“Then he showed four lights when he wished them to set full sail and follow in his wake.”

From “First Voyage ‘Round the World by Magellan.”

FRIENDLY RELATIONS COMMISSIONS

After this war is over, unless peace brings with it a greater amount of world organization than we internationalists dare to hope, there will still be numerous independent sovereign nations, each jealous of its rights and aspirations, although at the same time wishing to remain at peace. The foreign offices of these nations will be looking after their respective interests, and the armies and navies will be preparing, we dread to think how vigorously, to maintain these interests by force; but what will be done officially by any nation towards realizing this almost universal desire to avoid wars?

One thing that a nation could do is to establish a number of permanent commissions, each assigned to a foreign nation or group of nations, for the purpose of making a thorough study of the international situation and recommending policies necessary for the maintenance of friendly relations. It would be a function of these commissions to get in touch with various elements in the foreign countries, such as business and labor organizations, and by thorough publicity keep public opinion at home informed as to the real economic needs of these countries, the sentiments and aims of their people and any cause for grievances which exist, thereby making for a better understanding between the peoples and greater readiness to cooperate in straightening out difficulties by peaceful means. Furthermore, these commissions would formulate plans for preventing hostilities and promoting friendship more or less regardless of the commercial interests of their country, and it would then be incumbent upon the nation to decide first as to whether carrying out such plans would be consistent with these interests or not, and if not, then as to whether the friendship involved would be worth the necessary sacrifice.

Friendly Relations Commissions of this sort would become the rallying point for all those liberal and constructive forces of the nation which profit by the continuance of peace, just as war departments are centers for the propaganda for war and armaments by those who profit thereby. And as the war department of a government is engaged in time of peace on plans for hostilities with other nations, regarding them as potential enemies, so these Commissions, forming a kind of Department of Peace, could constantly present to the nation plans for maintaining peace; though not having power to enforce such policies any more than the war department has the power to decide upon war. And, finally, just as the latter by preparations and propaganda tends to keep the nation in a warlike frame of mind and to make other nations distrustful, so these Friendly Relations Commissions would not only be working out schemes for peaceful cooperation, but by their very existence and activities would create an atmosphere of trust and conciliation, which is so essential for the great task of international organization.

A. D.
Hating Germany

With Other Notes on New Books

If we are going to fight Germany, we've got to hate Germany. Hate as well as ammunition has to be manufactured in preparation for war. It doesn't do to let the supply of either run low. And if we are to hate Germany, Madeleine Doty's book, "The War in Germany," is indispensable. The proposed "quarantine" (Century, $1.50), ought to be suppressed. You cannot hate starving women and children. You can ignore them, but you cannot learn to love them. This war, Miss Doty's book makes clear, has resolved itself into a contest of starvation. The German people, like a futile policy, says Miss Doty, this trying to starve a nation into submission. For, who starves? Not the governing class, nor the war-makers—but the women and children, the old and the helpless. The book is an aunt of two visits to Europe, but by far the more interesting part of it is this picture of Germany in 1918.

Mr. Herbert Bayard Swope has also been in Germany twice. He brings out some interesting contrasts in his book, "Inside the German Empire" (Century, $2.00). On his first visit he found that the German motto was "Siegem." On his second visit he found it changed to "Durchhalten." Strangely enough the quality of German patriotism seems to be exactly the same as that of the other countries at war. This, too, will tend to make lasting difficult if we once open our minds to it. (Of course, we won't!) The book reveals some very curious ideas that prevail in Germany. For instance, it seems generally believed that there is a secret alliance between the United States and Great Britain. No wonder they blow up our ships! The election of James Buchanan is new ancient history and in the present reign of loyalty it may be bad form to mention it. But by the time starting to hate Germany would have chased the defeat of Wilson as a victory! She would have seen it in a rebuke from the American people for the lack of effectiveness of his pacifist policy! Imagine the Colonel campaigning in the inter­ests of a more powerful world and the goal that the war aims to achieve—unification! Which is important only as an indication of the wide possibilities of misunderstanding.

"Principles of International Policy" (The English title of Bertrand Russell's recent book, "Why Men Fight") (Century, $1.50), is a better index to its contents, although the American title, of course, challenges attention. The attention of the fighting impulse in hu­man nature, which he has been the first to investigate, is lowered by proposals for the reorganization of society on a basis that would give the constructive forces free play. Mr. Russell writes in his best tradition. He has found of a pacifist: "One in whom some impulse to bring about the cessation of destruction," the English title of Bertrand Russell's recent book, "Why Men Fight." A failure to perform it adequately is far more serious than a failure to protect it from extinction. Neither function is now performed with entire satisfaction. To protect against foreign interference will require some international means of adjusting conflicting interests, but protecting by war is obviously not a protection to those who suffer from the war. At its very best, military "preparation" is but a makeshift protection against foreigners. Meanwhile, what sort of protection do we give against war?

