

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 apostles of world peace are cowering in the shadow, looking mournfully upon a planet where war has crushed all their beliefs and theories and hopes, should read "The Restoration of Europe," by Dr. Alfred H. Fried of Austria, just published in a translation from the original German by the Macmillan Company. Dr. Fried, one of the most famous peace advocates in the world, the winner in 1911 of the Nobel Peace Prize, declares that real pacifists, far from feeling discouragement, see in the lessons of the world war their complete vindication. It is those who pinned their faith to war as a panacea for human ills, says he, who are now mercilessly confuted, hopelessly bankrupt.

"The great hour of pacifism has come," he announces—and he paints a picture of a cleansed and regenerated Europe, built up on new and firm foundations, worthy of taking its place in the vanguard of the cause of world peace, which is one of the most remarkable, if not the most remarkable, of all the works of a constructive tendency which have emerged from the smoke and din and horror of the great war.

Of special interest to us of this country is the important rôle assigned to the United States in the tremendous task of reconstruction which, according to Dr. Fried, must precede the lasting peace which he foresees. The United States, he says, is the only non-European nation qualified to aid in arranging the preliminaries of that peace. And it is in the New World that the distinguished Austrian writer finds the model which must serve to make lasting peace possible, that model being the Pan American Union, which in his eyes has been of inestimable value in promoting better understanding between the republics of this hemisphere and is destined to play the infinitely more splendid rôle of pointing out the path which bleeding and broken Europe must tread in order to reach the goal of her regeneration.

"The Co-operative Union of Europe"—that is the dream of Dr. Fried. It has nothing Utopian about it, he emphatically declares—in fact, throughout his book he indignantly combats the idea that there is anything Utopian about himself, the Baroness von Suttner, or the rest of the pacifists, whose theories, as so many supposed, had been ruthlessly refuted by the war.

Dr. Fried does not suppose that his Co-operative Union is to appear full-fledged in Europe as soon as the furies of war are spent. He outlines, in vigorous and lucid language, some preliminaries which must intervene between the dying out of the cannon's roar and the advent of real peace on earth. He believes, for instance, that this war must bring not one but two treaties of peace, the first to mark the cessation of actual fighting, the second to lay the groundwork for that union which is destined to stamp out war forever.

"The present war is the logical outcome of the kind of 'peace' which preceded it"—there is Dr. Fried's doctrine in a nutshell. Never is he pro-Ally or pro-German; never anything but anti-Past, anti-Present, and pro-Future.

As necessary preliminaries to the Co-operative Union which he so ardently desires, the Austrian pacifist enumerates seven reforms which, he says, must come before the mistaken ideas which have caused the present upheaval can be uprooted. These are:

1. The transformation of European diplomacy.
2. The elimination of the antiquated conception of sovereignty.
3. The changing of the present system of international alliances.
4. The gradual elimination of over-armament.
5. The muzzling of unscrupulous organs of the press.
6. The removal of the "moral rubbish" which the war will leave behind.
7. The establishment of international justice.

On the subject of the transformation of diplomacy Dr. Fried is especially eloquent. He writes:

It has often been pointed out that diplomacy has changed little since the time of Cardinal Richelieu. This is very significant in view of the new tasks which confront it. The outbreak of this war made it clear that diplomacy had become a danger and that its reformation from tip to toe was a necessity. No thinking person will assert that ten or six or perhaps only three persons should decide whether millions are to have their heads cut off or not. A system that maintains such a possibility is not fit for our age. And the fact that there are still diplomats who are willing to accept such a responsibility is sufficient evidence of the untenability of the

scathing of all his arraignment of present-day diplomats:

They, who are the real Utopians, because they are not compelled to deal with realities, are considered wise heads and "practical politicians." The desire to end insanity is called Utopianism; to act insanely is statesman-like wisdom.

That theme, presented with many variations, is the "leitmotif" of Dr. Fried's work.

Pacifists, he repeats unceasingly, are the men of the present age; diplomats and their dupes are men chained to the outgrown traditions of the past. Fol-

liance with one or another of the powers with whom we are at present in bloody combat. There is nothing real to prevent the substitution of a European alliance for the separate alliances of today.

The fact that a general European alliance need not be political at all, indeed, would have no reason to be so, makes such a step easier. If all the nations should unite there would be no occasion to direct their energies against any other State—unless it be an extra-European constellation. The political aspect would cease to exist, and with it our greatest obstacle would be overcome. A general European alliance would not have the menacing character of the alliances of the past, and would be far more helpful in economic and social life. Such an agreement would doubtless have its effect upon the political life of the participating States and secure more real protection than the present-day so-called "protective" alliances possibly could. It would also create an atmosphere in which the institutions of The Hague could develop into that which they were intended to be. The Hague Conferences would finally be vivified, and, supported by the will of the organized world, would become effective.

