

Fenwick, Charles G.  
- A Primer of peace  
ADP 1152

790546

# A Primer of Peace

By

CHARLES G. FENWICK, Ph. D., LL.D.

President, Catholic Association for International Peace,  
Washington, D. C.



Price 25 Cents

CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE

Washington, D. C.

1937

## PREFATORY NOTE

THE following Primer of Peace is an attempt to state in the simplest terms the fundamental problem of peace. There is no need to stress here the urgent need of a better understanding of that problem on the part of the public at large. Nothing is more tragic in the life of the nations today than the paradox of millions of people in every country hoping and praying for peace and yet unable to find ways and means to make their aspirations effective. What is needed therefore is not merely the good will, upon which all plans of peace are ultimately dependent, but also a better understanding of the institutions and methods of procedure by which the will to peace can be given practical application.

If the questions and answers should seem too simple and obvious, it may be observed that their purpose is not merely to give information but to challenge the reader to investigate the subject more carefully. For this purpose a brief reading list of pamphlets and books is added; and reference is made to the *Syllabus of International Relations*, second edition, recently published.

C. G. FENWICK.

February 2, 1937.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Lesson I—The Catholic Church and World Peace.....	4
Lesson II—International Ethics.....	7
Lesson III—War .....	10
Lesson IV—Causes of War: Moral and Political.....	14
Lesson V—Causes of War: Economic.....	17
Lesson VI—United States and Europe.....	20
Lesson VII—United States and Latin America.....	24
Lesson VIII—China .....	28
Lesson IX—Russia .....	31
Lesson X—Arbitration and the World Court.....	35
Lesson XI—International Organization.....	39
Lesson XII—The Kellogg-Briand Pact.....	44
Lesson XIII—Disarmament .....	46
Lesson XIV—The Neutrality Policy of the United States.....	49
Lesson XV—Obligations of Membership in the World Society..	53

# LESSON I

## THE CHURCH AND WORLD PEACE

### 1. What is the ideal of world peace?

The ideal of world peace is the ideal of a family of nations living together in friendly relations based upon justice and cooperation.

### 2. Is the ideal of peace a Christian ideal?

It is the ideal of the gospel first announced when the shepherds heard the tidings of "Peace on earth to men of good will." Ever since peace has been held out as the hope and blessing of a Christian world.

### 3. What is the primary condition of world peace?

It is that the nations do justice to one another and cooperate for their mutual benefit.

### 4. What does the rule "Do justice" mean practically?

It means that the nations must respect their mutual rights and fulfill their mutual duties to one another.

### 5. What was the rôle of the Papacy as peacemaker in the Middle Ages?

In the Middle Ages, when the Papacy was at the height of its authority, there were frequent exhortations to peace and numerous arbitrations by Popes between sovereigns. There was also established the famous Truce of God, which limited the period during which war might be carried on. Prohibitions were issued against the employment of cruel instruments of warfare.

### 6. What recent Papal statements have been made looking to the furtherance of peace?

In 1914 Pope Benedict XV appealed to the heads of the governments at war to find other means than the



force of arms to rectify the wrongs done; in 1917, in a letter to the belligerent governments, he set forth points which seemed to him "to offer the foundations of a just and lasting peace," among them being the limitation of armaments and the establishment of a Court of Arbitration; in 1920, in the encyclical *Pacem*, he urged the nations to unite into one single society for the purpose of protecting their individual independence and maintaining the general order of the community. In 1930, Pope Pius XI, in his *Allocution on Peace*, condemned in the strongest terms the policy of a "hard and selfish nationalism," which would substitute competition and struggle in place of cooperation.

7. What has been the rôle of theologians and doctors of the Church?

Among the early theologians and doctors, St. Ambrose, writing in the fourth century, was conspicuous in laying down the moral foundations of peace. St. Augustine, in his famous work on "The City of God," written early in the fifth century, held up the ideal of a peace based upon the principle of "order" in the sense of a just distribution of goods between man and man in accordance with a recognition of their equal status before God. St. Thomas Aquinas, in the thirteenth century, not only laid down in detail the moral obligations of princes and rulers but prescribed the specific conditions which alone could justify a nation in resorting to war. Vitoria, a Spanish Dominican, writing in the sixteenth century, emphasized the moral unity of the family of nations, as did Suarez, a Spanish Jesuit, later in the same century.

8. What significant change has taken place in the attitude of modern theologians and jurists?

A number of modern theologians and jurists, such as Father Delos, O.P., and Father Stratmann, O.P., Monsignor Julien, Bishop of Arras, and Father Yves de la Brière, S.J., take the position that, in view of the possible alternatives of peaceful settlement of controversies



now available to nations, it would be an immoral act for a state to declare war on its own account without having previous recourse to such alternatives. The former justification of war, whether as an act of self-defense or as a means of obtaining justice not otherwise available, must give way, these writers hold, to the extent to which the peaceful procedures established by the community of nations are actually capable of affording a remedy. This argument, they further assert, is all the more cogent in view of the fact that modern war has become so destructive that, except in the most extreme cases of self-defense, the injury which it would be certain to inflict would be out of all proportion to the rights which it sought to protect.

## LESSON II

### INTERNATIONAL ETHICS

1. Do the same principles of moral conduct apply to states as well as to individual persons?

Yes, the same principles of Christian morality hold good for states as for individual citizens. Men associated in larger groups are bound by the moral law just as much as they are bound singly and in smaller groups.

2. What is to be thought of the modern doctrine that the state is "above the law"?

It is a doctrine which cannot be too strongly condemned. If the state is above the law, then there can be nothing but anarchy in the world.

3. Can a correct sense be attributed to the saying—"My country, right or wrong"?

It does not mean, or should not mean, that we uphold our country in wrongdoing. Rather it should mean that as loyal citizens we shall not desert our country even when it is wrong, but shall try to influence it to do what is right.

4. What is the moral law in regard to the rights and duties of nations?

It is that the rights of other nations should be respected and duties to them fulfilled.

5. Are all rights and duties of the same character?

No, some are moral and others legal.

6. What are legal rights as distinct from moral?

Legal rights are rights which have received the sanc-

tion of international law either by special treaty or by long custom.

7. What are moral rights?

Moral rights, as distinct from legal, are rights which a nation may claim by reason of its being a member of the family or commonwealth of nations, but which are not at present recognized by international law.

8. What would be an example of a moral right as distinct from a legal right?

A nation which is a member of the family or commonwealth of nations and which has inadequate natural resources with which to feed or clothe or maintain its population would have a moral right to such resources from states which have them in superabundance.

9. How can moral rights be made legal rights?

That is the great problem of statesmanship. Some day international law, as we now know it, must be supplemented by a Christian code of moral law which will more adequately provide for charity and justice among the nations.

10. Does this mean that justice and charity are above the law?

Yes, in the sense that nations may on occasion be called upon to do greater justice than the law actually requires them to do. But this does not mean that a particular nation is free to claim as its right whatever it believes it needs at a particular time.

11. What is the meaning of the term, "Family of nations"?

It means that the nations of the world as a body are not isolated units but are bound together by obligations of charity and justice in much the same way that members of a family are bound together.



