

There are those who say it is impossible to define an aggressor, to adjudicate on facts in the light of that definition, and put a finger on the offending power. The answer is, it has already been done. The League of Nations' definition to which I have some time ago referred has actually worked, and because it has worked a Greco-Bulgarian war in 1925 was avoided.

There are still more who say that sanctions to restrain an aggressor cannot be provided, and if provided, cannot be applied. The difficulties, I know, are great. To overcome them means some limitation of certain attributes of sovereignty which nations have always claimed. But after all, everything worth while in the way of co-operation entails something like that, and the appalling truth is there is no other way in which mankind can adjust its affairs to great new facts of this present time, and make sure of survival.

Senator Borah has argued that to provide for force against an aggressor in a Pact of Nations looking to peace is an anachronism, and he applauds the Pact of Paris because it has no such provision. The very compact of this United States, the compact upon which it is built and its peace and order rests, provides for that very thing. The covenant of man with man over the whole sweep of this Republic, the covenant by which you are citizens of one nation, binds each and all not only to obey the law and keep the peace, but to put forth when called upon the hand of force to hold in check an offender. It is no anachronism; it is the very essence of the Social Contract itself; it is the principle by which the integrity of a nation is assured and the reign of law sustained.

The practically-minded man keeps telling us this whole plan is Utopian. Maybe so; but there is nothing too Utopian if it has to be done. The civilization of today would be Utopian to all ages gone by. He tells us it presupposes confidence in a World Court on the part of at least a dozen mighty nations and submission to its decrees. Even so; I put against him the plea of necessity, for otherwise man who has conquered the forces of nature is in turn conquered by his own discoveries; man who has made a slave of the elements becomes himself a slave. He tells us it means the curtailment of a sovereign right asserted by every State from the beginning of recorded time to make war when it deems itself aggrieved. So it does. I put against him the plea of necessity; the sovereign right of a single people to fight must yield to the sovereign right of all to live. He tells us finally that it means the allocation of forces now controlled by governments, those physical forces which make for international destruction; that it means their allocation to abide the judgment of an International Congress and their steady reduction to the dimensions of an international police. Let us all pray that it does. I plead again the law of necessity, of imperious overwhelming necessity, for a movement toward this goal is the only substitute for the armament system of this day, a system which left alone may in no distant time send civilization crashing to its doom.

Nationalism, I know, is rampant still--narrow, short-sighted nationalism--and that nationalism must be abated. Every nation wants peace, I verily believe; but nations are self-centred, and fear and distrust are with them tremendous factors still. Let us remember, on the other hand, by way of inspiration, that the inter-relations now of people with people are more intimate, the printed and spoken word passes night by night over deserts and oceans to every land. The processes of our minds, the longings of our hearts can be communicated without ceasing and on a universal scale. The bitter lessons of these years and the dangers looming ahead can be taught and retaught without hindrance over the whole range of nations. And surely there are common chords of humanity which will vibrate still when touched in unselfish appeal by brothers in the Crusade for International Friendship of every tribe and tongue.