

JX
1963
C215p

CARNEGIE

PATH TO PEACE UPON THE SEAS



nia
al



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

2.

THE PATH TO PEACE
UPON THE SEAS.

BY

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

THE PEACE SOCIETY,
47, NEW BROAD STREET, LONDON, E.C.

—
1909.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

2
THE PATH TO PEACE
UPON THE SEAS. 11

BY
ANDREW | CARNEGIE.
L

THE PEACE SOCIETY,
47, NEW BROAD STREET, LONDON, E.C.

—
1909.




JX
1963
C215p

THE
PATH TO PEACE UPON THE SEAS.
BY
ANDREW CARNEGIE.



*Reprinted from the London TIMES, of June 19th, 1909,
(Slightly Revised.)*



OUR New York Correspondent advised you by wire of the proceedings of meetings of the Peace Societies of New York and Chicago, which called upon our President to exert his influence for Peace and “especially to secure an Agreement among the Powers for a speedy arrest of the ruinous competition of armaments now prevailing.”

The New York meeting suggested his inviting a Conference of the Powers, which I, as President of the Society, approved, but I am bound to say that subsequent travel in Europe has modified my views. It is not from America, but from Britain, such invitation should come.

Wherever one travels upon the Continent to-day, the chief subject of conversation among

2097241

THE PATH TO PEACE.

intelligent men is the British Dreadnought and its consequences. Dreadnoughts might, and probably would, have been introduced sooner or later by another nation than Britain, but, unfortunately for her, they were not. It is the British Dreadnought the people hear of in other countries, and she alone is blamed for the serious consequences following upon its introduction.

There seems no possibility of preventing the other naval Powers from following the example of Britain and Germany, and although our industrial Republic has nothing to covet, and has repeatedly refused to give the Executive more than one-half the battleships demanded, it may be impossible to prevent even her from increasing her fleet rapidly like the others. Thus no Power will gain much in naval strength over another, for relatively their positions will remain substantially as before. These enlarged navies, instead of tending to ensure Peace, will increase the danger of war.

What a strange spectacle the naval Powers present to-day? Go where one will, he hears the men in power lamenting the necessity forced upon them for increasing armaments, one after the other explaining that they must increase their navy, and this only for "protection."

THE PATH TO PEACE.

The Emperor of Germany and Prince von Buelow urge nothing for their increased armaments except "protection" for their commerce and their coasts.

The former has just made this remarkable statement:—

"His Majesty the Emperor and I are agreed that our meeting is to be regarded as a powerful confirmation of Peace. (Loud cheers.) We feel ourselves, as Monarchs, responsible to our God for the weal and woe of our peoples, whom we desire to lead on so far as possible upon the path of Peace and to raise to prosperity. All peoples need Peace in order, under its protection, to be able to devote themselves to the great tasks of civilisation, and to their economic and commercial development. Both of us, therefore, will always strive, as far as lies in our power, and with the help of God, to promote and preserve Peace."

Prince von Buelow addressed the following message to the British ministers of the Prince of Peace:—

"I sincerely hope that our guests and Christian brethren will bring the conviction home and publish the fact that there is living on this side of the North Sea a peaceful and laborious people which heartily desires, as well as its Government,

THE PATH TO PEACE.

to live peacefully in friendship and neighbourliness with its brethren beyond the Channel.”

Not a voice is raised in Britain except for needed protection from assault. So with the good men of France. So with Austria and Italy. So with President Taft, who recently wrote :—

“The policy of the United States in avoiding war under all circumstances, except those plainly inconsistent with honour or its highest welfare, has been made so clear to the world as hardly to need statement at my hands. I can only say that so far as my legitimate influence extends while at the head of this Government, it will always be exerted to the full in favour of Peace, not only as between this country and other countries, *but as between our sister nations.*” [Italics are mine.]

One leader is more insistent than another that his country's aim is to secure Peace—the only end it has in view. If this be untrue, there is not an Emperor, King, President, nor Prime Minister in the world to-day who does not perjure himself every now and then, protesting that his country desires nothing but to live in neighbourly friendship with all others.

Are these public men, who have risen to eminence and enjoy the confidence of their fellow-countrymen, perjuring themselves? No ; far from

THE PATH TO PEACE.

this, they speak the sober truth from the heart. They feel what they utter. The desire for Peace is genuine. "Give us Peace in our time, O Lord," is the prayer of civilized nations and rulers. Ambassador Bryce, speaking at the Peace Conference in America, corroborates this. He says :—

"Every nation is conscious of its own rectitude of purpose, and believes its armaments are for its own safety and will not be used aggressively."