12. Is there a world society as distinct from the 60 or more nations which have a separate national existence?

Yes, the ideal of a world society is an old one. In the Middle Ages there was the conception of a *Civitas Maxima*, one great city of the world. The Holy Roman Empire was intended to represent the unity of Christendom. In the seventeenth century the Spanish theologian Vitoria called attention to the bonds uniting the family of nations; and more recently Benedict XV expressed, in 1920, the hope of a "family of peoples" united together to protect one another and to promote justice.

## LESSON III

### WAR

#### 1. What has been the place of war in history?

War has filled a large place in the history of the world, and its wreckage has been strewn here and there through the centuries down to our own times.

#### 2. What are wars of conquest?

Wars of conquest are wars which have had no other purpose than that of extending the control of a ruler over subject peoples for the satisfaction of his own ambition. Such were the wars of Alexander the Great, of Caesar, and in more modern times, of Napoleon.

#### 3. What are dynastic wars?

Dynastic wars are wars in which two or more rival kings or chieftains have struggled for a disputed throne. They have not been contests of peoples so much as contests of rival claimants.

#### 4. What are "imperialist" wars?

"Imperialist" wars are wars in which modern industrial nations have sought to obtain control over backward peoples of the world with the object of obtaining the raw materials of industry and of extending the markets for industrial products.

#### 5. How does modern warfare differ from the warfare of earlier times?

Modern warfare is highly mechanized; its instruments are far more destructive and its range of devastation far greater than ever before.

6. Is it lawful to use any instrument of destruction in time of war?

As new instruments of warfare were invented during the late Middle Ages, such as the cross-bow, gunpowder, and the harquebus, they were condemned by successive Church Councils, but this did not prevent their continued use. In modern times the instruments of war have become more and more deadly with each succeeding decade.

7. Is chemical and bacteriological warfare lawful?

The use of chemicals, such as poisonous gases, and of bacteria, such as typhoid germs, has been condemned by the nations; but it would appear more than likely that at least chemical warfare will be used in the future, as it has been in the recent past.

8. Are non-combatants protected from the effects of war?

The old law called for the protection of non-combatants, old men, women, children and those not actually carrying arms.

9. Does the traditional law still hold?

It would appear doubtful whether, with the modern instruments of warfare—long-range guns, airplanes, poisonous gases, and food blockades—it will be possible to spare non-combatants the fate of the armies in the field.

10. Must warfare be limited to military objectives only?

That was the old rule of international law, but the changed conditions of modern warfare make it seem probable that churches, schools, hospitals, art museums, and scientific institutions will all be destroyed indiscriminately because of the practical difficulty of singling out military establishments and limiting the attack to them alone.

11. What lessons did the World War teach us in this respect?

The World War taught us the practical impossibility of segregating the non-combatant population from the military forces and of protecting public buildings of a peaceful character from the destruction intended for military objectives.

12. Can war under any conditions be justified?

Yes, in theory there can be such a thing as a just war.

13. What kind of a war would in theory be a just war?

A just war would be a war of self-defense as distinct from a war of aggression.

14. Have the doctors of the Church ever admitted that a war may be just?

Yes, they have distinctly said so, thinking of the conditions of their times.

15. Was the distinction between a defensive and an aggressive war a clear one in earlier times?

It was possibly clearer in earlier times than today, but even then there were numerous cases of attack under guise of self-defense.

16. Can each state be left today to decide for itself whether its war is a defensive or an aggressive one; that is, whether its war is a just war or an unjust one?

No, because the claims at issue between two or more states are often very complex, so that each is likely to assert that it is acting in self-defense. Also, it is common for a state to assert that it must anticipate the attack of another state by itself attacking first, in which case the actual invasion of a neighbor's territory would still be held to be self-defense. So long as each state is the judge in its own case it will, except in rare cases,



be impossible, as a practical proposition, to distinguish between defensive and aggressive wars.

17. Is the justice of a war affected by the availability of means of peaceful settlement?

Yes, that is particularly the situation today when grounds which might have been adequate to justify a war during the Middle Ages are no longer adequate in view of the modern agencies of peaceful settlement.

18. Is the justice of war dependent, then, upon the existing peaceful alternatives?

Yes, the justice of war diminishes to a vanishing point in accordance with the alternatives of peaceful settlement which may be readily available.

## LESSON IV

### CAUSES OF WAR: MORAL AND POLITICAL

#### 1. What are the moral causes of war?

By the moral causes of war are meant the forces of human passion which lead nations to engage in combat, much as individual men might engage in combat if they were not restrained by law.

#### 2. In what way is materialism a cause of war?

Materialism is a cause of war when it leads a nation to make war upon another for the sake of adding to the national wealth. In like manner greed may be a cause of war when a nation seeks to add unduly to its national resources at the expense of other states.

#### 3. In what way may pride be a cause of war?

When pride means the predominance of our own race and its superiority over other races, it may readily lead a nation to resort to war to assure that predominance. So, too, may bigotry be a cause of war when it has the effect of leading a nation to misunderstand the people of foreign countries and to underrate their just claims.

#### 4. Can we limit the application of moral principles to people of our own race or language or religion?

Definitely no. To do so would be to repudiate the universality of Christian brotherhood.

#### 5. What are the political causes of war?

The political causes of war, as distinct from moral causes, are causes which relate to the action of governments as distinct from the action of individual citizens.

6. How may nationalism be a cause of war?

Exaggerated nationalism may lead a state to seek to unify its racial elements by force, by making war upon a neighboring state to detach from it persons belonging to its own race.

7. How may a false conception of sovereignty be a cause of war?

Sovereignty originally meant the independence of the state from any higher control by another state, but it has been perverted at different times to mean that the state is above the law instead of being subject to it.

8. How are competitive national armaments a cause of war?

They are a cause of war because they give rise to mutual fear and suspicion of attack, as a result of which one state is led to attack when it sees that the longer it waits the less powerful its armaments will be relative to those of its neighbor.

9. How could armaments be made an agency of peace rather than an agency of war?

They could be made so if all the nations assumed a collective responsibility to protect one another. Individual armaments might then be reduced without fear of exposing the particular nation to attack; and the combined force of all acting together would restrain the law-breaker.

10. Would the principle of collective responsibility run counter to the traditional American policy of neutrality?

Yes, for if the principle of collective responsibility were in force all nations would cooperate to prevent wrong, and no nation could then stand aside and declare its neutrality in the presence of wrong.

11. Can neutrality be under any circumstances a correct principle of law?

Yes, if there appears to be no hope of putting into effect the principle of collective responsibility and co-operative defense. But it can only be a temporary expedient, until the world is better organized.

12. Is the principle of the collective responsibility of all nations to protect one another against attack in harmony with the development of law within the individual state?

Yes, it is merely the extension of principles that have long been accepted within the individual state, and within such federal unions as the United States.



## LESSON V

### CAUSES OF WAR: ECONOMIC

1. What is meant by the economic causes of war as distinct from political causes?

By the economic causes of war is meant those causes which bear upon the production and distribution of goods and which lead nations to make war in order to increase their economic wealth.

2. Are the food supplies of the different nations fairly distributed?

No. For various reasons, due to soil and climate, the food supplies of the nations are unevenly distributed. Some have a superabundance; some have less than is necessary for subsistence.

