure its powers and duties on a continental scale, and know that national life into which they are incorporated as the nobler and more commanding life, determining the other. The nation is organized. Its logic was shaped finally in the fiery forge of war.

The nation is the largest thing we have yet got organized. We must organize the world. Unending jealousies, commercial clash, friction of law, paralysis of industry, financial disorder, the misdirection and miscarriage of good energy, mischievous ignorance and prejudice, incalculable waste, chronic alarm and devastating wars are before us until we do it. That is the lesson of the hour. The relations and interdependence of the nations of Christendom have become, by the amazing advance of civilization in the century, closer, complexer, and more imperious far than the relations of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and Georgia, when Washington from the heights of the Alleghanies looked into the West and thought of the continent. Yet France and Germany, England and Russia, America and Spain, in their great burrs of guns, jealous of each other, distrustful, envious, afraid, go on in their separate, inco-operant, abortive ways, keeping God's earth in chaos, when a great wisdom and great virtue like Washington's a hundred years ago would convert them into a family of nations, into a federation and fraternity, with a comprehensive law, an efficient police, and a purposeful economy.

The trouble with us is that we have not organized ourselves. Our institutions are not up to our best feeling and best thought. The new wine of our larger and better humanity finds no new bottles, and the old ones are bursting. The nations are in the condition of men before the days of courts, who had to settle their differences by their fists and by seeing who was strongest. If we quarrel with England about Venezuela or with Spain about Cuba, there is no court to which we can go. Nations improvise boards of arbitration for particular emergencies; it is the glory of America that no other nation has been so forward in this as she has been. But particular emergencies are precisely the occasions when there is need of general principles and regular procedure. As the Supreme Court of the republic settles differences between individuals and states, and between states and states, so when we pass beyond our present crude condition, when we organize the world, will the regular and permanent world tribunals adjust our international disputes and, upon proper complaint and

proper evidence, put an end to nuisances and wrongs, such as Europe did not stop in Armenia, and such as we did stop in Cuba.

If the Spanish war and the problems springing out of it have made the people of America realize that they live in a very different time and different circumstances from those in which the Monroe doctrine was born, we are glad of it. Their readiness to plunge into the politics of the Philippines without any reference to the Monroe doctrine, although not very creditable to a people who, under the shelter of that doctrine, made such an outcry three years ago against the English epiphany in Venezuela, shows how superficial and fictitious the ground of that outcry was, and how effectually we are now transcending that view of the world which, for political purposes, sees it primarily as two hemispheres instead of as one great whole. The world of 1898 is not the world of 1823. The one cardinal part of the Monroe doctrine, that this republic will not permit the lodgment on this continent of any institutions or influence hostile to free government, we trust the republic will always be true to; and we believe it will. Therein lie the glory and the mighty power of the Monroe doctrine. The faster the rest of it is now sloughed off, the better for America and for mankind. And we are glad that the attitude of our government and people this year toward the Philippines; whatever the final outcome there, has forever placed us out of court, should we venture the poor plea again that a European power or people may not have anything new to say or do upon this continent simply because it is European. That parochialism at least is over, and perhaps the result is worth all it has cost. America's international issues are no longer to be settled by geography, but each on its own merits, by justice and by right.

It is right and justice, honor and wisdom, common sense, not the atlas, which to-day forbid the forcible annexation of the Philippines to the United States. It is not that this republic is not as competent as any nation upon earth to govern and educate people behind us in their political development,—to lift up men who are lower down than we. That, as we declared six months ago, were a pusillanimous thing to say. That were a shameful impeachment of America. That were to accuse democracy with an accusation which, if it could be sustained, were fatal. The question is not one of competence to dominate and rule: it is the greater question of political morality and fidelity to the democratic idea and democratic method in the world. Let the republic insist that the Philippines shall be independent, freed from a sovereignty which

had no credentials but conquest and force, none which pass muster in the court of heaven. Let her view her present duty as simply and solemnly that of paving the way to self-government in the islands. Let her, best of all, call upon the enlightened nations of the world to unite with her in guaranteeing this unhappy people order and opportunity; and then, if her people be still consumed with zeal, let them pour in missionaries and schoolmasters, trades and tradesmen, health experts and political philosophers, to their hearts' content. But not guns, not soldiers, not new credentials of greed and force and conquest, to supplant the old.

The duty is not alone to the Philippines, not alone to America's own honor nor to that health which is the first condition of good service, but to the world and the future, to that high principle of international concert and of consideration in the first place for the world's peace and progress instead of our own gain, in whose ascendancy alone lie the world's hope and the lasting and true gain of any nation. We entered upon this war with solemn disclaimers of the world's old motives of war, with express repudiation of the thought of conquest, of that "original sin of nations," as Gladstone called it, "the lust for territorial aggrandizement." Europe said that our fine protestation was hypocrisy. We could afford the action which to the European mind will prove it so,—although even a strict and formal consistency, novel and startling in this field, would have a heroism and salutary virtue in it for which much good might well be given up,—if the protestation were ignored for some plain interest of mankind. We cannot afford the action, thus to fortify those hoary old aims and methods of conquest and expansion, which in the century have sullied England's honor and corrupted England's life, hindered English liberty and multiplied English sin to an extent for which England's undeniable world service, service which other methods would have made not less, but greater, furnishes, as the working-out must show ever more and more, no adequate makeweight. It is no new question which confronts us: we cannot plead that we have not full instruction from history. It is the question of Gladstone against Disraeli: it is the question whether America will praise Gladstone with its lips and do the works of Disraeli with its hands. We cannot afford it, thus to strike mankind in the face and cloud the dawning new policies of progress, to push back again the borders of reason which is pushing back so painfully the dominion of force, to militarize this great republic, with which it has been our pride to confront army-ridden Europe, at the very hour when the gospel of peace

has reached even the mouth of czars, to multiply the chances of confusion and war when the best minds of the nations are working for the order and the organization of the world.

The organization of the world has been the dream and goal of prophet minds through the whole modern time. The first great modern man—for Dante was that—made that the central thought of his politics. He spoke in his *Monarchia* of peace,—there can be no sure progress, no sure conservation of civilization, he saw well, till peace is sure; he spoke of freedom; he spoke of justice; but chiefly he spoke of unity. He could conceive it only under the form of universal empire; we, with six centuries more of experience and thought, dream of the federation of the world; but he saw clearly what the centuries have made us see more clearly, that peace and freedom and justice and progress are assured only by unity, the organization of the world. The Bohemian Podiebrad, two centuries after Dante, laid his plan “for the emancipation of peoples and kings by the organization of a new Europe”; and, a century further on, Henry of Navarre and Sully conceived their “Great Design”—of a “Christian republic” of free nations. The seventeenth century began with Emeric la Croix’s *Nouveau Cynée*, in which he discoursed upon the occasion and the means of establishing a general peace and freedom of trade for all the world, arguing for a permanent international diet to be intrusted with the power of settling all international disputes. The century ended with William Penn’s “Plan for the Peace of Europe,” which was a plan for a United States of Europe, most remarkable of all early plans of federation, and most remarkable prophecy and earnest of the United States of the World, which is the ultimate political object to-day. The eighteenth century opened with the great dream of Saint-Pierre: it closed with Immanuel Kant’s “Eternal Peace.” The time would fail to tell of Leibnitz, of Rousseau, of Voltaire, of Goudar, of Mayer, of Fichte, and of Franklin, of Saint-Simon and Fourier, of Seeley and Laveleye and Edward Everett Hale.

