

PEACE AND PACIFISM BY
BARONESS BERTHA VON
SUTTNER :: :: :: :: ::

Principally owing to the approaching Conference in The Hague, which like her predecessor is called the Peace Conference, and in consequence of the considerable notice given to the subject by the Press, the word and idea "Peace" greatly occupies the attention of the public. Long explanations on this subject are given by politicians, military men, in government circles and by the public, explanations which plainly show that in the different grades of social life the idea of "Pacifism", if not entirely unknown, is very little understood.

There exists in this connection great misunderstanding, total confusion. Peace in the ordinary sense of the word and in the sense of pacifism are distinguishable from each other. It is as with woman and femininism. "Woman" signifies a part of the human race, "feminism" on the other hand is the name for a movement which has as object the alteration of woman's position in society. And in the same way is "Peace", as it is at present generally—and especially in political discussion—understood, is the condition which exists between two wars and which with difficulty (yes, even by the show of millions of bajonets) is maintained, and which can be broken at will any day by "the warlike neighbour": Pacifism on the other hand is the movement to establish peace on a sound basis.

During the last few weeks there has been a great deal of controversy over the question, as to whether or not the problem

of the decrease of armaments, which formed the basis of the first conference, shall also be discussed at the second; which controversy has subjected that exceptionally pacific opportunity to the policy hitherto pursued when discussing peace and war: and the whole German press forgot in this connection to mention the meritorious contents of the English disarmament proposition, simply taking into consideration: whose proposition is it? What are the by-purposes and what are the intentions towards Germany? That Germany, notwithstanding her well-known peaceful intentions, and her ally with her, would have nothing to do with the proposal, was openly admitted, on purely national and political grounds. There is much anger shown whenever home and foreign pacificators express doubt as to Germany's love of peace, seeing that she has not taken part in a European war for nearly 40 years, and that in all her official speeches and announcements she has expressed the desire to live under friendly or (subtle distinction!) correct relations with her neighbours. It is true that she continually strives to preserve the peace and knows the value of the advantages to be gained therefrom, and the whole world ought to be thankful to her for that alone, but it must be acknowledged that in her own official circles she is not favourably inclined to Pacifism.

She wishes to follow the line of conduct now pursued, viz., to protect the peace of Europe by the arrangement of equilibrious alliances, the maintenance and unhindered extension of her own fear and respect-inspiring defensibility, and by her straightforward but independent inclination towards peace. But it is just this that pacificators have to fight against, for their object is to establish peace on the more solid foundation of international contracts, of international laws and international ententes cordiales including all civilized nations, which of itself would revoke the warlike and threatening attitude connected with the increase of her defensibility.

The pacificators do not look upon disarmament as the first and foremost object. The present state governing affairs political,

without contracts or laws, could not offer sufficient guarantee against war, if military forces were reduced. Pacifism therefore desires in the very first place an international lawful organization, but it does not because of this set aside the question of disarmament. Where could the matter really be better treated than at a Peace Conference, where 46 countries are represented? By discussion the conviction will continue to gain ground that an army is a burden and that much money would be saved if all countries could agree to reduce their armaments, and just for that there would be a reason for the foundation of the Peace organization.

Such a peace society does indeed exist to-day in name. It has been brought about by the improvement of means of communication, of science, of technics, and by the dependence of trade and a hundred and one other factors, but still, de jure, it has yet to be established.

A special duty of the peace movement is, and will always remain, to bring into broad daylight the changes brought about.

To give a new lawful form to these changes is the task of those in authority and they have already begun the work by establishing the Court of Arbitration in The Hague, by forming committees of enquiry and by making contracts and ententes cordiales.

A cause of confusion is the fact that the specific international work of the Pacific movement continues to be looked at from a national point of view, and when considering the concrete questions brought forward, the abstract factors—England, France, the Triple Alliance, etc.—are mixed up in the debate, whereas the fight for the peace of the world really only has to be fought out between two parties, who possess representatives, in larger or smaller numbers, in every country—namely, the pacificators, the representatives of a new order of affairs, and the non-pacificators, or those who do not believe in such a new order and still cling to their theories. Between these parties there exists mutually as regards home and abroad enmity and agreement

respectively. The pacificators of the one country are in agreement with their brothers in the other and must defend themselves against their own countrymen who share a different opinion. The chauvinists of one capricious country help their like in another country, since they supply material for the support of their warlike policy. In the same way Campbell Bannerman, who in the eyes of the foreign anti-pacificators is the telephone of the always intriguing England, who contrives to hinder her German competitor and the latter's further development, has in his own country continually to defend himself against the attacks of the Lords of the Admiralty. And in turn also rejoices the German chauvinist over the anti-pacificatory articles in the Temps and the articles of a French colonel crying for vengeance, because he sees there a caution to always hold himself prepared for war. And because both pacificators and anti-pacificators look at things from their own national point of view they cannot always sufficiently follow up the arguments which they bring out against each other—the suppositions, the language and ideas are too much at variance.

The following example serves to illustrate one or two points.

Three or four large factories are situated next to each other in the same town. They work close to, but really against one another, for they are competitors in every respect. They are rivals, one might almost say enemies, although in company the managers' conduct one towards the other is always respectful and correct. Their tools and machinery are always getting dearer, their advertising expenses increase, their profits get smaller, the clerks' salaries and the wages of the workmen have to be reduced; consequently they begin to hate each other and one hopes — naturally because it would be to his advantage — that the other will be compelled to file a petition.

Then in the business horizon presents itself the idea that by an amalgamation of the competing houses many abuses can be abolished and the "association" or "trust" is brought into existence. In the same way the "pacifism" idea can be traced, if one

substitutes the various states for houses of business. When plans are being made by trust leaders for the reduction of working expenses, these plans cannot be discussed from the point of view of those who adhere to the competitive system. Can manufacturer A say: Ha-Ha, B. wants me to stop advertising, so that he can increase his sales? Or if C. amalgamates with B. is he justified in thinking that the arrangement is levelled at his head?

The object of "Pacifism"—as I hope to have made it plain in this sketch—is simply the formation of a states-trust, with the Hague Conference as meeting place, where this preliminary roughly-outlined plan should be further developed and legalized.