3. Are the raw materials of industry fairly distributed among the nations?

No, some have abundant raw materials, such as coal, oil, iron ore, cotton, while others have very limited supplies or none at all.

4. Why cannot the nations which have inadequate supplies of raw materials purchase what they need from other countries which have a superabundance?

Because few nations have gold with which to buy goods; they can only exchange their own products for the products of other countries; and if the other countries will not take their goods they cannot buy the raw materials they need.

5. Are there cases in which the fear of industrial starvation has led nations to go to war?

Yes, that has been a frequent cause of war in modern times.

6. How has the exploitation of undeveloped countries led to war?

It has led to war because the competition between the leading nations to obtain monopolies of raw materials and exclusive markets for their manufactured products has become so sharp as to lead a nation at times to resort to force to get control over the undeveloped country.

7. What part does the investment of surplus capital play as an economic cause of war?

The owners of surplus capital seek opportunities for profitable investment abroad when they do not find them at home; and having invested abroad, they are then led to call upon their governments to protect their investment when it appears to be threatened by hostile forces.

8. Are the opportunities of industrial exploitation of the so-called "backward" portions of the world open equally to all nations?

No, nations possessing colonies and protectorates have generally used them for their own special advantage as distinct from the common advantage of the world.

9. What is the meaning of an "open door" policy in the markets of the world?

An "open door" policy in the markets of the world would mean that these markets are open to all nations on equal terms; that is, the citizens of every country can buy and sell in those countries upon equal terms.

10. What is the meaning of a "closed door" policy?

It means that the door of opportunity is wholly or partially closed to the citizens of other countries than the nation controlling the particular market.

11. What form does the "closed door" policy take?

It may take the form of prohibitive tariffs, which are so high that the foreign country cannot climb over them;

---

or it may take the form of preferential rates which are made lower to one country than to another; or it may take the form of "quotas" which limit the amount of goods that may be shipped from other states. The depreciation of currency, by which a temporary advantage is obtained over other states, may also have the effect of closing the door to foreign goods.

12. Have there been any attempts to regulate international trade by general agreements seeking to abolish artificial restrictions?

Yes, there have been several World Economic Conferences, as in 1927, 1930, and 1933, but none of them has gone far towards removing the present economic barriers to trade and the present economic causes of war.

## LESSON VI

### THE UNITED STATES AND EUROPE

1. What has been the condition of Europe since the World War?

Europe has suffered seriously from the effects of the Versailles Treaty and from the political and economic disorganization resulting from the World War.

2. Was the Treaty of Versailles the primary cause of the present situation?

No, the Treaty of Versailles righted a number of pre-existing wrongs and cannot be said to be the sole cause of the present situation.

3. What positive wrong was done by the Treaty of Versailles?

The chief positive wrong was the imposition upon the defeated nations of an intolerable burden of reparations.

4. Did the readjustment of boundary lines by the Treaty of Versailles create greater injustices than existed before?

No, but a number of minor injustices were done which, under the strain of post-war economic conditions, have seemed to be more serious than the conditions existing before the War.

5. Has the reparations problem been brought nearer to a settlement?

Yes, but each time that relief was granted it came too late to relieve the sense of wrong done or to ease the conditions of economic distress.



6. Can the minorities problem in Europe be settled by drawing new boundary lines?

It would seem impossible ever to draw lines which would satisfy both countries claiming the particular people. The reason is that through the centuries the people of one nationality have inextricably intermingled with the people of another nationality.

7. What possible remedy is there for the minorities problem?

It would seem that the only effective remedy would be to make the particular boundary line separating the people of different nationalities from their mother country mean less to them; that is, by lowering the political and economic barriers along that particular boundary line and making it a matter of less consequence on which side of the boundary a particular person is.

8. What are the leading problems of American-European relations?

The leading problems are, first, the limitation of armaments; second, the adjustment of war debts; third, the lowering of tariff barriers so as to permit a freer flow of trade.

9. What effect has the growth of Fascism and Communism had upon the relations of the United States to Europe?

It has greatly increased the difficulties of cooperation due to our suspicion of both forms of dictatorial government under which democratic institutions, together with freedom of speech and of the press, have been more or less abolished.

10. What special relations arose between the United States and Europe during the World War?

During the World War the problem of neutrality on the part of the United States became a pressing one,

owing to the difficulty of denying to our citizens the right to engage in war trade with its large profits. There was also the problem created by blockades and the capture of contraband, both of which, in addition to restricting trade in war materials, also restricted trade in ordinary commercial goods.

11. What is the meaning of neutrality as an American policy in time of foreign war?

It has meant a policy of political isolation by which we have stood aloof from European conflicts. But it has not meant a policy of economic isolation, for we have not believed it to be either necessary or feasible to deny to our citizens all trade relations with belligerents. The recent restrictions relate only to trade in arms and ammunition, and to loans and credits.

12. What are the relations of the United States with the League of Nations?

The United States is not a member of the League of Nations, but it cooperates with the League in non-political activities.

13. Does this cooperation extend to the adjustment of our trade so as not to defeat the application of sanctions by the League against an aggressor state?

No, thus far we have not seen our way to adjust our trade policies to take into account the conditions created by economic sanctions against an aggressor.

14. Does the cooperation of the United States with the League extend to consultation with the League when there is threat of war?

It has been stated by our Government that the Kellogg Pact (see Lesson XII) implies consultation with other states which are signatories of the pact when war is threatened; but thus far no machinery has been created to accomplish that purpose.

15. What are the possibilities of better relations between the United States and Europe?

The possibilities appear to lie in the development of a greater sense of responsibility on the part of the United States as a member of the world society, and in a willingness on the part of the leading powers of Europe to undertake the constructive reforms needed to remove the causes of war.

16. Can this responsibility on the part of the United States be developed without creating the "entangling alliances" which we have always sought to avoid?

Yes, it can. First of all we can eradicate hostile attitudes by closer intellectual cooperation; that is, by education looking toward mutual understanding. Secondly, we can remove the economic barriers between us by reciprocal trade agreements which will do much to remove the feeling of hostility which other nations may have towards us. Thirdly, we can participate in social and economic conferences looking to the promotion of the common interests which we have with other nations.

17. What further cooperation may we some day hope to find possible?

It may some day be possible to go further and cooperate to the full in preventing war by a system of collective security. This is a difficult problem, not to be solved all at once, but step by step. It implies common ideals of foreign policy which do not seem to exist at present in a number of the leading nations.

## LESSON VII

### THE UNITED STATES AND LATIN AMERICA

1. What is the historical background of the present friendly relations between the United States and Latin America?

Our relations with Latin America began in the first decades of the nineteenth century when the United States formally recognized a number of the Latin American states as independent states.

2. Are there any common political ideals between the United States and Latin America?

Yes, both the United States and Latin America have sought to uphold the ideal of democracy, of a government based upon popular support and seeking to promote the welfare of the people.

3. What special part does the Monroe Doctrine play in the relations between the United States and Latin America?

The Monroe Doctrine has gone through several stages of development, beginning as a doctrine for the protection of the United States and Latin America against European aggression and extending more recently into a doctrine of cooperation by the United States and Latin America for the promotion of their mutual interests.