Protecting Americans

The first duty of a modern government is to protect its citizens from starvation and want. A government has to perform this function in some manner, for it is of the first necessity to its existence. A failure to perform it adequately is far more serious than a failure to protect citizens abroad. Neither function is now performed with entire satisfaction. To protect against foreign interference will require some international means of adjusting conflicting interests, but protecting by war is obviously not a protection to those who suffer from the war. At its very best, military "preparation" is but a makeshift protection against foreigners. Meanwhile, what sort of protection do we give against war?

"A Soldier of Life," a novel by Hugh De Selincourt, is one of those remarkable works of fiction that show that there is freedom of thought in England. It is primarily a study of the mental after-effects of war, dealing with the problem of readjusting to normal life those who have come home with shattered nerves. "A Soldier of Life" is a "presentiment of the future" (in "American Policies" (Macmillan, $2.50)) as Miss Selincourt's face, is faced with a choice: between Nationalistic Imperialism and Internationalism. In "American Policies," Miss Selincourt's novel, the United States has made three great contributions to the political and social world—the true patriot. The battle goes on. In the novel, she stands in a position to make a fourth contribution.

Should we say that America stood in such a position that she already made her choice—to follow not to lead?

The Next Step in International Control

Internationalism is not an untried venture; it is already realized as a fact, a successful operation for over forty years. It is not surprising to note that its formation was delayed by the refusal of France to join it on the ground that its "national interests" might be jeopardized. Such a fear has long since disappeared; and no nation in the world would any longer run the risk of operating its postal service along the old isolated nationalistic lines.

The International Telegraphic Union has been in operation since 1865. The thorough supervision and the propriety of all transactions are controlled by a Convention international. This great organization was the result of a convention of the nations in 1865, the "Universal Postal Union." In 1874 the Universal Postal Union was established. This time it was Great Britain who feared that its national interests would be endangered by such an international type of administration; but Great Britain is to-day an effective and loyal member of the International Union.

In industry and commerce, international administration has been effectuated through the International Congress of Chambers of Commerce, the International Union and Bureau for the Publication of Customs Tariffs, the International Commission, the International Institute of Intellectual Property, the International Institute of Agriculture. In morals and crime, slavery and prostitution are to-day internationally controlled.

The world, in short, is already in large measure internationally controlled. The next war may bring to the fore the international control of investments in backward countries. Such a war may perhaps show what is still to come. It is nevertheless true that the competition for investment privileges, particularly for investment monopolies, in the next world war will be as ruthless as in the most recent. It will mean no United States of Europe.

The estabHshment of such a Convention means no internationalism. It means simply that an organ of international admi­nistration would be set up to make the conduct of international traffic more uniform. The establishment of such a Convention means no repeated cataclysmic change in governmental organization. It means no nationalized state, but the growth of international Conventions as the object of international law.

"From the first the war party had found Great Britain as the object of attack. In the sober light of history, France appears to be quite as much an enemy to America commerce, as long as the administration main­tained that Napoleon had withdrawn his decrees, and that England had not, consistency required than Great Britain be regarded as the greater of­fender. M. Gaspard, the French minister, the Group of young Revolutionaries, who murdered King Louis XVI, the agents of the Convention, the Convention itself, were the object of attack.

The treaty of 1815Cmd. "... it was the object of the Convention to bring into being the Convention internationale sw:
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"I TOOK IT!"

said Theodore Roosevelt in 1911. "We'll pay for it," say the American people in 1917.

The Colombian treaty, which failed of ratification at the close of the last Congress, will be brought up again before the opening session of the new Congress. Watch its progress, Internationalists, and give it your support. The repeal of the canal tolls was prompted by the New Ideal of National Honor. The same ideal demands the settlement of our indebtedness to Colombia.

Keep watch for the so-called "spy" bills which will undoubtedly come before the new Congress, and for other measures that tend toward the Prussianizing of America.

Keep watch, too, for reactionary legislation of all kinds. Moses E. Clapp of Minnesota, in retiring from the Senate, called attention to the fact that the conditions that tend to arouse patriotic feeling "afford a shelter and a shield for the development of sinister forces." "Commercialism," he said, "taking advantage of the fact that the public vision is centered upon the problem of foreign relations and national security, is strengthening its hold and buttressing its legislative citadel as never before in the history of our country."

Keep Watch!

America is the only great nation left in the world in which militarism is not enthroned and the principle of conscription established. In order to defend our institutions and our democracy from imaginary dangers from without, we are urged to surrender to this much more real and formidable enemy of militarism and conscription from within. Upon the outcome of the great debate on "Conscription vs. Democracy" depends the question of whether the last fortress of democracy in the world and the greatest adventure in human history shall go down in failure. All patriotic Americans, all who believe that America has a mission and a great message of democracy to give to the world should enroll themselves in defence of America's freedom and democratic institutions presenting a united front against this attempt to militarize the whole American people.

GEORGE NASMYTH.

This number of FOUR LIGHTS is dedicated to Romain Rolland in France, Karl Liebknecht in Germany, and Bertrand Russell in England. They show us the way.
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