

## INTERNATIONAL DISARMAMENT

ARTURO LABRIOLA

THE newspapers have recently reprinted what purports to be the prophecy of General Nogi concerning the probable effects of a great European war, spoken at the time of the siege of Port Arthur. The Japanese statesman and military strategist is quoted as saying: "This war will be the last in Europe for many a day, perhaps forever," and that a probable result of such a conflagration would be a general disarmament.

Instinctively public opinion in Europe has felt something similar, vaguely hoping that the great Continental conflict would mark the beginning of a new era. Even in the darkest hours of life hope is apt to be mocked, but at least it forces upon us the recognition that this cyclopean clash of races cannot be brought to a close without leaving the world the task of eliminating causes for the repetition of such a tragedy.

But we need not imagine that such a propitious event can be brought into reality merely through disgust and horror at all the catastrophes that have been heaped up by the war. From this moment, it will be necessary to create a conscience in accord with the results for which we are hoping. Our minds must prepare to sterilize those conditions which might bring about the same crisis again, and we must aim to spread a general desire for disarmament.

The present war—I have made myself hoarse repeating this—is the outcome less of the essential and inherent differences between races, or of the accumulation of differences in the opposing fields, than of the inevitable logic of persistent and intense armament, which through the military caste has effected the popularization of its own intransigent logic and its own particular psychology. The responsibility for this war, which is so great and tempestuous, is no longer placed at the door of a society which is based upon the opposition of classes and of nations. More particularly we can blame the system of "armed peace," which while raising its voice in a protest for peace has

countenanced the frenzied and monstrous accumulation of arms. *At a certain point the War Machine becomes its own master.* At a certain point, it must act autonomously. Who can doubt that war must have occurred some time?

In this truth lies the justification for the violent antipathy that is now so troublesomely surrounding the Fatherland. If we were to take an international vote to-day among the neutral and belligerent nations, the result of it would be crushing for Germany. Even those peoples who for reasons of material gain should look for German victory would express their aversion to her; and this not so much because of the way in which the war was provoked or because of the violation of Belgian neutrality, but rather because of the widespread sentiment that the system of "armed peace" is the cause of the gigantic tragedy. Armed peace is not a theory, but a real fact imposed on all Europe by Germany and therefore the fundamental reason of this terrible crisis. Even Russia, which has been so decried by liberal opinion, has acted benevolently, in view of the fact that armed peace has been fostered by example and through fear of Germany.

With the exception of Austria, Germany is practically without a friend. Public opinion has already been convinced that the actual war is a result of the system of armed peace and of the Permanent Alliance, both imposed on the world by Germany. Everyone remembers that Germany has twice frustrated attempts to pass from the system of armed peace to the system of *international armament*: in 1900, when the Czar called a conference at The Hague, and in 1905, when the English Liberals went to the Government and through Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman proposed the limitation of naval armaments. Public opinion throughout Europe has not been able to free itself from the idea that if Germany had accepted the principle of international and balanced armaments, we should never have been hurled into the present catastrophe.

Thus public opinion in Europe has already been convinced that the first enemy to defeat is this system of armed peace. But it is especially among neutral nations that we must spread the conviction that the war ought to be ended with an obligation among all belligerent Powers to adopt the system of interna-

tional armament, which implies the principle that the strength of reciprocal armament is a matter for international agreement and arbitration, as much among great nations as among weaker ones. This war—long or short as it may be—cannot be ended with partial and unilateral agreement, but ought to bring about a congress of all European Powers. Neutral and minor nations will certainly have the same voice as the belligerent and great Powers. And when a union of the majority of the European states is in favor of the principle of international armament, Germany must halt before the danger of a general coalition.

This will bear the most conspicuous fruit in its influence upon the democratic future of the world. The internal contradiction that splits the German world is the development of the democratic organization of the working-class, an organization that has been steadily and increasingly weakened by the military and autocratic constitution of the Government. The force that is opposed to the full expression of working-class organization—the most significant element in the game of democratic politics—is the iron mechanism of the German army, which is under the exclusive direction of the Kaiser and the aristocratic and financial oligarchy which surrounds him.