4. What form did the original assertion of the Monroe Doctrine take?

As asserted by President Monroe in 1823, the Monroe Doctrine stated that the continent of America was to be regarded as no longer open to colonization by European powers and that the United States would oppose the extension of the European system to this continent.



5. What was meant by President Monroe in using the phrase "the extension of the European system"?

He meant that the United States would oppose any attempt on the part of European states, meaning chiefly the so-called "Holy Alliance," to combine together to force back the Latin American states under the sovereignty of their former mother countries.

6. What have been some of the modern extensions of the Monroe Doctrine?

The modern extensions have at times taken the form of the exercise by the United States of a sort of "policemanship" of certain of the Latin American states.

7. Has this exercise of policemanship been intended to be an encroachment upon the sovereignty of the states which have been subjected to it?

No, in theory it has been intended to enable them to maintain order and to meet their international obligations and thus avoid the occasion for intervention by European powers. Practice, however, has not always conformed to theory.

8. What have been some of the recent developments of the relations between the United States and Latin America in this respect?

The United States has distinctly disclaimed any right of intervention on its part in the domestic affairs of the Latin American states and has, in the particular instance of Cuba, withdrawn the Platt Amendment as a manifestation of the new spirit prevailing in its relations with Latin America. A similar treaty has been signed with Panama by which the United States abandons the control conferred by the treaty of 1903.

9. What unfortunate conditions have at certain times attended the economic relations between the United States and Latin America?

The economic relations between the United States and Latin America have been disturbed at times by manifestations of "imperialism" on the part of the United States.

10. What is the meaning of "imperialism" in this connection?

It means an attempt on the part of a stronger country to control the economic life, and indirectly the political government, of a weaker country in the interest of permitting the citizens of the stronger country to exploit the weaker country for commercial advantage.

11. What part have loans and investments by citizens of the United States played in giving rise to the accusation by some of the smaller Latin American states of imperialism on the part of the United States?

The United States has naturally sought to protect its citizens against unfair treatment by states to which they have loaned money or with which they have entered into contracts; and this has led at times to an unwarranted interference with the domestic government of the weaker state.

12. What are the Drago and the Calvo doctrines?

They are doctrines put forth by Latin American states in which they repudiate the use of armed force for the collection of debts owing to the citizens of other countries and for the enforcement of contractual obligations between the Latin American states and the citizens of another state.

13. Has the United States accepted those doctrines in principle?

Yes, the United States has distinctly asserted the wrongfulness of the use of force in both those respects, assuming that the state in question is willing to arbitrate the justice of the claim at issue.

14. What progress has been made in respect to provision for the arbitration of disputes between the United States and Latin American states?

A number of treaties of arbitration have been entered into with individual states, and an important treaty was entered into by the whole body of states in 1929.

15. Do these treaties provide for the arbitration of all disputes which may arise between the United States and Latin America?

Yes, with exceptions relating to certain vital national interests, these treaties provide in a broad way for the arbitration of all disputes between the United States and the Latin American countries.

16. What was the outstanding accomplishment of the special Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace held in 1936?

A treaty was entered into, known as the "Convention for the Maintenance, Preservation and Reestablishment of Peace," providing for common consultation by all of the American Republics in the event of a threat to the peace of America. Without making direct reference to the Monroe Doctrine the treaty makes the fundamental principle of the Doctrine the law of the continent.



## LESSON VIII

### CHINA

1. When was China opened up to intercourse with the Western World?

Beginning in 1842 and 1844, Great Britain and the United States entered into treaties with China which step by step opened up new portions of China to foreign trade and intercourse.

2. What is meant by a "treaty port" in regard to China?

A "treaty port" is a port into which Europeans may enter and there enjoy certain rights of residence and trade defined by treaty.

3. To what extent have the various treaties with China given to foreign powers a control over the Chinese tariff?

The early treaties all fixed definite tariff schedules, and these were a source of great annoyance to China until of recent years when China has been allowed to determine its own tariffs.

4. What has been the effect upon China's foreign relations of its transition from an empire to a republic in 1911?

The transition has greatly added to the difficulties of China's foreign relations, because it has created internal confusion which has been taken advantage of by certain foreign powers.

5. What is the meaning of the policy of the "Open Door" in relation to China?

The policy of the "Open Door" was first put forth by the American Secretary of State, John Hay, in 1898,



---

and it means that the markets of China and the opportunities for commercial activity and financial investment shall be open equally to the citizens of all countries.

6. What encroachments upon Chinese sovereignty took place during the World War?

In 1915 Japan made a series of "Twenty-one Demands" among which were a group that, if accepted, would have given Japan partial control over the domestic administration of China.

7. What was the Lansing-Ishii agreement of 1917?

It was an agreement by which the United States, although opposing the demands made by Japan upon China in 1915, nevertheless recognized the "special interests" of Japan in China.

8. Has the control of foreign powers over China been relaxed in any way since the World War?

Yes, the control over the Chinese tariff has been given up and the so-called extra-territorial jurisdiction, giving to foreign states the right to have their citizens tried by their own tribunals, is being gradually abandoned.

9. What was the relation of Manchuria to China before 1931?

Manchuria was legally part of Chinese territory, although enjoying a large degree of practical independence.

10. What was the result of the Japanese invasion in 1931?

Japan succeeded in detaching Manchuria from China and in setting up a puppet government under Japanese control.

11. What has been the attitude of foreign powers toward the action of Japan in Manchuria?

Most of the foreign powers, under the leadership of the United States, refused to recognize the legality of the new independent state of Manchuria, now called Manchukuo.

12. What recent demands has Japan made upon China?

Japan has not only invaded the northern provinces of China but has insisted that China appoint Japanese military officials as part of its domestic administration.

13. What are some of the domestic problems of modern China?

China must find a way to maintain domestic law and order, which is thwarted by the anarchy prevailing in some of the provinces, and must develop a sense of national unity and modernize its agricultural and industrial production.

14. What can foreign powers do to assist China in solving its domestic problems?

In a negative way they can assist by not taking advantage of China's weakness. In a positive way they can offer their friendly advice and technical aid.

## LESSON IX

### RUSSIA

1. What were the social and economic conditions in Russia that contributed to the outbreak of the Revolution?

There was great poverty and distress on the part of the masses of the people; relatively few owned their own farms; the illiteracy was over 90 per cent, and class distinctions made advancement from the ranks very difficult.

2. What progress had been made in the struggle for democracy?

A parliament, called the Duma, had been established, but its powers were very limited; freedom of speech and of the press were sharply restricted; oppression led to anarchism and anarchism led to more oppression.

3. Was the Communist Revolution a result of the World War?

Yes, in part. The Revolution began under the leadership of the moderate elements, but, in consequence of the confusion caused by the war, the leadership was soon taken over by the Bolsheviks, who set up a dictatorship of the most extreme character and proceeded to exterminate the less radical groups.

4. What is the present form of government in Russia?

It is a federal form of government known as the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics (USSR). The former Russia is now only one member of the Union, although the leading member.

