Co-operative Union of Europe After War

Dr. Alfred H. Fried, Winner of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1911, Has Interesting Plan for Securing Lasting Peace

ANYBODY who believes that the second world war of world history is covering in the shadow, looking mournfully upon a world in which war has crashed all their beliefs and theories and hopes, should read "The Co-operative Union of Europe," by Dr. Alfred H. Fried of Austria, just published in the United States by the New York Times Co-operative Union, the American division of the Norwegian-Canadian Co-operative Union.

On the subject of the transformation of diplomacy Dr. Fried is especially lucid. He writes: "It is clear that, in order to prevent the present attempt to destroy the balance of power, the powers that be, that is to say, the states who are in control of the modern field of activity, must be prevented from sinking again into the ancient business of politics in the old-fashioned way, that is to say, by military means and by the declaration and mobilization of large armies and the use of guns.

The success of the recent peace attempts in the European Union of Europe has shown that this is possible. The old-fashioned way of politics is not only contrary to the present situation, but it is also contrary to the nature of the world we live in. The new way of politics is the only way to prevent the recurrence of war.

That is why the Co-operative Union of Europe is worth considering. The union is not only a political organization, but it is also a social and economic organization. It is a union of all the peoples of the world, and it is the only organization that can prevent the recurrence of war.

The Co-operative Union of Europe is an attempt to create a new world order, a world order that is based on justice and freedom.

The Co-operative Union of Europe is a world organization that is not only a political organization, but it is also a social and economic organization. It is a union of all the peoples of the world, and it is the only organization that can prevent the recurrence of war.

The Co-operative Union of Europe is a world organization that is not only a political organization, but it is also a social and economic organization. It is a union of all the peoples of the world, and it is the only organization that can prevent the recurrence of war.
ment a form of government suited to the changes which they have undergone—changes with which existing Governments have failed to keep pace. Still seeking to steer clear of the reefs of Utopia, on which, as he confesses, many pacifist dreamers have gone down in shipwreck, Dr. Fried makes clear his belief that the world can change politically only if its present political organization is attacked indirectly. He elucidates this theory as follows:

Europe must grow into the new community just as in the past it grew into anarchy. The old historic units must be combined, not as parts of a federation, but rather as independent members of a great union created for a specific purpose. It is true that war is a political phenomenon, but it would be false to assume that the organization which is to supersede it must therefore be of a political nature. On the contrary, experience demonstrates that political unions such as our present-day alliances finally lead to war, while our purpose is the association of States for the furtherance of their numerous non-political common interests. We shall meet less opposition if we attempt simultaneously to organize them politically. In the long run, a close association in economic, technical, social, and ideal fields will inevitably make itself felt in political relations as well. Following the line of least resistance, there will eventually be a complete form of international organization possible. A concrete instance of such an association not formed on political lines, but inevitably tending to closer international union in a political sense, is found by Dr. Fried in the Pan American Union, which, he opines, is far better suited to the needs of the new Europe than the Constitution which binds together the States of the American Union. This Pan American Association, he says, has an unmistakable effect on the political life of the New World. Of this phenomenon the Austrian writer says:

Yeats peace cooperation between nations and the representatives of mankind, confidence, sympathy, and in part which does not presuppose hostilities in one's neighbors, and in critical issues reinforces the determination to resist capitulation. The association and mediation have reached their highest development on the American continent. The peaceful co-operative union expedites peaceful settlement of such disputes as inevitably arise.

In Pan Americanism he not only sees a model for Europe, but a warning, which he explains in these words:

Before the war there was much talk of the American menace, by which was meant economic competition. It exists, but in a different form. A continent so organized will only too easily win precedence over other continents. If the disorganization which has preceded the war should continue after the war, the danger of the associated States of Pan America not only Europe will be far greater. This has changed the relative position of Europe and America, and not to the advantage of Europe. Europe will lag behind in economic development, and also because of its exhaustion. Hence a co-operative union must be formed, that a united Europe may meet that united continent across the ocean—not for attack, but to make further co-operation possi- ble. * * * * should be directed neither against Russia nor against England, against the Central Powers or the Western Powers, but solely against the old Europe and its head- lessness, its bitterness, its hate and anarchy, its service should be to create the promotion of an organized, a co-operative, a self-conscious new Europe.

So much for Dr. Fried's dreams of a relatively distant future. He does not confine himself to them but tries to solve the more immediate problem of putting and end to the present war.

As has been said, he believes that there should be two treaties; one to stop hostilities, the other to pave the way to lasting world peace. The second treaty, says he, is necessary, because "the same old diplomats" will be summoned to draft the men whose vision will have hardly been broadened sufficiently to establish the new international organization, the foundation of which genuine peace must be founded. On the subject of the second treaty he writes:

It is essential that the representatives of the neutral nations of Europe and of the United States take part in it. This will hardly be possible in the immediate settlement of the war, as the combatants would object to any interference in a matter which concerns them alone. But in the establish- ment of the future order we must have the united States which were not immediate participants in the war, but were nevertheless affected by it, will have a right to share. Thus in such a second stage of the work of peace there would be a greater chance to effect the re- organization of international relations in a modern spirit.

Furthermore, not until after the war will European public opinion attain its old free- dom. The neutral and the neutral, who have had to be so cautious about their neutrality, as well as among the combatants. If we are in earnest in our endeavor to mold the future we cannot dispense with our most powerful and effective instrument, public opinion. It is because more important to remember that not until the war is well past will its real damage be evident and all the data be at hand. Such facts will help us in the re-organization of the world and we cannot afford to dispense with their assistance. Such a task as the reorganization of the European political system will require very thorough and therefore long deliberation. Were it to be undertaken when the immediate issues of the war were being settled it would be a costly and hurried affair. For the disorder of war to continue and the armies to remain in their positions until the last formula for future relations has been determined, would not only be impractical but would create a intolerable situation which inevitably would finally lead to a fatal abbreviation of the discussions. Despite the separation of the two confer- ences in function and in time, certain things must be demanded of the former. Its first task is to lay a true war; but it must also pave the way for the second undertak-