To break and to weaken the monstrous structure of the German army, to limit its number and its efficiency, is only another way to aid the development of German industrial democracy, the character of which is now crushed and compromised by the army and the power exercised by the oligarchy of bankers and aristocrats under the direction of the Kaiser.

The first step to be taken in this direction is to focus public attention upon the real causes of the catastrophe. The historian who traces causes and by judging facts searches for antecedents is enabled to discover the contradictory nature of capitalism, of race-conflict, and so forth. Yet a long conflict of races does not necessarily explode in war. Capitalism is a contradictory system, but it cannot always lead to conflicts between one country and another. On the contrary, it generally exhausts itself in the class conflict. When out of capitalism and the antithetical tendency of races war does break out, there is a disturbing factor in the two causes, which in the present instance is precisely our

system of armed peace, that does not consider the independent development and growth of armaments in any single country a menace to peace.

Therefore it is necessary to undertake a long campaign against the system of armed peace and independent armament. It will be necessary at the time of the convention of plenipotentiaries appointed to enact treaties to consider the opinion of neutrals and of minor nations already confirmed in this principle: that the matter of armament is of equal importance to all nations and therefore a matter not to be decided by any single state in its presumption of sovereignty. It is necessary at least among democratic countries that the opinion should prevail that it is a common menace that any one state should refuse to be subjected to the principle of internationality in the matter of armament.

Captains of industry have always been the enemies of accumulated armament, judging it dangerous not only to prosperity but to the freedom of every country. It has always seemed more difficult to associate great armies with the defence of the democratic principle. When the dangers of socialism first appeared, these captains of industry submitted. But their calculations were wrong. Socialism is along the normal line of industrial evolution of each nation, and is hastened by reckless financial politics. Great armies have led these countries straight into war, into devastation, into famine. How many capitalists at the present moment would not have preferred to double the wages of their employees as an alternative to facing the irreparable disaster of this war? However, lamentations are of no avail. The only thing to do now is to safeguard the future. If this terrifying lesson proves sufficient, it will teach the world the necessity of proletarian democracy and of international disarmament.

If it does not . . . barbarism!

BRURY COLLEGE  
LIBRARY

## "THOU SHALT NOT KILL" IN WAR

*The Limitations that International Law places upon Violence.  
"Kriegsraeson" subordinate to "Kriegsrecht" and "Kriegs-  
manier." Prohibited Agencies, Means and  
Methods of Warfare on Land*

WILLIAM MILLER COLLIER

WAR is hell!

Whether or not General Sherman was the first to utter the remark so often attributed to him, millions to-day reiterate it. Yet with all its carnage and destruction, its unloosing of passion and hatred, its disregard of the usual obligations of mankind and its overthrow of the customary laws that prevail in the normal times of peace, war is not, either in legal theory or in actual practice, a wholly lawless state. It is not anarchy; it is not chaos. It has its rules and its rights. Above the roar of battle there thunder out "Thou Shalt Nots," as loud, as clear and as authoritative as those that were uttered on Sinai. There is a "Thou Shalt Not Kill," a "Thou Shalt Not Steal," a "Thou Shalt Not Bear False Witness," in war as well as in peace, although the difference of the conditions makes an act that is a crime in peace a heroism in war, and not infrequently that which is commendable in peace culpable in war.

War is still so generally regarded as a license to kill that it is well to consider the "Thou Shalt Not Kill" of warfare, the limitations upon the force that a belligerent may exercise against his enemy.

The fundamental principle of the modern law of war is:

*A belligerent may use such a degree of force as is necessary to overcome his enemy and ABSOLUTELY NO MORE.*

He may kill, if necessary to do so in order to overpower; he may not even smite on the cheek if resistance has ceased. He may wound in order to disable, but he must not cause the slightest needless suffering.

On this principle hang all the law and the prophets; all the limitations and restrictions that have been reduced to rules; all