Eternal peace, said Immanuel Kant, can come only with the federation of the world, and the federation of the world only with the universal republic, self-government in every nation. There can be peace only as there is organization, adequate, rational machinery to take the place of war when nations fall out with each other. “Lay down your arms!” good men are shouting to the nations. Let the shout be, “Organize the world!” The arms will be laid down, wars will cease, only as an adequate rational appeal and authority

are provided to take their place. "The methods by which war may be superseded," was what the will of Charles Sumner invited the students of Harvard to consider year by year. "I cannot doubt," he said, and still keeps saying, "that the same modes of decision which now prevail between individuals, between towns, and between smaller communities, may be extended to nations." The question of method it is upon which men must fix their attention; and Sumner's creed pointed the way to the true method, to the first step in the organization of the world, which, and which alone, can end the age of war and bring perpetual peace.

We dream of the federation of the world; and we will dream of it, and work for it. But we shall not soon see a world federation like this American federation. There can be no mechanical federation that will be lasting or that would be very useful. We want to study chiefly the chemistry of federation, not its mechanics. This federal republic demands and guarantees that every state within it shall also be a republic. No federation of the world, says Kant, save with self-government in every nation. That is the order,—democracy, unity. The key of the federation is the key of the average; and the federation of tyranny with freedom might well be the fatal form by which tyranny should tyrannize over freedom, leaven and neutralize it, and check its conquest of the world. But the federation of the world will come; and in its spirit let us live, as age by age we extend its institutional borders. And whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule and mind the same thing,—that is the law of new attainment and of advance into larger and yet larger circles of unity.

The wars of Christendom would cease to-morrow if the nations of Christendom would make rules commensurate with their attainments and organize what can be organized in fidelity to freedom and every principle of progress. Only selfishness, jealousy and false ambition delay longer the establishment by the half-dozen great enlightened powers of a permanent international tribunal. With such a tribunal, the Venezuela agitation of three years ago, the wrongs in Cuba and last summer's wasteful and devastating war would have been impossible, while every reform and every right would have been easily and instantly secured. With such a tribunal the recent strained relations between France and England could not have lasted an hour. The fact of a court is in common life the chief and usually sufficient pledge of legal and orderly habits; and the mere existence of the international tribunal will in the better future be the world's protection from a thousand col-

lisions and conditions which now provoke the cannon or might then demand the judge.

In the first place, men, not Americans or Englishmen or Russians,—let us as such go in the first place into court. That may end war, and that is much indeed; but that does not make an organic world. The world is to be organized, not to keep nations peaceful in orderly arbitrament and protected separateness, but for constructive and co-operative life. That life will come as nations see that they are not their own, but all of them members one of another, with common inheritances, with common obligations, and with a common destiny. They will not see it alike, and they will not see it simultaneously. Some great enlightened, chosen nation—shall it not be this federal republic?—will see it, and the vision will make it a centre of union; and to this another nation, by some commanding affinity, will join itself, and another and another will thrill responsive to the call, the leavening word spreading and spreading. And so the state of nations, the organization of the world, will come. It shall be Anglo-Saxondom; it shall be Teutondom; it shall be Christendom; it shall be mankind.

In the Parliament House at Westminster, among the scenes from English history painted on the walls, the American is most stirred when he comes to the Departure of the Pilgrim Fathers to found New England. England—the England descended from the England which “harried them out”—will not let that scene go as a part of American history only, but claims it now as one of the proudest scenes in her own history, too. So the American will no more view Wyclif and Shakespeare and Cromwell and Milton and Gladstone as chiefly Englishmen, but as fellow-citizens,—as he views Victor Hugo and Kant and Tolstoï and Mazzini. The American is to be pitied who does not feel himself native to Stratford and to London, as to St. Louis or St. Paul,—native to Leyden and to Weimar and Geneva. Each narrower circle only gains in richness and in sacredness and power as it expands into the larger and the larger; each community and state and nation, as it enters into a broader and completer organic life. This is the Christmas message to the world. Let there be peace; let there be order; and, that there may be, let us know what manner of men we are. “Peace on earth!” that was the first Christmas greeting; and the first Christian argument upon the hill of Mars, “God hath made of one blood all nations of men.

Kant's "Eternal Peace."

BY EDWIN D. MEAD.

IN 1795, just a century before the sudden excitement in America over the Venezuelan imbroglio roused our people as never before to a sense of their duty to establish a permanent system of arbitration to take the place of war in the settlement of disputes among nations, Immanuel Kant published his great tractate on "Eternal Peace." It was the most remarkable prophecy and program ever made of the day

"When the war-drum throbs no longer, and the battle-flags are furled
In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world."

The prophecy was not forgotten by some of those who in the April days went up to the Arbitration Conference at Washington, the most important gathering which the world has ever seen of men who were in earnest about having the prophecy fulfilled. The name of Immanuel Kant was honored there. But few perhaps remembered the word in his immortal essay which seems a special prophecy of the part which our republic seems destined to take in the promotion of the cause in which the great philosopher was the pioneer and in behalf of which these men from every quarter of the nation came together. "If happy circumstances bring it about," wrote Kant, "that a powerful and enlightened people form themselves into a republic,—which by its very nature must be disposed in favor of perpetual peace,—this will furnish a centre of federative union for other States to attach themselves to, and thus to secure the conditions of liberty among all States, according to the idea of the right of nations; and such a union would extend wider and wider, in the course of time, by the addition of further connections of this kind."

It was a remarkable insight of Kant's that universal peace could come only with the universal republic. The republican constitution, he said, founded on the principle of the liberty

Reprinted from the Editor's Table of the *New England Magazine*, June, 1806. This leaflet may be procured for \$1.50 per hundred copies, or \$10 per thousand, from the Peace Crusade Committee, 14 Bedford Street, Boston.

and equality of its citizens and the dependence of all on a common legislation, is "the only one which arises out of the idea of the original compact upon which all the rightful legislation of a people is founded. As regards public right, the republican principles, therefore, lie originally and essentially at the basis of the civil constitution in all its forms; and the only question for us now is as to whether it is also the only constitution that can lead to a perpetual peace." Kant declares that the republican constitution, having its original source in the conception of right, does include the prospect of realizing perpetual peace; and the reason of this, he says, may be stated as follows: "According to the republican constitution, the consent of the citizens as members of the State is required to determine at any time the question whether there shall be war or not. Hence nothing is more natural than that they should be very loath to enter upon so very undesirable an undertaking; for in decreeing it they would necessarily be resolving to bring upon themselves all the horrors of war. And in their case this implies such consequences as these: to have to fight in their own persons; to supply the costs of the war out of their own property; to have sorrowfully to repair the devastation which it leaves behind; and, as a crowning evil, to have to take upon themselves at the end a burden of debt which will go on embittering peace itself. On the other hand, in a constitution where the subject is not a voting member of the State, resolution to go to war is a matter of the smallest concern in the world. For in this case the ruler, who as such is not a mere citizen, but the owner of the State, need not in the least suffer personally by war, nor has he to sacrifice his pleasures of the table or of the chase or his palaces. He can therefore resolve for war from insignificant reasons, as if it were but a hunting expedition; and he may leave the justification of it without concern to the diplomatic body."