Dr. Fried's views on the evils of over-armament, the next thing which, he thinks, must be swept out of existence, are summed up in these sentences:

Armament is the substitute for order in the prevailing international disorder. It is supposed to defend the body politic just as armor protected the individual in the days of intra-national lawlessness. But just as armor was dropped as soon as peace within the nation brought personal security, so armaments will disappear, or least be decreased, in proportion as international organization does away with international anarchy and achieves national security for its members. The difficulty of the problem vanishes when we understand this indirect method of treatment.

As a step toward this better state of affairs Dr. Fried advocates Government control of the armament trade which, he thinks, would greatly facilitate international control of armaments and pave the way for their limitation, since it would eliminate the chances for individuals to make huge profits out of the manufacture of arms and ammunitions.

Taking up the subject of the "yellow" press, the most effective means for stamping out its tendency to incite peoples to war, says Dr. Fried, would be "thorough enlightenment of the public, a task in which the decent press can co-operate."

"Anything that seems hopeful must be tried," he writes. "The essential is to do something. Humanity, which has armed itself to meet pest, cholera, diphtheria, tuberculosis, and cancer, will surely find the proper weapon to use against the jingo press."

How "moral rubbish" left by the war is to be cleared away is outlined thus:

People from every country, stirred by the sights and horrors of war, will join us, eager to serve in the great campaign for the elimination of hate. A League of Europeans will arise—not an association with a program and statute, but a free union of those who, acting with their own wounds, understand the anguish of the age and are ready to relieve it. This League of Europeans will consist of those men and women who have come to understand that the evils of war poison life even when the cannon are silent, and that they can only be overcome by an understanding which knows no national border lines, and with the co-operation of all nations. Its members will be those who feel it their duty to forget their own pain and their own gaping wounds for the service of that which is above all nations—humanity.

The civic heroism of peaceful activity will be manifest in their activity. They will be scorned and scolded, accused of lack of patriotism and of Utopianism. And yet they will be the true patriots and the truly practical politicians.

Of the seventh requisite—the establishment of international justice—declared by Dr. Fried to be the most fundamental of all problems, he writes:

European history of the last century, since the convulsions of the Napoleonic era, has been governed by two principles, one following the other. They are the principles of legitimacy and nationality. The first collapsed in the storm of revolution; the latter is collapsing under the strain of world catastrophe today. A new principle is arising to dominate European history, which for the first time will give Princes and peoples complete enjoyment of their rights; it is the new, the constructive, safeguarding, and liberating principle of international justice.

Dr. Fried then proceeds to outline his "Co-operative Union of Europe," which, having swept away the barnacles of the past, is to give to the nations of the pres-



system. Only the consciousness that no accounts will have to be rendered to the people whose business they manage, or that those accounts will never be audited, can give present-day diplomats the courage to accept such a responsibility.

In this age of complete publicity their trade, upon which the happiness of generations and empires is so often dependent, is secret. They have no rebuke to fear but that of history; and that will not bother them until this earthly pilgrimage is done. They tell us that it is in the people's interests that diplomatic negotiations be conducted in secret. But the people do not wish that secrecy; they would prefer to resign an advantage which may compel them blindly to risk their lives. The complexity of the modern world makes publicity an indispensable condition, the omission of which is disastrous.

Secrecy is not the only danger of diplomacy. It is dominated by a spirit which would do honor to mediaeval chivalry. Any one who reads the diplomatic white papers published at the beginning of the war will observe with disgust this knightly relic of a vanished age. In those critical eleven days of European history the lives and happiness of millions were at stake, and the diplomats, coldly smiling, refused to discuss this matter or that, directly or at all. They preferred detours to direct negotiations; they refused peaceful methods of settlement for reasons of etiquette, or with an irrefutable reference to that idol of their cult, Prestige. *The Moloch of the old sagas never devoured so many human beings as this modern idol.*

Commenting on the present-day conception of the sovereignty of nations, Dr. Fried says that "modern diplomats use sovereignty as a bulwark behind which they hide when there is no rational justification for their actions." And it is here that he sets down this, the most

lowing this line of thought Dr. Fried comes to his third bugbear—the present-day system of alliances, which, he says, has assisted to "main: in international anarchy and has hastened its final collapse." Here, too, he refuses to be carried away into any Utopia, but presents his theory of reform in these sober words:

Alliances cannot be ended by a simple decree. It is of no use to forbid them. Even after the war there will be no power strong enough to carry out such a decree. Even within the nations it will be difficult to combat the evil, for only a very powerful State would undertake a parliamentary decree to enter no alliances. The others will refrain from alliances only when to do so has become the general rule; and that will happen only when the method of common action in the work of restoration is so far developed that the nations find in it a real substitute for the poor system of individual alliances. That is not so difficult as it seems. It is only a matter of a second step following the first. The Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente would be replaced by a European alliance.

