

It would be a pity if the permanence of this great doctrine, so well and so opportunely announced by you, were left dependent upon a treaty from which the congress or parliament of any nation may vote withdrawal. It would be made safe by its enactment in international law from which no nation can withdraw.

World opinion would be its sufficient and best enforcement. On July 23rd, 1930, in explanation of your appeal to other governments to join in exerting influence upon two contending nations to respect the Treaty for the Renunciation of War, you said that you acted to "get something done, to get the public opinion of the world mobilized against the two countries going to war." In the entire effort to settle that dispute and avert a dangerous conflict there was no other method used. There was no use of force, no threat of military action and no thought of it. World opinion was found in that emergency sufficient to establish peace between Russia and China. So it has been in other notable instances, the surest and shortest road to conciliation and peace, and all it needed was mobilization and direction. I believe it will be ultimately successful in the unfortunate issue between China and Japan. Later when making reference to the Pact of Paris in connection with the same crisis, you said, "Its sole sanction lies in the power of public opinion."

But some form of economic sanction would be a good added bar against war, although attended with many difficulties, when the nations can be brought to agree to it. However, a surer enforcement would be the general treaty proposed by you at the London Naval Conference, which would provide for the call of a conference of nations for conciliation, inquiry and report in the event of any war, or impending war.

HOW MAY THE DELEGALIZATION OF WAR BE ENACTED?

Since state and national laws are enacted by legislatures, congresses or parliaments composed of representatives of states or districts, would it not be absurd to hold that accredited representatives of the nations of the world in a congress of nations assembled for the purpose cannot enact international laws that will be binding upon all nations when ratified and signed by the constituted authorities? This may be done by negotiation, the representatives of the various governments meeting in some capital of Europe for the express purpose of signing an enactment already agreed upon, as was the case with the Treaty of Paris. This would not be a superstate but only a temporary congress convened for a short time for one specific and predetermined act, and then to cease its existence. The great statesmen who met to sign the Briand-Kellogg Pact were without power to add or subtract a single word, but had to sign the exact text as predetermined and directed.

The adoption of these, in large part your own suggestions, while making a great program for the insurance of the permanence of peace would come in conflict with no other sane proposal but would afford the most substantial reinforcement to all of them. If you will now put your influence behind them with the support of the American Delegation it will be the greatest possible aid to the insurance of the permanence of peace and incidentally to the security that will make the Disarmament Conference a success.

Very sincerely yours,

Signed, SAMUEL COLCORD.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL PUBLICITY
305 West 113th Street, New York

Not for Sale, Single Copies Free, Postpaid