

Lansdowne Asks New Peace Aims

A London cablegram, dated Nov. 30, says: The Marquis of Lansdowne, in a letter published by the Daily Telegraph, urges on the allies a revision of their war aims in an attempt to bring about peace before the "prolongation of the war leads to the ruin of the civilized world."

"We are now in the fourth year of the most dreadful war the world has ever known," says Lord Lansdowne in the letter, "a war in which, Sir. W. Robertson lately informed us, the number of the killed alone can be counted by the million, while the total number of men engaged amounts to nearly 24,000,000."

"Ministers continue to tell us that they scan the horizon in vain for a prospect of lasting peace, and without a lasting peace we all feel that the task we have set ourselves will remain unaccomplished."

"But those who look forward with horror to the prolongation of the war, who believe that its wanton prolongation would be a crime differing only in degree from that of the criminal who provoked it, may be excused if they, too, scan the horizon anxiously in the hope of discovering there indications that the outlook may, after all, not be so hopeless as is supposed."

OBSTACLES ARE FORMIDABLE

"The obstacles are indeed formidable enough. We are constantly reminded of one of them."

"It is pointed out with force that, while we have not hesitated to put forward general description of our war aims, the enemy have, though repeatedly challenged, refused to formulate theirs and have limited themselves to vague and apparently insincere professions of readiness to negotiate with us."

"The force of the argument can not be gainsaid, but it is directed mainly to show that we are still far from agreement as to the territorial questions which must come up for settlement in connection with the terms of peace."

OTHER BIG QUESTIONS

"These are, however, by no means the only questions which will arise, and it is worth while to consider whether there are not others also of first-rate importance in regard to which the prospects of agreement are less remote. Let me example one or two of these."

"What are we fighting for? To beat the Germans, certainly; but that is not an end in itself. We want to inflict a signal defeat upon the central powers, not out of mere vindictiveness, but in the hope of saving the world from a recurrence of the calamity which has befallen this generation."

"What, then, is it we want when the war is over? I know of no better formula than that more than once made use of with universal approval by Mr. Asquith in the speeches which he, from time to time, has delivered. He has repeatedly told his hearers that we are waging a war in order to obtain reparation and security. Both are essential, but of the two security is perhaps more indispensable."

MUST PREVENT FUTURE WARS

"In the way of reparation much can be accomplished, but the utmost effort to make good all the ravages of this war must fall short of completeness and will fail to undo the grievous wrong which has been done to humanity."

"It may, however, be possible to make some amends for the inevitable incompleteness of reparation if the security afforded is, humanly speaking, complete."

"To end the war honorably would be a great achievement. To prevent the same curse falling upon our children would be a greater achievement still."

"This is our avowed aim, and the magnitude of the issue can not be exaggerated, for, just as this war has been more dreadful than any war in history, so we may be sure the next war would be even more dreadful than this. The prostitution of science for the purposes of destruction is not likely to stop short."

URGES UNION OF NATIONS

"Most of us, however, believe that it should be possible to secure posterity against a repetition of such an outrage as that of 1914 if the powers will, under a solemn pact, bind themselves to submit future disputes to arbitration; if they will undertake to outlaw politically and economically any one of their number which re-

fuses to enter into such a pact, or to use their joint military and naval forces for the purpose of coercing a power which breaks away from the rest, they will, indeed, have traveled far along the road which leads to serenity."

"We are at any rate right to put security in the front line of our peace demands, and it is not unsatisfactory to note that in principle there seems to be complete unanimity upon this point."

QUOTES PRESIDENT WILSON

Lord Lansdowne then cites from President Wilson's speech at the League to Enforce Peace banquet his reference to a "universal association of the nations to prevent any war from being begun either contrary to treaty covenants or without warning and full submission of the cause to the opinion of the world."

He also quotes from the German chancellor's speeches to the main committee of the reichstag the same year in favor of a "peaceful agreement and understanding which will prevent the return of such an immense catastrophe."

The papal suggestion of August last of the establishment of arbitration and the Austrian welcome of it and the readiness to enter into negotiations regarding the papal proposals are recorded, and Lansdowne proceeds:

"In this dispatch covering the allied note of Jan. 10, 1917, Mr. Balfour mentions as one of the three conditions essential to a durable peace the condition that 'behind international law and behind all treaty arrangements for preventing or limiting hostilities some form of international sanction might be devised which would give pause to the hardest aggressor.'

WOULD PROVIDE DISCIPLINE

"Such a sanction would probably take the form of coercion applied in one of two modes. The aggressor would be disciplined either by the pressure of superior naval or military strength or by the denial of commercial access and facilities."