5. Is the government of the Soviet Union to any extent democratic?

The local village Soviets are to a large degree democratic in character, but the central government is under the control of the Communist Party whose leader, Stalin, is stronger than the technical head of the government. There is still no real freedom of speech and of the press. However, the great masses of the people, especially in the industrial centers, appear to be at the present time solidly behind the government since it uses its dictatorial powers for their economic welfare; hence the absence of complete freedom of the press is felt only by a small minority.

6. If the government of Russia has the support of the great masses of the people why should it continue to be a dictatorship accompanied by ruthless suppression of opposition?

Probably because the Communist Party which controls the government has been from the beginning almost fanatical in its political and economic dogmas, looking upon opposition as something heretical; partly also because of the necessity of stern discipline in a country not accustomed to regimentation.

7. What are some of the economic problems of the Soviet Union?

The primary problem of the Soviet Union has been to increase domestic production while at the same time organizing it along communistic lines; secondly, the problem has been to direct production along lines of military defense and self-sufficiency, so as to enable the government to resist attack upon it from without.

8. What was the original "Five Year Plan"?

It was a plan for increasing and directing industrial production so that at the end of five years certain definite results would be attained. In this way the workers were encouraged to speed up production as a patriotic duty and the masses of the people were persuaded to make sacrifices of the things they wanted until the time when



---

the government should have attained its objective of national defense.

9. What are some of the social problems of the Soviet Union?

Education is one of the most important problems, in the sense that it will largely determine the future of the Union. Equally important is the freedom of religious worship and the sanctity of marriage and of family life. The abolition of class distinctions likewise plays a significant part in the life of the country.

10. Why has the Soviet Union tried so hard to suppress religion?

Because its radical leaders, in their fanatical reaction against oppression, became convinced that religion was the ally of capitalism, which they were determined to destroy; and because the teaching of Christianity seemed to them to lead the people to accept their economic status rather than rise up and change the whole system.

11. What recent changes have taken place in the foreign policy of the Soviet Union?

The Soviet Union has abandoned its earlier policy of isolation and has sought to ally itself with states having the same political interests; it has become a member of the League of Nations and has been active in support of disarmament. Its chief fear is an attack on the west by Nazi Germany and on the east by Japan.

12. Why does the Soviet Union engage in propaganda to win over other countries to Communism?

Partly because it is characteristic of those who hold opinions with great intensity to seek to win over others to them and partly because the Soviet leaders were at first convinced that unless the rest of the world could

be converted to Communism their own system was in danger. More recently they have modified this position and have been willing to cooperate with capitalistic states when they felt that they had interests in common, such as the defense of their territory and the promotion of disarmament.

## LESSON X

### ARBITRATION AND THE WORLD COURT

1. What is the meaning of arbitration as a procedure for the peaceful settlement of disputes between states?

It means the reference of a dispute to an impartial tribunal, accompanied by an agreement to accept the award of the tribunal as a final settlement.

2. Has arbitration been resorted to successfully in the past?

Yes, for many centuries arbitration has proved a useful method of settling disputes. The disputes of kings and princes were frequently submitted to the Pope for arbitration during the Middle Ages. During more recent times, beginning with the Jay Treaty of 1794, the United States has arbitrated disputes with Great Britain and other states.

3. What are general treaties of arbitration?

They are treaties which pledge the parties to arbitrate future disputes of the character described in the treaty. The Root Treaties of 1908 and the Inter-American Treaty of 1929 are typical examples.

4. What are the advantages of such treaties?

They pledge the parties to arbitrate at a time when public opinion has not yet become aroused by a particular controversy.

5. What was the special feature of the Washington Treaties of 1913-1914?

These treaties, known popularly as the "Cooling-off Treaties," provided that all disputes of whatever kind would, if not submitted to arbitration, at least be sub-

mitted to a commission of inquiry, and in the meantime the parties obligated themselves not to go to war.

6. Are all arbitration courts of the same character?

No, they vary all the way from single neutral judges to the special tribunals of the Hague Permanent Court of Arbitration.

7. What is the Hague Permanent Court of Arbitration?

It is a list of judges, selected by the different nations, from which tribunals of arbitration can be selected when the occasion arises. While the words "permanent" and "court" seem hardly applicable to the mere list of judges, nevertheless the tribunals selected from the list have heard and settled a large number of cases.

8. What is the World Court?

The World Court is the popular name for the Permanent Court of International Justice.

9. How does the World Court differ from the older Hague Court of Arbitration?

The World Court is permanent in the sense of having a fixed body of judges which meets regularly and which has established some degree of continuity in its successive decisions.

10. What authority has the World Court to hear cases?

It has no authority other than that given it by the states which are resorting to it in a particular case.

11. Is the World Court connected with the League of Nations?

The World Court operates under its own independent constitution, known as the "Statute" of the Court, to which states may be parties even if they are not members



of the League of Nations. However, there is a connection between the World Court and the League in the fact that the judges of the Court are elected by the Council and the Assembly of the League.

12. Does the method of election of judges to the World Court make the Court dependent upon the League?

No, the election of the judges by the Council and the Assembly is only a convenient way of balancing the claims of the large and small states for representation. Once elected, the judges owe nothing to the League and cannot be controlled by it.

13. Why has the United States not become a party to the Court?

Presidents Harding, Coolidge, Hoover and Roosevelt, and their respective Secretaries of State Hughes, Kellogg, Stimson, and Hull, have urged this, but the Senate has either added reservations which prevented final ratification, or has failed to approve by the necessary two-thirds vote.

14. If the authority, or jurisdiction, of the World Court is not compulsory, why should there be any objection to the membership of the United States in the Court?

A number of people confuse the World Court with the League of Nations and are afraid lest in some indirect way the participation of the United States in the functions of the Court might involve us in the League.

15. If the Court has no compulsory authority, or jurisdiction, what purpose can it serve that would make it desirable for the United States to be a party to it?

The Court has already rendered about sixty judgments and advisory opinions and has proved a valuable agency for the settlement of such disputes as the nations have

been willing to submit to it. It is a symbol of law and order between nations as against resort to force for the settlement of disputes. It can be made as effective as the nations wish to make it. The participation of the United States would greatly strengthen its prestige and enlarge its opportunities for service in the settlement of international controversies and in the development of international law.

## LESSON XI

### INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

1. What machinery have the nations of the world had at their disposal for the settlement of their problems and the promotion of their mutual interests?

They have had numerous meetings in the form of conferences and congresses, permanent associations for limited purposes in the form of international "unions" and the International Labor Office, judicial institutions in the form of the Hague Court of Arbitration and the Permanent Court of International Justice, and most important of all, the elaborate and comprehensive organization of the League of Nations.

2. Why have conferences and congresses proved to be inefficient machinery to promote the most important international interests?

Because they are held only occasionally, they have no permanent organization, and they have no power to make present decisions but can only draw up treaties for subsequent ratification.

3. What was accomplished by the Hague Peace Conferences of 1899 and 1907?

They made provision for a permanent list of judges from which special arbitration courts could be selected when wanted. This list was known as the Hague Permanent Court of Arbitration (see Lesson X). They also, paradoxically enough, drew up elaborate rules and regulations for the conduct of the next war.

4. Have the successive Inter-American (Pan American) Conferences been able to accomplish anything of value for the American Republics?