It is certainly true that the development of the idea of international arbitration has been coincident with the growth of modern democracy. It was no accident which made the United States and England the leaders of the nations in the preaching and the practice of this principle; and it was no accident which brought about the conference at Washington, looking to a permanent system of arbitration between these two greatest republics in the world. It was the logic of Kant's philosophy and of the nature of political things. Such a union as it was the object of the Washington conference to bring about will extend by the addition first of those other nations which have advanced farthest in self-government or have be-

come republics in the sense in which Kant uses that term. The republican constitution of Kant's thought is not to be confounded with the democratic constitution. Self-government is often better realized under monarchical than under democratic forms. "Republicanism regarded as the constitutive principle of a State is the political severance of the executive power of the government from the legislative power. Despotism is in principle the irresponsible executive administration of the State by laws laid down and enacted by the same power that administers them, the ruler exercising his own private will as if it were the public will. If the mode of government is to conform to the idea of right, it must embody the representative system; for in this system alone is a really republican government possible. Without representation, no government can possibly be any other than despotic and arbitrary.

Great Britain is to-day among the leading nations of the world the truest republic, according to Kant's definition, after our own republic, because her people are most truly and completely self-governed. There was never so conspicuous and pitiful an instance of failure to distinguish between names and realities as that of Secretary Olney's characterization of the issue between England and Venezuela, in his correspondence with the English government made public in December, 1895, as a collision between monarchical institutions and the principle of self-government. England and the United States, one hemmed and hampered still by the spectre of a crown and the social power of a hereditary aristocracy, the other shackled and encumbered worse by a lawless plutocracy and consuming mammonism, stand side by side as the great exemplars of representative government in the modern world; and the logic of history, we say, and of the profoundest political philosophy decrees the establishment between these republics of the first permanent system of international arbitration, with the sure pledge and prospect that such a union will extend wider and wider until it eventuates in the "universal cosmopolitical institution" of Kant's prophecy.

It was almost a dozen years before the publication of "Eternal Peace," in 1784, that Kant used this great prophetic term, and confidently foretold the end of wars and the reign of international law, in his essay on "The Natural Principle of the Political Order, considered in connection with the Idea of a Universal Cosmopolitical History." It is to be remembered that this essay appeared five years before the outbreak of the French Revolution, and one year after the Treaty of Paris recognized the success of the American Revolution, in

which Kant had taken so deep an interest. "Eternal Peace" was published just after the peace of Basel had recognized the French Republic, seeming to inaugurate a new era of peace in Europe. The later essay was received with far the greater interest at the time, 1,500 copies, we read, being sold in a few weeks, and a second edition appearing the following year; and it is a celebrated essay, while the former essay is but little known save by the special student of Kant. Yet this former essay is, to our thinking, one of the most remarkable works ever written; and, in the revival of interest in political speculation which we are now happily witnessing, it is to be hoped that it will at last receive that attention among ourselves which it deserves. The work is much more than a political essay. It is a work which may be compared, among recent works, with Fiske's "Destiny of Man." It is a survey of the whole movement of nature and of human history, with a view to determine the final end; and its spirit and outcome are singularly like those of Mr. Fiske's treatise, which it preceded by a hundred years. It sees clearly that a serious study of evolution tends to the teleological principle, a study of the character and destiny of man to the idea of God.

The following are the principal of the nine propositions which Kant lays down, and to the unfolding and defence of which his essay is devoted: "All the capacities implanted in a creature by nature are destined to unfold themselves, completely and conformably to their end, in the course of time." "In man, as the only rational creature on earth, those natural capacities which are directed toward the use of his reason could be completely developed only in the species, and not in the individual." "The means which nature employs to bring about the development of all the capacities implanted in men is their mutual antagonism in society, but only so far as this antagonism becomes at length the cause of an order among them that is regulated by law." "The greatest practical problem for the human race, to the solution of which it is compelled by nature, is the establishment of a civil society universally administering right according to law." "The problem of the establishment of a perfect civil constitution is dependent on the problem of the regulation of the external relations between the States conformably to law; and without the solution of this latter problem it cannot be solved." "The history of the human race, viewed as a whole, may be regarded as the realization of a hidden plan of nature to bring about a political constitution internally and, for this purpose, also externally perfect, as the only State in which all the capacities implanted

by her in mankind can be fully developed." This is a remarkable body of doctrine. The essay throughout is instinct with the principle of progress as the cardinal principle for the interpretation of history, a subject to which Kant a few years afterward devoted a special essay. "The idea of human history," he says, "viewed as founded upon the assumption of a universal plan in nature, gives us a new ground of hope, opening up to us a consoling view of the future, in which the human race appears in the far distance as having worked itself up to a condition in which all the germs implanted in it by nature will be fully developed and its destiny here on earth fulfilled. Such a *justification of nature* — or rather, let us say, of *Providence* — is no insignificant motive for choosing a particular point of view in contemplating the course of the world. For what avails it to magnify the glory and wisdom of the creation in the irrational domain of nature, and to recommend it to devout contemplation, if that part of the great display of the supreme wisdom which presents the end of it all in the history of the human race is to be viewed as only furnishing perpetual objections to that glory and wisdom? The spectacle of history, if thus viewed, would compel us to turn away our eyes from it against our will; and the despair of ever finding a perfect rational purpose in its movement would reduce us to hope for it, if at all, only in another world."

This is precisely in the spirit, we say, of the glowing final pages of those most modern books, Mr. Fiske's "Destiny of Man" and "Idea of God." Kant believes in Providence, in God, in nature and in history, in the omnipotence of the right, believes that the fact that a thing ought to be is the sure reason that it will be, that "what is valid on rational grounds as a theory is also valid and good for practice," is the only thing that is ultimately good for practice, and is inevitably bound to be reduced to practice in due order.

The consideration of the rational law of progress here stated brings Kant, in his essay on "The Principle of Progress," to the idea of internationalism. He shows how the lawlessness and caprice of individuals involve evils which alone are sufficient to compel the establishment of the State; "and in like manner," he says, "the evils arising from constant wars by which the States seek to reduce or subdue each other must bring them at last, even against their will, also to enter into a universal or *cosmopolitical constitution*." This may not, he held, assume the form of a universal commonwealth or empire under one head, but of "a *federation* regulated by law according to the *right of nations* as concerted in common." In this essay as

powerfully as in the earlier essay on "The National Principle of the Political Order" and in "Eternal Peace" does he picture the irrationality and monstrosity of war, and assure himself that, just so surely as the world becomes republican, so surely will war yield to arbitration and to federation. "When the decision of the question of war falls to the people,"—it is the same word as that already quoted from "Eternal Peace,"—"neither will the desire of aggrandizement nor mere verbal injuries be likely to induce them to put themselves in danger of personal privation and want by inflicting upon themselves the calamities of war, which the sovereign in his own person escapes. And thus posterity, no longer oppressed by undeserved burdens, and owing it not to the direct love of others for them, but only to the rational self-love of each age for itself, will be able to make progress in moral relations. For each commonwealth, now become unable to injure any other by violence, must maintain itself by right alone; and it may hope on real grounds that the others, being constituted like itself, will then come, on occasions of need, to its aid." There is no possible remedy, he declares, against the evils of war but "*a system of international right* founded upon public laws conjoined with power, to which every State must submit, according to the analogy of the civil or political right of individuals in any one State." To all scepticism about this program and the allegation that it has always been laughed at by statesmen and still more by sovereigns, as an idea fit only for the schools from which it takes its rise, Kant answers roundly: "I trust to a theory which is based upon the principle of right as determining what the relation between men and States *ought to be*, and which lays down to these earthly gods the maxim that they ought so to proceed in their disputes that such a universal International State may be introduced, and to assume it therefore as not only possible in practice, but such as may yet be presented in reality."

