

neither to the happiness nor the dignity nor the moral and material well-being of men and women; that the whole theory upon which rest the supposed advantages of conquest or enlargement of territory, in the way of trade, need for expansion and the like, is based upon grave misconceptions of fact. I have urged further that the attempt to impose a national ideal by force of arms is as futile and as wicked as was the attempt in an earlier age to impose a religious ideal or form of faith by the same means; and that just as in the case of the religious wars peace did not come by one party—Catholic or Protestant—imposing its will upon the other, but by both agreeing to exclude military force from religious differences, so in the rivalry of political ideals there can be no real peace until there is a general recognition that military force should not be used to promote them.

Parenthetically, it is indicative of how little we thrash out this problem that, when we speak of military force, we use the term indifferently to indicate two forms of its employment which have diametrically opposed results. If our thought were as clear in these matters as it ought to be and might be, we should all realize that the proposition, that "Military force is religiously, socially, and economically futile," does not condemn a war of defence, or resistance to religious oppression, since such a war is not the imposition of military force upon others; it is the cancellation of such force, the attempt to see that military force is not imposed upon us. It is not defence which creates war or threatens nationality, for if there were no aggression there would be no need for defence, and nationality or religious faith would be safe. At the bottom of the whole problem lies the belief in the advantage, moral or material, of power over others.

T
theo
or in
the l
one
way
Holl
that
thin
Con
favo
they
the
oppo
the
does
wou
Ven
of th
force
conv
it ca
free
idea
oath
the
abov
patr
wro
the
Mer
accu
just
T