Yes, they have succeeded in drawing up treaties providing for the peaceful settlement of disputes, either by arbitration or conciliation, and they have also accepted certain fundamental principles of law, such as the rule of non-intervention by one state in the domestic concerns of another.

5. What was the most important accomplishment of the Conference held at Buenos Aires in 1936?

It made the principles of the Monroe Doctrine the collective concern of all the American Republics and provided for common consultation in the event of a threat to the peace of America. Also, it succeeded in coordinating earlier peace treaties and in providing machinery of consultation in order to secure their more effective observance.

6. What are the functions of the International Labor Office?

Its chief functions are to endeavor to raise the standards of labor in different countries and, with that object, to draft treaties by which the worst evils of the exploitation of labor may be overcome. The United States became a member of the International Labor Office in 1934.

7. How does the League of Nations differ from earlier conferences and congresses?

In the first place it was planned to be a permanent as distinct from a temporary organization, and in the second place it was based on new principles of law.

8. Through what organs does the League of Nations act?

It acts through a Council, composed of the larger states and others elected from time to time, and an Assembly representing all the members of the League on a basis of equality. There is also a permanent Secretariat which performs the administrative work of the League.



9. What new principles of law were written into the Covenant of the League when it came into force in 1920?

The most important principles were that all the members of the League should be collectively responsible for the protection of each individual member, and that in the future any war or threat of war was to be the common concern of all of them even though their own immediate national interests were not directly concerned.

10. By what means were these principles to be put into effect?

Provision was made for the settlement of disputes by peaceful means, and if any state violated its obligations in this respect and resorted to war it would be regarded as an aggressor and be subjected to economic, and possibly military, sanctions.

11. What relations has the United States maintained towards the League?

The United States took a leading part in the promotion of the idea of a League of Nations and in the drafting of the Covenant. The Senate of 1920, however, refused to ratify the Covenant except with reservations which were unacceptable to the President. Since that time the United States has refused to take part in the political activities of the Council and of the Assembly of the League, but has cooperated to an increasing degree with the social and administrative work of the Secretariat of the League, for example, in the promotion of public health.

12. Why has the League of Nations failed to secure the peace of the world in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant?

Partly because of defects in the Covenant and partly because of the unwillingness of members of the League to live up to their obligations.

13. What defects in the Covenant have obstructed the efforts of the League to promote peace?

The Covenant made provision for the maintenance of the *status quo*, i.e. the continuance of the territorial adjustments made by the Treaty of Versailles, but it did not make adequate provision for the changes needed in the interest both of correcting the mistakes of the Treaty of Versailles and of promoting economic justice.

14. Why has the system of economic sanctions, to be enforced by the League against an aggressor, failed to maintain a stable peace?

Partly because a number of important exporting states, such as the United States, are not members of the League, and partly because the leading members of the League have, for political reasons, been unwilling to exert their full pressure against the aggressor.

15. What changes in the organization and functions of the League seem to be needed to make it an effective agency of peace?

It seems imperative that all the leading nations without exception shall be members of the League, so that the decisions of the League shall have behind them the force of the great body of public opinion throughout the world. Further, the members of the League must be prepared to make the economic readjustments necessary to obtain a stable peace. (See Lesson V.)

16. How could the United States cooperate with the peace work of the League without "commitments" which are contrary to the traditions of our foreign policy?

The cooperation of the United States could be limited to consultation without the assumption of an obligation to participate in sanctions.

17. Would the Covenant of the League have to be amended to permit such consultation?

Not necessarily, since in practice other nations have refused to be bound against their will. Decisions on important questions must be unanimous, and while that requirement weakens the effectiveness of the League it does protect the members against any action of which they might individually disapprove.

## LESSON XII

### THE KELLOGG-BRIAND PACT

#### 1. What is the Kellogg-Briand Pact?

It is a treaty signed in 1928 by which the contracting parties condemn recourse to war for the solution of their controversies and renounce it as an "instrument of national policy" in their relations with one another. Moreover, they agree that the settlement of disputes of whatever kind that may arise between them shall never be sought except by pacific means.

#### 2. What were the motives that led the United States to propose the Pact?

It was believed that a declaration outlawing war might be effective in restraining states which might be tempted to commit acts of aggression against their neighbors.

#### 3. Are there any exceptions in the Kellogg Pact to the obligation not to resort to war as an instrument of national policy?

No, there are no exceptions, but in a separate letter Secretary Kellogg made it clear that the obligations of the Treaty did not take away the right of a state to go to war in self-defense.

#### 4. Does the Kellogg Pact provide any means of distinguishing between a war of self-defense and a war of aggression?

No, the Kellogg Pact makes no provision for determining that question.

#### 5. Does the loophole of self-defense seriously weaken the Kellogg Pact?



In one sense it does, in that each state is left to be the judge when its war is a war of self-defense. But it was hoped that each state would reach that decision with a sense of responsibility to the other signatories of the Pact and in a spirit of good faith.

6. Does the Kellogg Pact provide any machinery for the enforcement of its obligations?

No, no such machinery is provided. No sanctions were planned to prevent violations of the treaty, but it was hoped that the public opinion of all nations would be sufficient to restrain the wrong-doer.

7. Was any procedure of arbitration prescribed to facilitate the performance of the obligations of arbitration?

No, the Kellogg Pact leaves the choice of a court to the particular parties when the dispute arises.

8. Has the Kellogg Pact succeeded in restraining nations from violating its provisions?

It has failed to do so in two important cases, the aggression of Japan against China in Manchuria, and the aggression of Italy against Ethiopia.

9. Does the Kellogg Pact imply an obligation on the part of the states to consult together when its provisions are being violated?

The Department of State of the United States so interpreted the Pact on one occasion, but no instance of such consultation has yet occurred. Individual powers have, however, made protests when the Pact has been violated.

10. What could be done to make the Kellogg Pact a more effective agency of peace?

There has been much discussion of "implementing" the Pact by making provision for consultation and for sanctions of an economic character, but thus far no action has been taken along these lines.

## LESSON XIII

### DISARMAMENT

1. What is the underlying cause of the present competition in armaments which is going on among the nations?

It is the fact that under the existing system of international law each nation is dependent for its protection upon its own armed forces.

2. What purpose do the nations assert they have in building up large armaments?

They all assert that their one object is self-defense.

3. Why then should there be competition in armaments, if national defense is the only purpose each state has in mind?

Because no state appears to be willing to trust its neighbor's alleged motive of self-defense, and each fears an aggressive purpose on the part of the other.

4. Has self-defense ever taken on an aggressive character in the past?

Yes, nations have asserted that they were acting in self-defense when they attacked the other nation first in order to anticipate an attack upon themselves under less favorable conditions.

5. Would it promote disarmament if the whole community of nations agreed upon a system of collective security by which they would, as a body, protect any one of their number if unjustly attacked?

Yes, in principle such a system of collective security would seem to be the necessary condition precedent to disarmament.

6. Why has such a system of collective security not been adopted by the nations?

It was attempted in 1920 in the Covenant of the League of Nations, but in spite of the pledges then adopted, it has not been found possible to maintain the system against powerfully armed states which have committed acts of aggression.

7. Why have the numerous disarmament conferences, held in 1921, 1927, and 1930, failed to result in limitation of armaments?