Thus everywhere where Kant discusses political relations does the great vision of internationalism and of universal peace secured by law, just as peace is secured in the State because justice is dependent on the court and not the fist, hover before him. Leaving the essay on "Progress," we must, before returning to "Eternal Peace," turn once more to the pages of "The National Principle of the Political Order," for the sake of citing a noteworthy passage at which we have already hinted, following one of his powerful arraignments of war as wasting so ruthlessly the treasures which might be applied to the advancement of enlightenment and the highest good of the

world, as burdening peoples with debts almost impossible to extinguish, and as settling nothing finally and reliably, since might never makes right and every unjust issue in war is the sure seed of future war. So intimate have the political and trade relations of nations become, he urges,— and how vastly truer has the intervening century made it! — that every political disturbance of any State becomes a disturbance of all, which are thus more and more forced by the common danger to offer themselves as arbiters. “In doing so,” says Kant, with marvellous insight and impressiveness, “they are beginning to arrange for a great future political body, such as the world has never yet seen. Although this political body may as yet exist only in a rough outline, nevertheless a feeling begins, as it were, to stir in all its members, each of which has a common interest in the maintenance of the whole. And this may well inspire the hope that, after many political revolutions and transformations, the highest purpose of nature will be at last realized in the establishment of a universal *cosmopolitical institution*, in the bosom of which all the original capacities and endowments of the human race will be unfolded and developed.”

Kant’s “Eternal Peace,” which has a somewhat scholastic form, opens with a section containing several preliminary articles of peace between States, such as: “No conclusion of peace shall be held to be valid when it has been made with the secret reservation of the material for a future war.” “Standing armies shall be entirely abolished in the course of time.” “No national debts shall be contracted in connection with the external affairs of the States.” “No State shall intermeddle by force with the constitution or government of another State.” The reasons for these articles, touching the principal causes of war in his own time as well as in ours, he elaborates at length. But it is in his second section, devoted to the definitive articles of a perpetual peace between States, that his three great constructive principles are stated. Those principles are: (1) that the civil constitution of every State shall be republican; (2) that all international right must be grounded upon a federation of free States; and (3) that right between nations must be limited to the conditions of universal hospitality. The balance of the essay is devoted to discussions of the guarantee of perpetual peace, the present discordance between morals and politics, and the accordance of politics with morals according to the transcendental conception of public right. The guarantee of perpetual peace is furnished, Kant maintains, “by no less a power than the great artist Nature herself”; and he surveys

again the course of evolution with all its struggles and antagonisms, to show that just as individual men, with all their conflicting interests and inclinations, are forced out of a condition of aloofness and lawlessness into the condition of a State, so individual nations are being gradually forced toward arbitration and federation by the sheer dangers and evils of the present disorder, self-interest itself pointing the same way which morality commands. To the objection of the practical politician, that great reforms theoretically admirable cannot be realized because men are what they are, Kant wisely answers that many have large knowledge of *men* without yet truly knowing the nature of *man*. The process of creation cannot be justified if we assume that it never will or can be better with the human race. Kant's cardinal position is that the pure principles of right and justice have objective reality, and can be realized in fact, that it is precisely our vocation to proceed about their realization as fast as we apprehend them, and that failure to do this is really opposed to nature and is dangerous politics. "A true political philosophy cannot advance a step without first paying homage to the principles of morals. The union of politics with morals cuts in two the knots which politics alone cannot untie." When men and States once make up their minds to do their clear duty instead of being selfish and specious, then things which seem hard will rapidly become very simple. "Seek ye first the kingdom of pure practical reason and its *righteousness*," is Kant's exhortation, "and then will your object, the benefit of perpetual peace, be added unto you."

Self-government, a federation of free States, universal hospitality,—these are the features of Kant's great program. "Every form of government which is not representative," he declares, "is a spurious form of government." "For States viewed in relation to each other" — thus he concludes his discussion of federation — "there can be only one way, according to reason, of emerging from that lawless condition which contains nothing but occasions of war. Just as, in the case of individual men, reason would drive them to give up their savage, lawless freedom, to accommodate themselves to public coercive laws, and thus to form an ever-growing State of Nations, such as would at last embrace all the nations of the earth." And his final words in the section upon universal hospitality are these: "The social relations between the various peoples of the world have now advanced everywhere so far that a violation of right in one place of the earth is felt all over it. Hence the idea of a cosmopolitical right of the whole human race is no fantastic or overstrained mode of representing right, but is a

necessary completion of the unwritten code which carries national and international right to a consummation in the public law of mankind."

The English Peace Society published a translation of "Eternal Peace," by J. D. Morell, a dozen years ago. We would suggest to our American Peace Society the circulation of an edition of this little book in America at this time, when the thought of our people is turned to the subject of international arbitration more definitely than ever before. More recently the essay has been translated, along with Kant's other popular political essays, by W. Hastie, of Edinburgh, who had previously translated Kant's "Philosophy of Law," and published in a little volume (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark) entitled "Kant's Principles of Politics."* Besides "Eternal Peace," "The Principle of the Political Order," and "The Principle of Progress," already referred to, this volume also contains the essay on "Principles of Political Right," written in 1793, which the translator properly characterizes as the philosophical counterpart and ultimate expression of the American Declaration of Independence, and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man. "The one thinker," says Mr. Hastie, "who completely understood the purpose and end of the whole movement,"—of the eighteenth-century revolutions, viewed as the culmination of the political science of the centuries,— "and who was capable of giving it its profoundest and largest expression, was Immanuel Kant."

It was Kant's intention to crown his philosophical achievements by a "System of Politics," worked out in accordance with the general principles of his philosophy; but he was reluctantly compelled in his seventy-seventh year to abandon this long-cherished intention. But the political essays which he wrote, and which are now placed in the hands of the English reader in such admirable form, indicate sufficiently what the lines of his system of politics would have been. It is an impressive fact that the interests of social and political reconstruction were those which in the closing period of his full life chiefly engaged the greatest thinker of the modern world. For that Immanuel Kant was. The general estimate of his place held by philosophic men is, as expressed by Hutchison Sterling, "that of the greatest German philosopher, greatest modern philosopher, greatest of all philosophers, with the usual exceptions of Plato and Aristotle." He revolutionized philosophy. His contributions to physical science were hardly

* Since the above was written, the American Peace Society have published a translation of "Eternal Peace," by Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood. This may be procured of the society (3 Somerset Street, Boston) for 20 cents per copy or \$12 per hundred copies.

less brilliant and fruitful than his contributions to metaphysics. He was one of the greatest mathematicians and astronomers of all time. To him, and not to Laplace, belongs, as is now recognized by all scientific writers on astronomy, the merit of the origin of the nebular theory. Mr. Hastie is not extravagant in saying that, had he never written anything but his "Universal History of Nature and Theory of the Heavens," he would have ranked as the first of the modern evolutionists and the founder of scientific cosmology. His work in ethics was yet greater and more far-reaching in its results than his work in physics. To quote Mr. Hastie again, referring to Kant's later, practical works, "In all these works he shows himself to be the universal philosopher of humanity, the greatest of the modern moralists, and the initiator of a new era of political science." It is to Kant's greatness on this side that men are now awaking as never before. The philosophers have long been shouting, "Back to Kant!" This now begins to be the cry of the politician and the humanitarian. "I have not yet lost my feeling for humanity," were the great philosopher's last words. It was to humanity, to the State, to the peace and federation of the world, that his last labors were given. "By inclination," he once said, "I am an inquirer. I feel all the thirst for knowledge and the eager unrest of striving to advance, as well as satisfaction with every kind of progress. There was a time when I thought all this could form the glory of mankind; and I despised the rabble who know nothing. Rousseau brought me to the right view. This blinding superiority vanished. *I learned to honor men*; and I should regard myself as much more useless than the common laborers, did I not believe that this way of thinking could communicate a value to all others in establishing the rights of mankind."

