

righteous dealing brought national strength, national strength would not bring national victory. Therefore, if, while nations remain, war is to be abolished, then unless the degeneracy of peoples can also be prevented, "there shall be no more war" must mean "there shall be no more progress."

But suppose that we seek to conceive some distant date, some day still in the depths of coming time, when, through intermarriage following intercommunication, all nations and all races shall have been merged into a single whole; when, throughout the bounds of our planet, one tongue is spoken, and nations make no more war because there are no more nations, would what is impossible now become possible then? Since in this our day the operative cause of war is international competition, would the removal of that cause remove war also?

Not necessarily, because as civil war has in the past often been waged within an individual nation, so it might be waged then within the one nation of mankind. In generations not very remote wars have been waged for religion, and wars have been waged for ideas. Even now in Africa, in Asia, and in Eastern Europe great numbers of fighting men exist who are ready to die in battle for their creed. (These are they who believe in one God and in Mahomet as His prophet, and their faith is not waning, but increasing). Therefore, though, while nations last, the present cause of conflicts must endure, the abolition of nations would not inevitably involve the abolition of war. In such a distant time as that which we are here contemplating, the inhabitants of this world may have arranged themselves in divisions other than national, and, as now between nations, so then between those divisions, competition may produce war. So long as those conditions lasted, the machinery for securing ethical advance would remain. Because righteousness brings warlike efficiency, therefore in the majority of cases righteousness as now would triumph over its opposite. But if those conditions ended; if the possibility of war absolutely passed away; then, *unless in the meantime human nature had radically changed*, the upward march of human morality would terminate because the terrific punishment which war provides for human degeneracy would be removed. In other words, war will cease to be a necessity only when corruption ceases to be a fact.

If this argument possess validity, then the deduction follows that while human nature remains what it is at present,