Because they have sought to bring about reduction of armaments by adopting fixed ratios of individual national strength without agreeing upon collective action by all the nations for their common defense.

8. Why cannot the nations limit themselves to the defensive instruments of warfare and thus lessen the suspicion of aggressive intentions by their neighbors?

Because it is impossible at the present day to draw a clear line between aggressive and defensive weapons, especially in view of the uses of the airplane in time of war.

9. Are modern weapons of offense superior to the weapons of defense?

Yes, that is one of the technical difficulties of the problem, to which must be added the fact that many articles, the use of which is regarded as essential in time of peace, can be so readily converted to the uses of war.

10. Why has the airplane in particular introduced a new element into the problem of disarmament?

Because the introduction of aerial warfare has greatly increased the possibility of sudden attack and has therefore increased the suspicion with which one nation regards the armaments of another.

11. Must disarmament necessarily await the agree-

ment of the nations to put into effect a system of collective security?

No, it would seem that a progressive limitation of armaments would create mutual confidence which would facilitate the adoption of a system of collective security.

12. What is the lesson of the Constitution of the United States in this respect?

In the Constitution of the United States the disarmament of the individual states, provided for in Article I, Section 10, and the system of collective security, provided for in Article IV, Section 4, mutually supplement each other, each being a condition of the successful application of the other.



## LESSON XIV

### THE NEUTRALITY POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

1. What is the meaning of a policy of neutrality in international relations at the present day?

It means that a nation seeks to avoid being drawn into a war which has broken out between two or more states.

2. Has neutrality been a traditional policy of the United States?

Yes, it has been, although we were forced to abandon it in 1812 and again in 1917.

3. How did our early policy of neutrality differ from the policy which we have been forced to adopt in recent years?

In 1793 the United States sought to be neutral in the war between Great Britain and France, but insisted, nevertheless, upon the right of American citizens to ship munitions of war to either belligerent and to maintain other neutral rights of trade with the two belligerents.

4. How did this policy result in our being drawn into the war in 1812?

Both of the belligerents, Great Britain and France, violated what we claimed to be our neutral "rights" and the United States finally declared war upon Great Britain as having committed the most serious violations.

5. Were the conditions which led the United States to be drawn into the war of 1812 repeated in 1917?

Yes, substantially, although the changes in the conditions of modern warfare raised new issues not presented a hundred years before.

6. What was the technical ground upon which the United States abandoned its policy of neutrality in 1917 and entered the World War?

It was the attacks of the German submarines upon American vessels engaged in trade with the other belligerents.

7. Were there other grounds which led the United States to take the stand against German submarine warfare which resulted in our declaration of war?

Yes, it would seem that the enormous trade in war materials, food and other supplies, which was developed between the United States and the Allies, led public opinion to be more insistent upon maintaining technical neutral rights than it might otherwise have been.

8. What effect had the entrance of the United States into the World War upon our traditional policy of neutrality?

President Wilson was led to believe that "the business of neutrality" was over; that is, that in the future all nations should combine to prevent war and thereby remove the occasion for the inevitable conflicts between neutral rights and belligerent claims.

9. What form did the new policy assume?

It assumed the form of the collective responsibility of all nations to combine against the aggressor, so that there would be no more neutrality in the presence of an international crime.

10. Why was this new policy of collective responsibility not adopted by the United States?

Because the Senate believed it might commit the United States to take action under conditions that might entangle us with foreign countries, with the result that reservations were attached to the ratification of the

Covenant of the League of Nations which were unacceptable to President Wilson.

11. What new form has the neutrality policy of the United States taken in recent years?

The United States has sought to prevent being drawn into another war by a law providing that American citizens may not ship arms and munitions of war or make loans to either belligerent in time of war.

12. Does this policy of neutrality apply to civil war as well as to a war between two nations?

It has recently, in 1937, been applied to the civil war in Spain.

13. Does the prohibition of the shipment of munitions of war and the making of loans remove all possibility of conflicts between the neutral rights of the United States and the claims of future belligerents?

No, there is still the danger lest controversies arise in connection with neutral trade in other articles of commerce.

14. Why have not prohibitions upon neutral trade been extended to cover these objects?

Because the government of the United States is unwilling to restrict the trade of its citizens in these articles.

15. What is the fundamental weakness of the policy of neutrality?

It refuses to attempt to make any distinction between which party is right and which is wrong in time of war, and at the same time insists that neither of them shall interfere with the trade of the United States with the other beyond the customary restrictions of contraband and blockade and the provisions of the neutrality laws.

16. Is neutrality a policy permitted to the citizens of the individual state?

No, no citizen may be "neutral" in the presence of crime. All are obligated to cooperate in suppressing criminal acts, although the agencies of justice are normally called upon to undertake that task.

17. What explains the survival of neutrality in international relations?

The same situation that explains the unwillingness of the United States to join in a system of collective security (see Lessons XI, XIII), namely, a doubt as to the possibility of determining the aggressor and a fear of "foreign entanglements" inherited from the early days of the Republic.



## LESSON XV

### OBLIGATIONS OF MEMBERSHIP IN THE WORLD SOCIETY

1. Is there a world society of which each individual nation is necessarily a member with corresponding rights and duties?

Yes, it is part of Christian teaching that the nations are members of a larger society or family of nations which creates for them certain obligations beyond their immediate national interests.

2. What are the moral obligations of membership in the world society or family of nations?

The primary obligation is that nations in their relations with one another are bound by the same moral law which is binding upon individual citizens, and from this obligation proceeds the duty of cooperation to prevent wrong and to promote justice as far as conditions make such action practically possible.

3. What are some of the social obligations of membership in the world society?

Prominent among such obligations would be the promotion of public health among the nations and the distribution of relief so as to prevent hunger and distress. There is also the obligation of intellectual cooperation to seek out a basis of action for the promotion of common interests.

4. What are some of the economic obligations of membership in the world society?

There is the obligation to bring about a fairer distribution of natural resources upon which the economic life of the individual state may depend. This calls for the removal of trade barriers which prevent the normal de-

velopment of commercial intercourse by which the necessary exchange of goods and services between nations takes place.

5. Would the promotion of the economic welfare of the whole community of nations call for sacrifices on the part of the states most favorably situated?

Yes, it probably would; but, on the other hand, there is reason to believe that those states would themselves profit by an adjustment of their economic policies which would remove some of the economic distress which now operates as one of the underlying causes of war.

6. What are some of the political obligations of membership in the world society?

One of the most important of these obligations is that of seeking a peaceful solution of disputes by arbitration.

7. Is there a duty upon the strong states to cooperate for the protection of the weak?

Yes, that would seem to be one of the political obligations of membership in the world society, if a practicable means can be found to make it effective.

8. Is there a duty to remove the causes of international friction?

Yes, for unless this is done the obligation to maintain peace would seem to be meaningless.

9. Do the political obligations of membership in the world society call for some form of international organization to make them effective?

Yes, for experience shows that good intentions alone are not sufficient, and that organization is necessary to find concrete ways and means of giving effect to intentions and ideals.

10. What is the rôle of education in promoting an un-

derstanding of the obligations of membership in the world society?

