

the war. Those declarations will work in two ways. First they have vastly strengthened the Allies' ideals and purposes, they have aroused enthusiastic sympathy in every people of Europe that is opposed to Germany, and they are sure to sustain and strengthen the failing military power of Russia. Secondly, nothing could do more than such a statement to strengthen the hands of the radicals in Germany. Germany is still fighting largely because she believes that any weakness will mean the enslavement of the Fatherland, the starvation of her people through an economic war. With this statement of war purposes, *some* element in Germany must question the more pertinently the faith of her leaders. Whether President Wilson's reply will sufficiently weaken German militarism to hasten her military disaster is questionable, but it surely will strengthen allied determination toward this result.

...

But there is still another aspect to the President's words that is infinitely more significant. We are beginning to assume in

**Our Chance to**      our thinking the over-  
**Make a World**      throw of Germany; so  
that the greatest, most tremendous thought before the world to-day is: when this war is over, what sort of a world shall we make for ourselves to live in? A world of balanced jealousies and feverish armament? God forbid. It must be a world without crippled nations, without smouldering revenges, without racial wrongs, as President Wilson has asserted before the whole world. To accomplish this we believe in: 1. General disarmament. 2. A world-parliament to enunciate the principles of international comity, to draft the laws of international relations. 3. An international executive to apply international law. 4. An international police force under the orders of the international executive. This in bare outline seems the most practical machinery for perpetuating world-peace. In its essence it

means simply an extension of our law orbit: we obey a city's police regulations unhesitatingly because we believe that, if not the best, they represent the best obtainable effort to harmonise neighbourly relations; we obey national laws because we believe in the community of ideals and purposes that makes a nation, because we are patriots. We can as easily obey international laws drawn up by the most intelligent, skilled representatives of each human group—men actuated by the welfare of the whole world—because we can now, joined by the common feelings of human loss and the common purposes of achievement, see that the whole world is but a human family whose interests are fundamentally identical: because, in short, we are all joined in the great adventure of making the human spirit at home in its environment—of making the world a good place to live in. General disarmament, a world-parliament, an international executive with an international police force—let us strive for this programme, modified and improved very probably, but certainly a thought, an effort in the right direction.

...

This ideal of internationalism, the ideal of an organic world in which the nations shall emulate each other in service to the common human brotherhood, implies an essential criticism of the orthodox "patriotism" that is now, in the crisis of war, asserting itself in every belligerent country—the type of patriotism that impulsively cheers the might and glory of the state as contrasted with inferior peoples, the patriotism that carried the barbarism of savages throughout Belgium but regards every retaliation as the brutishness of "foreign devils." Such a patriotism harks back to the earliest human psychology; it was the group patriotism, or group consciousness, that determined survival and through the process of selection has become part and parcel of

our own mental fibre. A discussion of this value in our social life and of the problem that it presents is made in this issue by Professor Cooley, of the department of philosophy of Columbia University. Professor Cooley maintains that this patriotism must be trained, not extirpated, that it must be "converted from a selfish group interest into a rational, or moral, group interest," that we must recognise the truth that "the supreme unit is the race and not the tribe, mankind and not any fraction of it." "The problem of the redemption of patriotism," he continues, "is simply part of the problem of the moralisation of society." Before the war the ideas of internationalism were used by social agitators largely in the attempt to consolidate the interests of their class throughout the different nations: internationalism was a propaganda idea used to divide society laterally into class antagonisms. Now under the fusion of war's intense struggle we can see that the internationalism that means a common pooling of human interests is the only solution of the problem of war and peace.

...

Germany's peace terms are being forecasted in Washington at the time of our going to press. These **Germany's Terms** terms which Germany is formulating in reply to the Pope's plea are said to include the following:

Restoration of Belgium and Northern France, to be paid for out of the sale of Germany's colonies to Great Britain.

Alsace and Lorraine to be independent states.

Trieste to be a "free port."

Serbia and Rumania to be restored, and Serbia to have a port on the Adriatic.

The Balkan question and the status of Turkey to be subjects for negotiation.

Disarmament and international police.

Freedom of the seas, with Great

Britain in control of the English Channel until the projected tunnel is built between Dover and Calais.

There are many points for dispute in such proposals: England would undoubtedly demur at paying for colonies she has already conquered, France would probably refuse anything but the absolute annexation of Alsace-Lorraine, Italy means to have Trieste, and it hardly seems likely that Turkey would be a willing partner to her Allies' offer to settle her fate in conference with her enemies. But all these considerations probably matter very little—the note will not be taken seriously because the world is now so thoroughly aroused to the German menace that a German military disaster, due either to the strength of her opponents or to the defection of her people, is necessary before the world can be assured of Germany's peaceful acquiescence to a place in the family of nations. What is of definite interest in the peace terms, however, is the reported suggestion of the German Government for disarmament and an international police. Although the terms as a whole will by no means end the war, these two proposals will give a great impetus to the only practical solution of the war menace, the best effort to establish a permanent peace; they will help to publicise both in Germany and in the Entente countries the ideas of disarmament and international police, with their necessary extension into a world parliament.

...

Disarmament by Germany, however, cannot be accepted on her mere promise in her present frame of **A German Disarmament** mind. The disclosure of the German envoy's notes from Buenos Aires to Berlin, via the Swedish legation and Stockholm, show German diplomacy even more thoroughly outlawed, further removed from the standards of intercourse of civilised nations, than even when Zimmerman sent out his infamous Mexico-Japanese plot note. A promise by the present German Govern-