It is the logic of events, of history and progress, which has now brought the world, or has brought England and America, to the necessity and the determination of practically and definitely establishing the reign of peace and international law. But it should be an inspiration and a reassurance to all who are working for this high end in the two countries to know that this is the logic, the prophecy, and the program of the greatest philosopher of modern time. "England," says the English translator of the political essays of Kant, which it is the purpose of these pages to commend to the study of our people, "has acted out the principles which Kant has thought out and held up for universal imitation and embodiment; and this holds even more literally of the New England of America.

In Kant the student will find the fundamental principles of all the best political and social science of the nineteenth century, the soundest exposition of constitutional government, and the first clear adumbration of the great doctrines of federation and universal law, which are now stirring in the hearts of the peoples."

Charles Sumner's More Excellent Way.

BY EDWIN D. MEAD.

CHARLES SUMNER began his public life by what he himself called a *declaration of war against war*. His great oration in Tremont Temple on "The True Grandeur of Nations" marked, his biographer rightly observes, the most important epoch in Sumner's life. "Had he died before this event, his memory would have been only a tradition with the few early friends who survive him. The 4th of July, 1845, gave him a national, and more than a national, fame." Epoch-making in Sumner's own life, we think it may be safely said that no oration which he ever gave has greater intrinsic importance, and that no other will be read so long. Of all pleas made by American men for the rule of peace on earth, it is by far the noblest and most comprehensive. There is almost no argument against war which it does not somehow make use of; and the advocate of peace in all the years returns to it, and returns again, for support and inspiration.

There was nothing upon which Sumner dwelt with greater emphasis in this famous oration than upon the cost and waste of war and the incalculable advantage that would result from the diversion of these misapplied resources to purposes of education and the real development and progress of society. Passing from the fearful cost of war itself, he discussed the regular, permanent expense of the war footing,—the preparations for war in time of peace. His survey of the armies and navies and fortifications of Europe is interesting to-day chiefly as revealing how startlingly the burden has increased in the fifty years between then and now. In the United States he found that the average annual appropriation for military and naval purposes was 80 per cent. of the total annual expenses of the government. "Yes, eighty cents in every dollar were applied in this unproductive manner. The remaining twenty cents sufficed to maintain the government in all its branches,

Reprinted from the "Editor's Table" of the *New England Magazine*, October, 1898. This leaflet may be procured for \$1.50 per hundred copies, or \$10 per thousand, from the Peace Crusade Committee, 1 Beacon Street, Boston.

executive, legislative and judicial, the administration of justice, our relations with foreign nations, the post-office, and all the light-houses which, in happy, useful contrast with the forts, shed their cheerful signals over the rough waves, beating upon our long coast." In the years from the formation of our government, in 1789, down to the time when Sumner spoke, almost twelve times as much was sunk under the sanction of the national government in mere peaceful preparations for war as was dedicated by the government during the same period to all other purposes whatever. Of the military expenses of the United States from that time to this, all of us know something.

But "the passage which was most striking at the time," says Sumner's biographer, "according to the testimony of hearers still living, was the one where, treating of the immense waste of war defences, he compared the coast of the 'Ohio,' a ship-of-the-line lying in the harbor and, on account of its decorations, a marked spectacle of the day, with that of Harvard College."

"Within cannon range of this city," he said, "stands an institution of learning which was one of the earliest cares of our forefathers, the conscientious Puritans. Favored child in an age of trial and struggle, carefully nursed through a period of hardship and anxiety, endowed at that time by the oblations of men like Harvard, sustained from its first foundation by the parental arm of the commonwealth, by a constant succession of munificent bequests, and by the prayers of good men, the University at Cambridge now invites our homage, as the most ancient, most interesting, and most important seat of learning in the land."

He spoke of its library, the oldest and most valuable in the country, its museums, its schools of law, divinity, and medicine, its body of professors and teachers, "many of whose names help to keep the name of the country respectable in every part of the globe where science, learning, and taste are cherished, and its distinguished president, Josiah Quincy, who had rendered such high public service in so many fields. "Such," he said, "is Harvard University; and as one of the humblest of her children, happy in the memories of a youth nurtured in her classic retreats, I cannot allude to her without an expression of filial affection and respect. It appears," he added, "from the last report of the treasurer, that the whole available property of the University, the various accumulations of more than two centuries of generosity, amounts"—1845 was still the day of small things at Harvard—"to \$703,175."

"Change the scene," said Sumner, "and cast your eyes upon another object. There now swings idly at her moorings in this harbor a ship of

the line, the 'Ohio,' carrying ninety guns, finished as late as 1836 at an expense of \$547,888, repaired only two years afterwards for \$233,012, with an armament which has cost \$53,945, making an aggregate of \$834,845." —1845 was still the day of small things in battle-ships, — "as the actual outlay at this moment for that single ship, more than \$100,000 beyond all the available wealth of the richest and most ancient seat of learning in the land!"

He referred to the "Ohio" because that ship happened to be in the harbor, not because it afforded the strongest case. The expense of the "Delaware," in 1842, had reached \$1,051,000. He pursued the comparison further. The expenditures of the University during the preceding year had been \$47,935. The cost of the "Ohio" for one year of service was \$220,000. "For the annual sum lavished on a single ship of the line, four institutions like Harvard University might be supported." The pay of the captain of a ship like the "Ohio" was \$4,500: the salary of the president of Harvard University was \$2,235.

"If the large endowments of Harvard University," he continued, "are dwarfed by comparison with a single ship-of-the-line, how must it be with other institutions of learning and beneficence, less favored by the bounty of many generations? The average cost of a sloop of war is \$315,000, — more, probably, than all the endowments of those twin stars of learning in the western part of Massachusetts, the colleges at Williamstown and Amherst, and of that single star in the east, the seminary at Andover. The yearly expense of a sloop of war in service is about \$50,000, — more than the annual expenditures of these three institutions combined."

"Take all the institutions of learning and beneficence," so Sumner concluded his arraignment, "the crown jewels of the Commonwealth, — schools, colleges, hospitals, asylums, — and the sums by which they have been purchased and preserved are trivial and beggarly compared with the treasures squandered within the borders of Massachusetts in vain preparations for war, — upon the navy yard at Charlestown, with its stores on hand, costing \$4,741,000, the fortifications in the harbors of Massachusetts, where untold sums are already sunk, and it is now proposed to sink \$3,875,000 more, and the arsenal at Springfield, containing, in 1842, 175,118 muskets, valued at \$2,099,998, and maintained by an annual appropriation of \$200,000, — whose highest value will ever be, in the judgment of all lovers of truth, that it inspired a poem which in influence will be mightier than a battle, and will endure when arsenals and fortifications have crumbled to earth.

" ' Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts,
Given to redeem the human mind from error,
There were no need of arsenals or forts.' "

At the Alumni dinner at Harvard in Commencement week, last June, the attention of Harvard and of the country was recalled to these old utterances of Sumner's in an emphatic and surprising way. Charles Francis Adams, the president of

the Alumni, who spoke chiefly of the Civil War, observed, in introducing President Eliot, after critical words upon the character and tendencies of the war with Spain, that the cost of the war, estimated at \$40,000,000 per month, would run three hundred and sixty-five universities of the size of Harvard. Taking up this word in opening his speech, President Eliot said:—

I am not sure I shall be able to follow President Adams in the line he has suggested. The quick capital of Harvard University is not more than the cost of two battle-ships; but can we compute what those battle-ships may win? It was Charles Sumner, who looks down upon us from the other side of this hall, who first made comparisons of that nature; and some years after he had made them there came upon us the terrific struggle which President Adams has been describing so eloquently. About that time I came to the conclusion that the whole argument of Charles Sumner was a fallacious one.