"The proceedings of the Paris conference show that we should not shrink from such denial if we were compelled to use the weapon for purposes of self-defense; but, while a commercial boycott would be justifiable as a war measure, and while the threat of a boycott in case Germany should show herself utterly unreasonable would be a legitimate threat, no reasonable man would surely desire to destroy the trade of the central powers if they will, so to speak, enter into recognizances to keep the peace and do not force us into conflict by hostile combination."

OPPOSES TRADE WAR

"A commercial war is less ghastly in its immediate results than a war of armed forces, but it would certainly be deplorable after three or four years of sanguinary conflict in the field—a conflict which has destroyed a great part of the wealth of the world and permanently crippled its resources — if the powers were to embark upon commercial hostilities, certain to retard the economic recovery of all the nations involved."

"That we shall have to secure ourselves against the fiscal hostilities of others; that we shall have to prevent the recurrence of conditions under which, when the war broke out, we found ourselves short of essential commodities because we had allowed certain industries and certain sources of supply to pass entirely under the control of our enemies, no one will doubt—subject, however, to this reservation — that it will surely be for our interest that the stream of trade should, so far as our own fiscal interests permit, be allowed to flow strong and uninterrupted in its natural channels."

QUESTION OF TERRITORY

"There remains the question of territorial claims. The most authoritative statement of these is to be found in the allies' note of Jan. 10, 1917."

"This statement must obviously be regarded as a broad outline of the desiderata of the allies; but is anyone prepared to argue that the sketch is complete, or that it may not become necessary to re-examine it?"

"Mr. Asquith, speaking at Liverpool in October last, used the following language:

"No one pretends that it would be right or opportune for either side to formulate an ulti-

matum, detailed, exhaustive, precise, with clauses and subclauses, which is to be accepted verbatim et literatim, chapter and verses, as an indispensable preliminary and condition of peace."

"There are many things," he added, "in world-wide conflict, such as this, which must of necessity be left over for discussion and negotiation, for accommodation and adjustment, at a later stage."

ASKS FRANK DISCUSSION

"It is surely most important that this wise counsel should be kept in mind. Some of our original desiderata have probably become unattainable, others would probably now be given a less prominent place than when they were first put forward; others, again, notably the reparation due to Belgium, remain, and must always remain, in the front rank; but when it comes to a wholesale re-arrangement of the map of southeastern Europe we may well ask for a suspension of judgment and for the elucidation which a frank exchange of views between the allied powers can alone afford; for all these questions concern our allies as well as ourselves, and if we are to have an allied council for the purpose of adapting our strategy in the field to the ever-shifting developments of the war it is fair to assume that in the matter of peace terms also the allies will make it their business to examine and, if necessary, to revise territorial requirements."

"Let me end by explaining why I attach so much importance to these considerations. We are not going to lose this war, but its prolongation will spell ruin for the civilized world and an infinite addition to the load of human suffering, which already weighs upon it. Security will be invaluable to a world which has the vitality to profit by it; but what will be the value of the blessings of peace to nations so exhausted that they can scarcely stretch out a hand with which to grasp them?"

ALREADY LASTED TOO LONG

"In my belief, if the war is to be brought to a close in time to avoid a world-wide catastrophe, it will be brought to a close because on both sides the peoples of the countries involved realize that it has already lasted too long."

"There can be no question that this feeling prevails extensively in Germany, Austria and Turkey. We know beyond doubt that the economic pressure in those countries far exceeds any to which we are subject here. Ministers inform us in their speeches of constant efforts on the part of the central powers to invite peace talk (Sir Eric Geddes at the Mansion House on Nov. 9)."

"If the peace talk is not more articulate and has not been so precise as to enable his majesty's government to treat it seriously, the explanation is probably to be found in the fact, first: That German despotism does not tolerate independent expressions of opinion; and, second, that the German government has contrived, probably with success, to misrepresent the aims of the allies, which are supposed to include the destruction of Germany, the imposition upon her of a form of government decided by her enemies, her destruction as a great commercial community, and her exclusion from the free use of the seas."

GIVES PEACE PROGRAM

"An immense stimulus would probably be given to the peace party in Germany if it were understood:

"(1) That we do not desire the annihilation of Germany as a great power."

"(2) That we do not seek to impose upon her people any form of government other than that of their own choice."

"(3) That, except as a legitimate war measure, we have no desire to deny to Germany her place among the great commercial communities of the world."

"(4) That we are prepared, when the war is over, to examine in concert with other powers a group of international problems, some of them of recent origin, which are connected with the question of the freedom of the seas."

"(5) That we are prepared to enter into an international pact under which ample opportunities would be afforded for the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means."

"I am under the impression that authority could be found for most of these propositions in ministerial speeches."

"Since the above lines were written, sections 1, 2 and 3 have been dealt with by our own for-