This being accepted, unfounded suspicion must be the root of all this trouble. Every additional battleship tends to convert suspicion in neighbouring nations into hatred, and then a misinterpreted word, movement, or accident, which would otherwise have been easily explained, becomes the cause of war, which usually arises, not directly from the possession of armaments by a nation, but from the suspicions aroused in neighbouring nations by these having been created. Hence the impossibility of increased armaments ever being conducive to Peace. (Suspicion, fear, hatred, and thus the danger of war, increase in compound ratio as armaments increase.)

It is the old story. Two neighbours have a slight misunderstanding which mutual explanations would readily have dispelled, but one, in an unguarded moment, says to the other, "I'll make

THE PATH TO PEACE.

you behave like a gentleman." "You can't do it," is the ready response. One decides to buy a pistol, not for use, but solely for "protection" if attacked. Hearing this, the other feels he must have "protection" also. The first substitutes a six-chambered revolver just to be dead certain of protection. The other follows, just to be dead certain also. If the insurance company knew of this misunderstanding the life premiums of these two citizens would rise in geometrical progression with each added weapon. Fortunately the law in civilized nations, founded upon experience that a hundred deadly feuds occur where men go armed to one where this is prohibited, steps in and prohibits private armaments and punishes the law-breakers. Britain and France played the part of the foolish neighbours fifty years ago. To-day it is Britain and Germany.

Nearly a century ago (1817) Canada and America agreed that upon the inland seas, which constitute their boundary for hundreds of miles, each should place one 100-ton vessel armed with one 28-pounder. The tiny craft, one flying the Union Jack and the other the Stars and Stripes, have never fired a shot except in friendly salute to each other, and unbroken peace has been preserved. If the world had its police force on the

THE PATH TO PEACE.

seas, there would be the "protection from assault" which each naval Power declares it only desires and is increasing its navy solely to ensure. There would remain no enemy from whom "protection" was needed. Commerce would be immune. The naval nations would be as one in friendly alliance.

Our English-speaking race has developed Parliamentary government, abolished the last vestige of human slavery from civilized lands, was first to abolish private war between men, and was also prominent in abolishing piracy upon the seas. Why should Britain, as the foremost naval Power and the Motherland of our race, hesitate to invite the other naval Powers to confer with a view to Peace, and, as one means of securing it, suggest they combine in abolishing war upon the seas, following the British-American example. Let this be freely discussed with other suggestions. There is nothing startling or new in this plan. It would follow a highly-successful precedent covering a century. Three or four Powers could be named which, united to-day to ensure Peace upon the seas, would be sufficient, but many more would respond to Britain's call. Surely few, if any, would decline. Why should they? How could they, their aim being Peace, as they all proclaim? Those who declined would

THE PATH TO PEACE.

reveal themselves the enemies of mankind. The peaceful Powers accepting might so greatly preponderate as to see their way to maintain Peace, and ships of war, except the few needed for police duty, would rust as being unneeded, as they have long been and are to-day upon the inland seas of North America. No nation would commit itself to anything by accepting an invitation to confer. Any action taken could be made subject to ratification by the Governments.

So easy the solution seems that to many it may appear unworthy of consideration, but great crises have usually easy solutions because, being the product of grave mistakes or great wrongs, total reversal of the policy pursued is the sure key that unlocks the door. Here is the key to the present situation. There is nothing speculative about this proved solution of the very question which disturbs the nations to-day. Though it may be rejected, the day will nevertheless come, and that I believe soon, when this stone which the builders reject shall become the head of the corner. It has proved itself the panacea for war upon the seas.

Has our race lost the breed of great statesmen, or is there to-day a Prime Minister and Cabinet in Britain composed of men who dare be great and

THE PATH TO PEACE.

thus lead the nations out of bondage to the false god of war, becoming the foremost body of statesmen of all time by having rendered mankind the greatest service, or is such an invitation to the Powers to be the beneficent act of others more zealous in the cause of Peace?

Even to attempt and fail for the time in such a cause would give to the participants lasting place among those whom coming generations are to hold in honour.

The policy of conciliation pursued by Britain has recently proved its claims to favour by brilliant successes, both in South Africa and India. She is entitled to adopt as her motto, and none is so well adapted to the present crisis, "First all means to conciliate." Britain has also won favour in other lands by the calm, firm moderation displayed by her Government, and its refusal to be stampeded into unnecessary armaments, which would only add fuel to the flame abroad, when for years to come its naval supremacy is perfectly secure. It has avoided bluster and maintained a dignified reserve.

Mr. Editor, in all truth and soberness it should no longer be permissible for any two Powers in jealous rivalry to build Dreadnoughts contingent upon what each other may do, thus

THE PATH TO PEACE.

compelling all other naval Powers to follow their ruinous and, in this the twentieth century, saddening example, or to become defenceless.

This is no mere German-British affair. It is a world-wide issue, and the next step, momentous as it may prove for good or evil, is apparently for Britain to take, as the inventor and first adopter of the Dreadnought.