President Eliot said other things concerning war and patriotism, in his speech, upon which, were this a more general word upon those subjects, we should have something to say. He spoke with manifest approval and with warmth of those students who upon any call to arms “offered their lives and their labor to their country without much thought except for love,—just as a lover throws a rose at the feet of his mistress. The educated youth,” he said, “who loves his country, does not stop to consider in what precise cause his country has gone to war.” We should have something to say concerning these utterances because, while all who are familiar with President Eliot’s position upon public matters must know well how he himself, speaking more leisurely and deliberately, would supplement and qualify them, we consider their primary and natural significance and influence so vicious (to use the word which, instead of fallacious, the newspapers attributed to President Eliot in his characterization of Sumner’s argument). Their influence seems to us especially dangerous in a time like that through which we have been passing. They do not describe what seems to us the desirable or right state of mind for “the educated youth.” It may become the solemn duty of the educated youth, as of each common citizen, to serve his country, even on the battlefield, in a cause to which he does not believe his country has been wisely or rightly committed, because far more may depend upon his country’s integrity and welfare than upon anything balanced in a special policy. But if the educated youth in our universities do not “stop to consider,” if they do not ask questions, if they are not trained to discriminate between causes, the causes in which their country goes to war, determining soberly and rationally what cause

they can support zealously, what reluctantly, and what not at all,—if such be the case with our educated youth, what will be the case with the unlearned and the untrained, and what must be the fate of the republic?

No one surely knows better than President Eliot himself the difference between causes and between the services which the educated youth may be asked to render his government. Of the Civil War and the war with Spain he declared distinctly, in this same speech, “The two wars, in their origin and motive, can hardly be compared”; and no one would ever suspect him of any general spirit of jingoism or militarism. Two newspapers lying on our table as we write quote trenchant words from him of the sort necessary for these times. The first passage is from the close of a recent address:—

After everything possible has been said in favor of martial virtues and achievements, whenever our people really take up the question how best to win glory, honor, and love for free institutions in general and the American Republic in particular, whether in our own eyes or in the eyes of other nations and later times, they will come to the conclusion that more glory, honor, and love are to be won by national justice, sincerity, patience in failure, and generosity in success than by national impatience, combativeness, and successful self-seeking, by as much as the virtues and ideals of civilized man excel those of barbarous man.

The second passage is from his address at the Washington Conference in 1896 in the interest of a permanent arbitration treaty with England. In that address he spoke of the recent jingoism in this country as “a detestable thing,” “an offensive foreign importation,” “a delusion than which a more complete cannot be imagined.”

“What other powerful nation,” he asked, “has dispensed with a standing army? What other nation with an immense seaboard has maintained but an insignificant fleet? It has been our glory to be safe, though without fortresses, fleets, or armies.” “I, too,” he exclaimed, “believe that this nation has a mission in the world, a noble mission; but it is not that of armed force. It is not by force of arms that we may best commend to the peoples of the earth the blessings of liberty and self-government, but rather by taking millions from various peoples into our own land, and here giving them experience of the advantages of freedom. . . . There is only one other means by which we should teach these principles to men. It is by example,—by giving a persuasive example, of happiness and prosperity, arrived at through living in freedom and at peace. Never should we advocate the extension of our institutions by force of arms, either on sea or land.”

We believe, says the writer who recalls this Washington address of President Eliot's, that Sumner would have called it a consummate practical statement of his argument, and would

have recognized his own voice in the noble passage quoted. "We appeal from President Eliot, the Alumni dinner orator in time of the excitement and delirium of war, to President Eliot in time of peace and sobriety."

With President Eliot, therefore, we should be slow to believe that we have any long or fundamental controversy. But with his word at Harvard in June, with any reflection upon Sumner's argument in "The True Grandeur of Nations," we do have controversy. We can think of nothing more dangerous or deplorable, especially at this time in America, than encouragement to our educated youth to view that great argument and vision as vicious or fallacious. We believe that in the line of Sumner's thought lies the hope of the world; and we believe that those who think as Sumner thought, should, without recourse to any generalities, to anything remote in time or place, apply that principle firmly and sweepingly to the situation through which the republic has been passing and the situation which confronts us to-day.

We have spent \$300,000,000 in a war with Spain. We are in the outer circles of the maelstrom of a policy which means larger armies, larger navies, costlier forts, and more of them, and all the paraphernalia of the Old World militarism which we have prided ourselves on being free from,—with the corresponding burdens of taxation, the devotion to waste and destruction of the immense resources which might otherwise go to development and progress. The man who does not see that we are in the outer circles of this maelstrom is a fool; and the man who, seeing it, has no forebodings, is not a student of history. Is this way of spending money, which is now proposed to the republic,—to put Sumner's question directly to ourselves,—a wise way? Is it protective, is it constructive, is it good business, is it common sense, does it pave a good road into the future, is it the economical and promising way to secure the results we claim to aim at, will it make us a truer and safer democracy, and will it help the world? Was Sumner right, was Longfellow right, or was he not, in claiming that, if half the wealth bestowed on camps, given to maintain armies and navies, were given to redeem the human mind, to educate the human race, there would soon be no need of armies and navies?

We have spent \$300,000,000 in a war with Spain. Have we spent it well? Have we done the most that could be done with \$300,000,000 to accomplish what we claimed to want to accomplish? Our object in going to war with Spain was to make Cuba free, to make it a better place to live in, to insure

it better government, and make its people comfortable and happy. Have we done it? Have we got our money's worth? Has our way of spending our \$300,000,000 been best, or would Sumner's way have been best? If in the midst of last April's perplexities the senator who sits in Sumner's seat had addressed words like the following to the senate and the nation, would they have been vicious or fallacious words?

We are clearly drifting towards a war with Spain in behalf of Cuba. In a month, unless we show wisdom greater than the past has shown, we shall be in the midst of war. That war will cost us \$300,000,000. Is there not a better way of spending \$300,000,000? Is there not a better way of achieving what we aim at,—the freedom, good government, and development of Cuba? I propose that we submit to Cuba and to Spain this offer and request: Let us establish at Havana a university as well equipped as Harvard University, with an endowment of \$10,000,000, free to every young man and woman of Cuba, with the best professors who can be secured from America and Spain and England and France and Germany. Let us establish at Santiago and Matanzas and Puerto Principe colleges like Amherst and Williams, with a total endowment of \$10,000,000; and in each of the twenty largest towns a high school or academy, at a cost of \$10,000,000. Let us devote \$20,000,000—\$1,000,000 a year for twenty years—to the thorough planting in Cuba of our American common-school system; \$10,000,000 to the promotion of a system of free public libraries, making books as accessible and common in each Cuban town and village as in Barnstable or Berkshire; and \$6,000,000 for the maintenance in each of the six provinces of a newspaper conducted by the best men who can be enlisted in the service, bringing all Cuban men and women into touch with all the world, giving them those things which will feed them, and not giving them those things which would poison them. Let us build a Cuban Central Railroad through the whole length of the island, from Mantua to Maysi; and let us devote the balance of \$100,000,000 to the scientific organization, by proper bureaus, of Cuban agriculture, industry, and commerce. Let there be a truce for ten years, till these things are done and begin to show their fruits; and then let the representatives of the United States and Spain meet at Havana to settle the "Cuban question" as it then exists. This, fellow-citizens of America, seems to me worth trying. If it succeeds, we should at least have saved \$200,000,000; and it would be, I think, a kind of success more pregnant with good for Cuba and Spain and America and humanity than the success which we may be celebrating next September. I spent the still hours of last night, leaving all this hurly-burly, reading Charles Sumner's solemn words on "The True Grandeur of Nations"; and his message has commanded me to submit this proposition to you at this hour. There are those of you who will laugh and scoff, and say the thought is all chimerical, vicious, and fallacious; but I say unto you, in the name of the God of our fathers, that with those of you who do not think so lies the hope of the world. I say that the kingdom of God can come in this world, that peace and justice and fraternity can come among men, that democracy itself has a safe future, only as some elect people, with sublime abandon, in a great opportunity, does this thing,—taking, in this world of undeniable and conflicting risks, the heroic risk,—the risk which alone has in it hope for the world and relish of salvation. And our opportunity is now.