Let no one protest that the hatred between the two camps would prevent this. Hate is not a political reality. It is merely a discovery of diplomacy, which creates popular moods in order to cite them as justification for its own errors. Enduring antagonisms exist only in phantasy; there indeed they are carefully cultivated! The present allies have all waged bitter wars on each other in the course of the past century, and almost all the present opponents have been allies in some previous war. That does not prevent former enemies from standing "shoulder to shoulder" today, nor the former allies from fighting each other. Already we in Germany hear talk of the possibility of an al-

ent 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.

If our purpose is to promote the association of States for the furtherance of their numerous non-political common interests we shall meet less opposition than 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.

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 points out, has had an unmistakable effect on the political life of the New World. Of this phenomenon the Austrian writer says:

Years of peaceful co-operation between na-

tions and their representatives strengthened confidence, engendered a habit of mind which does not presuppose hostile intentions in one's neighbors, and in critical issues reinforces the determination to let rational considerations decide. Arbitration and mediation have reached their highest developments on the American continents. 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 divided Europe. If that disorganization which has led to war should continue after the war, the danger of the associated States of Pan America outstripping Europe will be far greater. The war has changed the relative position of Europe and America, and not to the advantage of Europe. Europe will lag behind America because of its disorganization, 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 possible. * * *

The union 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 heedlessness, its bitterness, its hate and anarchy. Its service should be to promote the creation 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 an 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 first—men whose vision will hardly have been broadened sufficiently to establish the new international organization upon 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 establishment of the future world order the nations 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 reorganization of international relations in a modern spirit.

Furthermore, not until after the war will European public opinion attain its old freedom. It has been limited among the neutrals, 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 no less 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 reorganization of the future, and we cannot afford to dispense with their assistance. Such a task as the reorganization of the European State 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 dangerously hurried. For the disorder of war to continue and the armies to remain in their positions until the last formula for future organization was found and the last name signed, would create an intolerable situation which inevitably would finally lead to a fatal abbreviation of the discussions.

Despite the separation of the two conferences in function and in time, certain things must be demanded of the former. Its first task is of course to end the war; but it must also pave the way for the second undertak-

ing. It would be small comfort to humanity to postpone the establishment of permanent peace, if at the end of the war a situation should be created which imperiled the success of that second conference. Real statesmanship and wisdom will be required. We can look for some help to the logic of events, an influence which will be more powerful after the war. The settlement should avoid any humiliation of either group, or its economic paralysis or exhaustion, and should lay the foundation for the congress that is to follow. Further, this second conference, which will be composed of both combatants and neutrals, must have the right to abrogate or extend the provisions of the previous treaty. The power of all Europe and America standing behind this conference will be sufficient to secure that. The exercise of this power should not be difficult in view of the moral pressure it can bring to bear and of its purpose of securing the general welfare.

It has been proposed that the task of establishing peace be referred to a Third Hague Conference, to be called immediately after the treaty of peace is signed. I do not agree. The Hague Conferences include all the nations of the world; to refer the further organization of Europe to all of them would be a mistake. Outside of Europe the United States alone really belongs to the European group. Furthermore, The Hague Conferences have always laid their chief emphasis on the regulation of war, and their bond of union has perforce been too weak. Thus they are not well adapted to the function of founding a European system or of securing permanent peace.

The new organization that such a system would create would lay the foundation necessary for The Hague tribunals to attain their true value. It is better not to refer this matter to The Hague Conference. We must remember that the organization of Europe will not immediately be completed by the mere treaty of peace. It will be only a beginning, a mere foundation. Its extension will be the unremitting task of decades.

Friends of humanity, turning sadly from a Europe thrilled with bloody hallucinations, are revived by the vision of these things that are to be. The hour will come when their work will begin. And we will continue to hope that it will achieve its purpose, that it will end a tragic period of human history and give birth to a happier.