The education of public opinion is necessary both to aid in the removal of national prejudices and to study the political and economic causes of war and the remedies that must be taken.

11. What is the special rôle of the Church as peacemaker among the nations?

The Church must lay emphasis upon Christian unity as a means of cutting across national boundaries and forming a basis of common interest among all nations.

12. What part have the popes played in this rôle of the Church as peacemaker, in recent years?

They have issued a number of encyclicals, such as those of Benedict XV in 1920, and Pius XI in 1930, urging the nations to cooperate together to promote their mutual interests and to remove the causes of hostility. They have urged the subordination of national claims to the moral ideal of a Christian commonwealth of nations.

## SUGGESTED READINGS FOR FURTHER STUDY

## Pamphlets and Articles

*Catholic Association for International Peace*, Washington

The Church and Peace Efforts, 1935

International Ethics, 1928

Ethics of War, 1932

Causes of War and Security, Old and New, 1930

International Economic Life, 1934

Tariffs and World Peace, 1933

Europe and the United States, 1931

Latin America and the United States, 1929

Manchuria, the Problem in the Far East, 1934

The League of Nations and Catholic Action

Arbitration and the World Court, 1937

Catholic Organization for Peace in Europe, 1935

Catholic Education and Peace, 1934

The Permanent Peace Program of Pope Benedict XV, 1931

Syllabus on International Relations, 2nd ed., 1937

*Foreign Policy Association*, New York

Wallace, H. A.: America Must Choose, 1934

Europe's Struggle for Security, 1935

American Neutrality in a Future War, 1935

The Increasing Burden of Armaments, 1934

War Tomorrow, Will We Keep Out?, 1935

*International Conciliation*, New York

Security and Defense

Neutrality of the Good Neighbor, 1935

Education and International Peace

*National Catholic Welfare Conference*, Washington

Encyclical Letter of Pope Benedict XV, "Pacem," 1920

Encyclical Letters of Pope Pius XI, "Quas Primas," 1925; "Ubi Arcano Dei," 1922, and "Allocution on Peace," December 24, 1930

Pastoral Letter of American Hierarchy, 1920

Peace Trends, 1931



---

*World Peace Foundation, Boston*

Jessup, P. C.: *American Neutrality and International Police*, 1928

Myers, D. P.: *Origin and Conclusion of the Paris Pact*, 1929; *World Disarmament, Its Problems and Prospects*, 1932

Sayre, F. B.: *America Must Act*, 1936

**Books**

Angell, Sir N.: *The Great Illusion*, 4th ed. Putnam, 1913

Brown, S. J., ed.: *International Relations from a Catholic Standpoint*. Browne and Nolan, London, 1932

Carr, W. S.: *Education for World Citizenship*. Stanford University Press, 1928.

Chamberlain, W. H.: *Soviet Russia*. Little, Brown, 1930

Condliffe, J. B.: *China Today*. World Peace Foundation, Boston, 1932

Eppstein, J.: *The Catholic Tradition of the Law of Nations*. Catholic Association for International Peace, Washington, 1936

*Must War Come?* London, 1935

*Ten Years of Life of the League of Nations*. Mayfair Press, 1930

Fenwick, C. G.: *International Law*, rev. ed. Appleton-Century, 1934

Haas, F. J.: *Man and Society*. Century Co., 1930

Hayes, C. J. H.: *Essays on Nationalism*. Macmillan, 1926

Hudson, M. O.: *By Pacific Means*. Yale University Press, 1935

*The World Court, 1921-1934*. World Peace Foundation, Boston, 1934

Latané, J. H.: *From Isolation to Leadership*, rev. ed. Doubleday, 1922

*United States and Latin America*, rev. ed. Doubleday, 1927.

Madariaga, S. de: *Disarmament*. Coward-McCann, 1929

Moon, P. T.: *Imperialism and World Politics*. Macmillan, 1927.

- Morley, E.: *The Society of Nations*. Brookings Institution, 1932
- Morse, H. B. and McNair, H. F.: *Far Eastern International Relations*. Houghton Mifflin, 1931
- Scott, J. B.: *The Catholic Conception of International Law*, 1934  
*The Spanish Origin of International Law*, 1934
- Shotwell, J. T.: *War as an Instrument of National Policy*. Harcourt, 1929
- Stratmann, F.: *The Church and War*. Kenedy, 1929
- Williams, B. J.: *The United States and Disarmament*. McGraw-Hill, 1931
- Wright, Q.: *The Causes of War and the Conditions of Peace*. Longmans, 1935  
*The United States and Neutrality*. University of Chicago Press, 1935



## PUBLICATIONS ON WORLD PEACE

### THE CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE

#### *Pamphlet Series—*

1. INTERNATIONAL ETHICS.\*
2. LATIN AMERICA AND THE UNITED STATES.\*
3. CAUSES OF WAR,\* AND SECURITY, OLD AND NEW.\*
4. HAITI, PAST AND PRESENT (out of print).
5. FRANCIS DE VITORIA (out of print).
6. AMERICAN AGRICULTURE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS.\*
7. PUERTO RICO AND THE UNITED STATES \* (out of print).
8. EUROPE AND THE UNITED STATES—ELEMENTS IN THEIR RELATIONSHIP.\*
9. THE ETHICS OF WAR.
10. NATIONAL ATTITUDES IN CHILDREN (out of print).
11. TARIFFS AND WORLD PEACE.\*
12. MANCHURIA—THE PROBLEM IN THE FAR EAST.\*
13. INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC LIFE.\*
14. THE CHURCH AND PEACE EFFORTS.\*
15. WAR AND PEACE IN ST. AUGUSTINE'S *De Civitate Dei*.
16. PEACE EDUCATION IN CATHOLIC SCHOOLS.
17. PEACE ACTION OF POPE BENEDICT XV.
18. RELATIONS BETWEEN FRANCE AND ITALY.
19. CATHOLIC ORGANIZATION FOR PEACE IN EUROPE.
20. THE UNITED STATES AND THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.
21. AN INTRODUCTION TO MEXICO.\*
22. PAPAL PEACE MOSAIC—1878-1936.
23. ARBITRATION AND THE WORLD COURT.\*
24. AGRICULTURE AND INTERNATIONAL LIFE.\*
25. NATIONALISM.\*

#### *Miscellaneous Series—*

##### PEACE TRENDS.

SYLLABUS ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

APPEALS FOR PEACE OF POPE BENEDICT XV AND POPE PIUS XI.

CATHOLIC PROGRAM FOR WORLD PEACE (free).

ARGENTINA—LAND OF THE EUCHARISTIC CONGRESS, 1934.

PERMANENT PEACE PROGRAM OF POPE BENEDICT XV.

CATHOLIC YOUTH AND WORLD PEACE (free).

#### *Books—*

THE CATHOLIC TRADITION OF THE LAW OF NATIONS—John Eppstein.

THE PEACE EFFORTS OF THE CHURCH DURING THE LAST THREE HUNDRED YEARS—Josef Müller.

#### *N. C. W. C. Joint Committee on Peace—*

PEACE STATEMENTS OF RECENT POPES.

THE CHRISTIAN WAY TO PEACE.

---

\* *Study Club Outline Included.*