We wish that these considerations might sink deeply into the heart of every member of Harvard University and into the hearts of all the educated youth of America. If our republic is to be true to itself, if we are to help civilization forward and not backward, then the young men of our universities and all of us who look at war and national defence and national grandeur in the old way have got to be born again,—nothing less than that,—baptized with the spirit wherewith Charles Sumner was baptized, and have our eyes opened to see that his way is the only right or sensible or efficient way, and that now we are wasting our substance and defeating ourselves. The revolution in the point of view is as radical as the difference between Ptolemy and Copernicus; but, when we go through it, things fall at once into order, we find ourselves in a rational world with right means for right ends, and our old notions of what is wise and prudent and necessary for the defence and upbuilding and influence of the nation instantly dissolve, stamped all as vicious and fallacious. Our thoughts on what it is that makes a nation strong need almost all of them to be turned inside out. Our economics and generousities are all Ptolemaic. We boast of public and private munificences in education and philanthropy. We need to understand that we are yet in the kindergarten of munificence as concerns all positive, constructive, and real things. It would sometimes seem as if, were the devil privileged to organize the world so as to thwart struggling men most effectually, wasting their accumulations and cutting forever the margin of civilization, he would choose precisely what he now sees,—the dominance of false political ideals and of gross unintelligence as to how men and nations should spend their money. If an eleventh commandment were to be added to the decalogue, it should be one addressed to nations, and should be: Thou shalt not waste thy substance. Last spring, as the war with Spain began,—a war whose aim and motive we justified and praised, although we held with the President and the Secretary of State and the minister to Spain that it was wholly unnecessary for the attainment of its aim,—we wrote in these pages the following words: as the war ends, we repeat them, as another statement for this time of Sumner's argument, the economic argument, which our educated youth and all of us who wish to see the world get on need to ponder upon in a far severer and more serious way than most of us are wont to do:

Every war gives new life to that old notion which died so hard, but which is responsible for so much mischief in the world, that patriotism is

somehow bound up with war,—the patriotic man, the man who fights or wants to fight for his country. Congress, “in a great wave of patriotism,” we read, appropriates fifty million dollars for gun-boats and torpedoes. No “wave of patriotism” is reported when Massachusetts appropriates a million dollars for good roads, when New York appropriates five millions for new school-houses or Chicago ten millions for an exposition, when Boston builds a library, when the Adirondack forests are secured, when the college is endowed, and when good wages are paid in the factory. There may be exigencies when the appropriation of fifty million dollars or five hundred millions for national defence or for national offence is the duty imposed upon the patriot; but the man who votes for guns and gun-boats with a glow and an excitement which he does not feel when he has opportunity to help on the great interests of education, science, art, and industry, may be very sure that his glow is not the honest glow of patriotism, but is very likely the excitement of the tiger and the savage, which still lives on in good society and dies so hard in half-civilized and even civilized men. It happens every day that a council, a legislature, or a congress, will buoyantly—without computation, without protest, and without debate—vote the people’s thousands or millions of money for some great waste, some great destruction—new cruisers and new forts—when some poor pittance is grudgingly doled out or grudgingly denied—each dollar pinched and challenged—for the measure of philanthropy, of conservation, of construction, of education, of relief, of encouragement or high enterprise, whose generous and bold advancement would do so much to hasten the day when forts and cruisers shall be unnecessary and obsolete. Society is zealous and lavish on its displays and its defences,—its dams and sewers and police and armament,—and blind and niggardly a thousand times as to the things which affect its fountains and its real vitality, the interests of the discipline and the construction which make protection needless.

The lifelong position of Charles Sumner upon the subject of armies and navies and forts and wars is to be commended to the educated youth of America at this time as a position peculiarly worthy of their adoption, imperatively worthy of their earnest thought. Sumner was not a non-resistant, not a man of “peace at any price.” We know how warmly and efficiently, in his place in the Senate, he supported the government in the Civil War; and we know how otherwise he appealed to force when that appeal was necessary and just. We know how he believed in strong government and hated imbecile police, how he spoke of “the sword of the magistrate” in the very record of his services for peace. But the great principles of his “True Grandeur of Nations” were the principles of his whole life, from a time long before that oration to the last hour, when he bequeathed a thousand dollars to Harvard University for an annual prize for the best essay on Universal Peace. We do not remember any autobiographical passage in his writings so impressive as that in which, replying to unfriendly criticism, he gives an account of his devotion to the peace movement. We do not remember any passage anywhere which we would commend so earnestly at this time to

the students of Harvard University as one worth striving to be able to parallel in their own autobiographies.

“My name,” he wrote, “is connected somewhat with two questions, which may be described succinctly as those of peace and slavery. That which earliest enlisted me, and which has always occupied much of my thoughts, is the peace question. When scarcely nine years old, it was my fortune to listen to President Quincy’s address before the Peace Society, delivered in the Old South Church. It made a deep and lasting impression on my mind; and though, as a boy and youth, I surrendered myself to the illusions of battles and wars, still, as I came to maturity, I felt too keenly their wickedness and woe. A lecture which I heard from William Ladd, in the old court-house at Cambridge, shortly after I left college, confirmed these impressions.” He tells how he expressed his ripened convictions to his friends, and how, going to Europe, he often dwelt upon them there. In Paris, when M. Victor Foucher submitted for his criticism the manuscript of his treatise upon the law of nations, Sumner, observing that he had adopted, among his fundamental principles, that war was recognized as the necessary arbitrament between nations, ventured to discuss this dogma, and, while admitting that it was accepted by every publicist up to that time, suggested to him to be the first to brand it as unchristian and barbarous and to declare that the institution of war, defined and sanctioned by the law of nations as a mode of determining justice between them, was but another form of the ordeal by battle, which was once regarded as a proper mode of determining justice between individuals. Returning to Boston after his two years and a half in Europe, he tells of the little meeting of the American Peace Society to which he found his way in the very month of his arrival. “The Rev. Henry Ware was in the chair. I think there were not more than twelve persons present. We met in a small room under the Marlboro Chapel. On motion of Doctor Gannett, I was placed on the executive committee.” He tells of his humble efforts for the cause in the next few years; and then he comes to the oration on the 4th of July, 1845. “The position taken by me on this occasion has drawn upon me not a little criticism,—perhaps I might use a stronger expression. Convinced of its intrinsic propriety and importance, I have been drawn, on subsequent occasions, by an inevitable necessity, to sustain and fortify it. I hope that I shall always be willing to maintain it.”

