

advantages; exchanging the blessings of continued peace for the hazards and calamities of war. It would, indeed, require some very powerful temptation to induce a people to forego the peace, security, and exemption,

* 93 * from military burdens conferred by such a treaty.

Public opinion, moreover, would unite with self interest in preserving these treaties inviolate. A government who, for the purpose of avoiding war, had pledged its faith to abide by the award of umpires would, by going to war in defiance of that award, and in palpable violation of its solemn engagements, shock the moral sense of mankind, and would probably disgust even its own subjects. At the present day all governments are more or less controlled by public opinion; and the progress of education and the power of the press, enables every individual to sit in judgment on the conduct of his rulers. Such a war would ! ous, because it would be felt by all to be unjust and dishonorable. It would also be reprobated by the umpires, whose decision would thus be condemned, and by every nation which had entered into a similar treaty. It ought, also, to be remembered that each new treaty would tend to secure the observance of all the preceding ones, as each nation would feel that the value of its own treaty would greatly depend on the faithful performance of all the others; since, if one were violated with impunity, the power of the others to preserve peace would necessarily be weakened. In short, such a war * would most probably be prevented or speedily terminated by the interference of other powers interested in enforcing treaties for the preservation of peace.

But, surely, it would be the height of folly to refuse entering into an advantageous treaty, because it might possibly be violated. What profitable commercial treaty was ever rejected on this ground? Even admitting the