Whatever the final result, if Britain played the part of Peacemaker as suggested, she would have the moral support of the enlightened public sentiment of the world with her, a tower of strength. If repulsed, she would have her "quarrel just." It is not for any non-citizen to advise—she will choose her own path; certain it is, however, she could play no nobler part, nor one that would redound in history more to her honour and glory, illustrious as that history is, for henceforth it is the triumphs of Peace through conciliation, not those of brutal war through the slaughter of our fellow men, that are to make nations venerated in after ages.

I write as one who loves his native land.

SUPPLEMENT.



The following reference to the preceding letter was made in a leader of the same date. "Mr. Andrew Carnegie, whose letter we publish to-day, even thinks the present a favourable moment to propose that Great Britain should invite the other Powers to agree to abolish naval warfare. He forgets that the suggestions our Government have made before with a view to a mutual limitation of naval armaments met with no response, and he makes no proposal with regard to land warfare. We are apparently to scrap our Navy and thus lay down our most formidable weapon, while the great military Powers retain their armies intact. This country is not in the least danger of being infected with any evil spirit of militarism, but it is even less disposed to shrink from any sacrifices which may be necessary, in the present state of Europe, to maintain its naval supremacy unimpaired."

The *Times* of Saturday, 3rd July, 1909, publishes the following letter from Mr. Andrew Carnegie :—

The only objection one has to "taking in" *The Times* is that he has to spend so much time upon it or miss so much that is of value. I missed your editorial comment upon the letter

SUPPLEMENT.

you did me the honour to publish until yesterday, when my attention was called to it.

Of course a Conference, if called, even if dealing with Peace upon the seas, would necessarily have to survey the whole field of International relations and study every phase of the present unfortunate situation, naval and military, in every part and also as a whole—welcoming every suggestion. Your presentation of this feature of the case is unanswerable. The important matter is to get the Powers together. We have just had a remarkable proof of the efficacy of conference in that of the eight naval Powers recently assembled in London—Germany, Austria-Hungary, Russia, Italy, France, Japan, Britain, and America.

It not only succeeded in establishing an International Marine Prize Court to deal finally with all disputes arising in that domain, but is also to be credited with another great achievement. It will be remembered that the last Hague Conference unanimously agreed to establish a judicial International Court comprised of legal authorities before which international disputes might be laid, thus securing purely judicial judgments similar to those of our present national Supreme Courts, free from political bias or compromise. A serious

SUPPLEMENT.

obstacle arose in deciding how this Court should be composed, the smaller Powers claiming equal representation with the greatest, which meant a bench of 46 judges ; and, besides, the small could have outvoted the Great Powers ; and the problem remained unsolved. The Marine Conference solved it by giving to each of the eight Great Powers the appointment of one judge, and reserving seven judges to be hereafter apportioned among such of the smaller Powers as may apply for and obtain admission to the Conference Court, these judges, however, to serve for shorter terms than the others, so that the small Powers will always be represented in turn. Meanwhile the eight Great Powers decided to go forward without them, and the cause of international Peace secures another decisive victory.

Mark the statesmanship here displayed. Another International Court, whose judgment is final, now graces the earth, which overrules, if necessary, the decisions of the highest Courts of any of the countries. Nor is this all. The problem of appointing judges having thus been solved, the next Hague Conference may be enabled to establish the International Judicial Supreme Court of Nations.

Now these eight are the very same Powers,

SUPPLEMENT.

and why not the same delegates who might meet again in friendly conference in London and endeavour to come to such an agreement for the consideration of the Powers in the realm of Peace as they have just reached as fair and satisfactory to all in the hitherto most complicated and unsatisfactory realm of marine prizes? Now is the time to remember the motto—"First all means to conciliate." The nations are playing with fire. I trust the commanding influence of the *Times* will be exerted in this direction.

Much has been gained when all the great naval Powers of the world, European, American, and Asiatic, unanimously create a tribunal for the final settlement of all disputes within one domain of human affairs. Amid all the arming of nations for each others' destruction in true savage fashion and "the thunder of the captains and shouting," peaceful settlement of international disputes makes steady progress toward civilisation. Belgium and the Netherlands have just concluded such a treaty covering all disputes, making thirteen nations that have done so, five of these are Central American Republics, which have created a Supreme Court to settle all disputes.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

D-URB
JUN 28 1971

AUG 4 1971

University of California
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
305 De Neve Drive - Parking Lot 17 • Box 951388
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90095-1388

Return this material to the library from which it was borrowed.

L
U
QL APR 0 3 2002

Fc

THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES



PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE THIS BOOK CARD



University Research Library

JX1963 . C215P

CARNEGIE/PATH TO PE

Univers
Sout
Lib