

had two dynastic wars—the French invasion of Mexico and the Franco-German struggle—in the century that is now ‘in the straight’ and going with a rush to the ‘finish’ But if in their methods these struggles were modern, in their motives they belonged to a period between which and us there stands a great iron wall of utter separation. Kings have made their last war; and dynastic rivalries and jealousies are not ever again likely to turn the mouldering skeletons of fighting men into bone-mannure or stain the green blades of honest wheat-fields with the ‘red rain’ such as on Waterloo ‘made the harvest grow.’ Cabinets succeeded kings as war-makers. But Cabinets are no longer the ultimate arbiters of war or peace. Nowadays it is the Chamber of Commerce and the Stock Exchange that, at their own sweet will, chain up the dogs of war or let them slip. From the day when the mercantile interest in England became a formidable rival to the landed interest, practically every war has been a war of commerce—a war to protect or extend the markets for the country’s wares. Such, for instance, was the great war with France from 1754 to 1763. Such again was the fierce, bull-dog Anglo-French struggle which went on with such a fine fury from 1793 to 1815. Such, too, the War of American Independence, the brief bout with the Algerines, the conflict with Persia, the three wars with China, and the Sudan campaign. And, in the opinion of the whole British Liberal Party, the powder-burning and blood-letting now proceeding in South Africa had their real origin in the interests of a ring of capitalists, chiefly with German names.

There has been in later British history no war on which English opinion was more cordially divided than on the present campaign. PRATT was, so to speak, swept off his feet by a practically unanimous public feeling when he endeavoured to prevent the exhausting struggle that opened in 1793, cost the combatants 1,900,000 men, and reduced the British workers to such fearful depths of destitution that starvation riots broke out all over the country in the year that followed Waterloo. But the verdict of history has abundantly justified PRATT. His great namesake, the first Earl of Chatham, opposed the war with America almost with his dying breath. His words made no impression on the widespread feeling of the time. And history has again justified him. CORBET and BRIGHT opposed the Crimean War with all the splendid vigour of voice and pen. They were publicly burned in effigy and (as JOHN MORLEY tells us) were openly branded as traitors for their pains. And nobody to-day pretends to justify that blundering campaign which entailed so aimless and woful a waste of blood and treasure—and all for nothing! We have already stated our reasons for believing that the verdict of history will likewise favour the views of that great and progressive English Party which looks upon the present campaign as, in its origin, unnecessary and avoidable. As lovers of peace we wish it a speedy termination. In the meantime it is pleasant to note how far, even in a campaign against what is chiefly a rude country-folk, the more brutal side of war—such as reprisals, ill-treatment of prisoners, etc.—is so happily and conspicuously absent. This is a gain to humanity and true progress. And there are two other features of modern international struggles which, taken in connection with this, bid fair to diminish the frequency as well as the atrocity of war.

The first of these is the marked tendency of late years to isolate war—that is, to limit it to the original pair of disputants. Most of the European wars of the past few centuries and some of the present century set many countries ablaze, and interfered with or paralysed trade and industry over wide areas of the Old World. Such were the Seven Years’ War, the Thirty Years’ War, the Great struggle with France in 1793-1815, and, in a much lesser degree, the Crimean War. Three nations were engaged in the Anglo-French-Chinese wars of 1856-8, and 1859-60; in the Schleswig-Holstein wars of 1848-50 and 1864; in the Austro-Prussian-Italian war of 1866; in the Austro-Franco-Sardinian war of 1859; and in the Chilean-Peruvian-Bolivian war of 1879-83. The days of the multiple-nation struggles practically closed with the sixties. Thus, the nations that were the original parties to the quarrel fought their great or little duels to a finish unmolested in the Franco-German war of 1870-1871 (we may, by a slight

anticipation, regard the German States as already practically federated); in the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-78; in the Franco-Chinese war of 1884-5; in the Servo-Bulgarian war of 1885; and in the more recent struggles between Chile and Peru, Japan and China, Greece and Turkey, America and Spain. Despite occasional minor scares and fleet-mobilising, there is every probability that the present campaign in South Africa will likewise be allowed to proceed to a close without interference from any of the great Powers of Europe.

The isolation of war, like the isolation of the bubonic plague, serves a double purpose: to limit its area of evil and shorten its duration. And this isolation is manifestly the tendency of later international policy. The nations are beginning to realise the value of the old maxim which, applied to individual conduct, commends the man who ‘minds his own business and keeps himself to himself.’ There is yet another promising sign of returning sanity in the midst of the vast armaments that cumber the soil of Europe. It is this: the marked tendency to return to the good old methods of preventing war—mediation and arbitration—that were known and practised by Popes and Catholic bishops long before the days of the flint-lock or the arquebuse, not to speak of Maxims or Lee-Metfords. At the Paris Congress of 1856 the Powers that were represented expressed a unanimous wish for an appeal to the good offices of a friendly nation in any international crisis that might arise. Article VIII. of the General Treaty of Peace made express provision for mediation in the event of misunderstanding arising between Turkey and any of the signatory Powers. The mediation of a friendly Power is also expressly provided for by Article XVIII. of the Convention of Paris of 1873 for disputes in connection with the Universal Postal Union; by the Treaty of Commerce of June 15, 1883, between Great Britain and Italy; and by Article XII. of the declaration relative to freedom of trade in the Basin of the Congo. In the first volume of his great treatise on International Law, PHARRSON shows to what extent formal arbitration—chiefly by the Pope, the Catholic bishops, and by lawyers—was a recognised mode of composing disputes between country and country in the middle ages. Thus—to mention two instances only—POPE BONIFACE VIII. arbitrated successfully between PHILIP LE BEL of France and the First Edward of England. This was in 1298. Twenty-one years later POPE LEO X. settled a dispute as arbiter between PHILIP the Long and the Flemish. Owing to the success of POPE LEO XIII. as an arbitrator, the London *Daily News* agreed that the true position of the Head of the Catholic Church at the present time would be that of ‘Chief Justice of Christendom.’

In the present century there is a growing disposition to fall back upon the good old rule, the simple plan, of arbitration in international as in commercial disputes. At least five knotty questions—chiefly of finance—were left to arbitration by the Congress of Vienna of 1815. In his recent work, *International Law* (p. 269), MR. LEONE LEVI gives the following further instances of arbitration in international difficulties during the present century:—

In 1831-35 the King of Prussia arbitrated between France and England on the Portendie indemnity. In 1839 the Queen of England arbitrated between France and Mexico. In 1861 the Senate of Hamburg arbitrated between England and Peru. In 1869 the President of the United States arbitrated between England and Portugal. In 1861-72 the *Alabama* claims, by the United States against England, were settled by arbitration. In 1882 the claims of France and Italy against Chile for damages produced by her naval and military forces on their subjects were left to the arbitration of a mixed tribunal, consisting of persons nominated by the President of the French Republic (or by the King of Italy), the President of the Republic of Chile, and the Emperor of Brazil. In 1884 the claims of the United States against Hayti were left to the arbitration of the Hon. William Strong.

Later instances of the settlement of international disputes by such pacific means are furnished by the arbitration of POPE LEO XIII. between the Republics of Hayti and San Domingo and between Germany and Spain over the Caroline Islands; and by the settlement recently concluded between Great Britain and Venezuela over an airy trifle of a disputed frontier-line. A Tribunal of International Arbitration is far within the bounds of political possibility. As proposed, its authority would be moral, not physical. But even at