Universal peace, the methods by which war may be permanently superseded,—these were ever the burden of his thought and study, of addresses to the public and letters to friends; and ever the economic argument is at the front. “I wish our country would cease to whet its tusks,” he writes to Doctor Howe in 1843. “The appropriations of the navy last year were nine million dollars. Imagine half—nay, a tithe—of this sum given annually to objects of humanity, education and literature! I know of nothing in our government that troubles me more than this thought.” To his brother George in 1844: “I would not vote a dollar for any engine of war. One war-steamer costs more than all the endowments of Harvard College. Nations keep standing armies and Paixhan guns—sharpen their tusks—that they may be prepared for war.

Far better to be always prepared for peace." Again: "What a boon to France, if her half million of soldiery were devoted to the building of railways and other internal improvements, instead of passing the day in carrying superfluous muskets! What a boon to Paris, if the immense sums absorbed in her fortifications were devoted to institutions of benevolence! She has more to fear from the poverty and wretchedness of her people than from any foreign foe." No crime was to him so great as that of the country which "entered into war for the sordid purpose of securing a few more acres of land." No letter that came to him among the many drawn out by "The True Grandeur of Nations" was more welcome than that from Theodore Parker,—his first letter to Sumner, the beginning of their friendship,—defending him from the attacks of "men of low morals, who can only swear by their party and live only in public opinion," and exclaiming: "The Church and State are both ready to engage in war, however unjust, if a little territory can be added to the national domain thereby. The great maxims of Christianity—the very words of Christ—are almost wholly forgotten." Full of faith in the republic, confident in the influence its institutions were destined to exert over the ancient establishments of Europe, he prayed "that a race of men may be reared among us competent to understand the destinies of the country, to abjure war, and to give extension and influence to our institutions by cultivating the arts of peace, by honesty, and by dignity of life and character." In the cause of peace lay to him the hope of the world. "It is destined," he said, "to a triumph much earlier than many imagine. It is so necessary to meet the financial embarrassments of Europe and the humane aspirations of the age that it must succeed. Let it be presented carefully and clearly, let the incalculable good it has in store be unfolded, and people must feel its practicability. . . . I have full faith in a coming era of humanity; but I believe it is to be brought about by removing existing evils, by education, and especially by removing the great evil and expense of war preparations or the war system. If the friends of progress in Europe would aim at the armies and navies, direct all their energies at these monster evils, all else that can reasonably be desired will soon follow. Why not sound the idea in the ears of Europe?" It was to his brother, then in Europe, that he wrote, in 1849. His call has been heard, fifty years afterward, by the Czar of Russia.

In 1849, four years after the oration on "The True Grandeur of Nations," he delivered an address on "The Abolition of the War System in the Commonwealth of Nations," advocating

instead of the arbitrament of arms a Congress of Nations with a high court of judicature or arbitration; and the next year, as chairman of the Peace Congress for this country, he prepared an address to the people of the United States, recommending these methods. In 1870 he was still enforcing the truths which he enforced in 1845. He gave in many places, in the autumn of that year, a lecture on the war between France and Prussia, pointing as its moral that the war system should be discarded and the nations should disarm themselves. In 1873 he was invited to be one of the speakers at the public meeting held at Steinway Hall, New York, to stimulate a war spirit against Spain at the time of the seizure of the "Virginus,"—a meeting at which Mr. Evarts presided, and made an inflammatory speech; but he declined, and instead sent a letter of a spirit directly opposite to that of the meeting, in which he insisted on waiting for evidence and on considerate treatment of the Spanish republic, and discountenanced the belligerent preparations then under way in our navy yards, which involved burdensome expenditure and encouraged an unhealthy war fever. In 1873, also, in the last summer of his life, he sent a letter of congratulation to Henry Richards, who had succeeded in carrying through the House of Commons a motion in favor of international arbitration. "It marks an epoch in a great cause. There is no question so supremely practical; for it concerns not merely one nation, but every nation, and even its discussion promises to diminish the terrible chances of war. Its triumph would be the greatest reform of history." At the same time he wrote to his English friend, Robert Ingham:—

I have been cheered by the vote of the House of Commons on Mr. Richard's motion. . . . It cannot fail to exert a prodigious influence. I know no reform which promises such universal good as the release of any considerable portion of present war expenditures or expenditure on armaments, so that they can be applied to purposes of civilization. It is absurd to call this Utopian. . . . Here is an open and incessant waste. Why not stop it? Here is something which keeps human thoughts on bloodshed, and rears men to slay each other. Why not turn their thoughts to things which contribute to human happiness? Mr. Richard has done a great work, and so has the House of Commons. . . . Such a presentation of the case must have an effect on the continent as well as in England, teaching reason. I shall not live to see the great cause triumph. I often wish I had been born a few years later, and one reason is because I long to witness the harmony of nations, which I am sure is near. When an evil so great is recognized and discussed, the remedy must be at hand.

But it was to Harvard University that Charles Sumner addressed his first striking message and his last, in behalf of the rule of peace. The first message was through Henry Ware. Mr. Ware, a graduate of Harvard of the Class of 1843, writes:

I went with Professor Felton one day, just after our Commencement parts had been assigned, into Sumner's office; and he, kindly asking what I had got, and being told that I had to *do* a Latin oration, asked me what subject I had chosen. I replied that I had not yet found a text to my mind. "Then," said he, "I will give you one,—*De imperio pacis*: talk about *that*." And, says Mr. Ware, I did.

His last message was through his will, the most memorable provision of which was as follows:—

I bequeath to the President and Fellows of Harvard College one thousand dollars in trust, for an annual prize for the best dissertation by any student of the College, or any of its schools, undergraduate or graduate, on Universal Peace and the methods by which war may be permanently superseded. I do this in the hope of drawing the attention of students to the practicability of organizing peace among nations, which I sincerely believe may be done. I cannot doubt that the same modes of decision which now prevail between individuals, between towns, and between smaller communities, may be extended to nations.

We cannot doubt that more and more, as days go on, the attention of the students of Harvard University will be drawn to Sumner's last solemn call and charge,—that this "most ancient, most interesting, and most important seat of learning in the land," to which in the sweep of his great oration he could not allude without pausing to pay his tribute of filial affection, will more and more become a centre where educated and aspiring youth, with their hearts kindled by Sumner's gospel and with great visions of a better future, will provoke each other to high argument, and in times of war prepare for peace. Upon each student's desk shall lie, as a book of each student's Bible, the great oration of the greatest son of Harvard who in the memory of men now living has gone forth from Harvard's halls into the councils of the nation. And no page of it will be pondered more than that which sets forth how, if we would transfer to the offices of education and development the millions now appropriated so lavishly for destruction and defence, the need of destruction and defence would quickly cease.

With two causes the name of the great Harvard senator is identified,—the cause of freedom and the cause of peace. From the wall of the memorial hall which Harvard built to commemorate the services of her sons in the cause of freedom, Sumner's face looks down upon the hundreds of students gathering daily in that most holy place, and upon the hundreds of alumni who, "in the memories of a youth nurtured in her classic retreats," come up to the ancient University as each Commencement week comes round. As that face looks down on them in the years to come, may it not

speaking chiefly to them of the past, of the victory of the cause of freedom, whose fruits we enjoy to-day, but of the future, the triumph, which he so longed to live to see and which the educated youth of America can do so much to hasten, of the cause of universal peace. Ever and ever may Harvard consider wherein the true grandeur of nations lies, and ever and ever hear the first and last message of her great statesman giving a new burden and new power to her great singer's gospel:—

“ Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts,
Given to redeem the human mind from error,
There were no need of arsenals or forts.”

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 033 266 039.1