



---

WHEN WILL THE PEACE OF FRANKFURT BECOME A REAL PEACE?

Author(s): O. UMFRIED, Die Waffen Nieder and Eternal Peace

Source: *The Advocate of Peace (1894-1920)*, NOVEMBER 1896, Vol. 58, No. 10 (NOVEMBER 1896), pp. 255-259

Published by: Sage Publications, Inc.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25750948>

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Sage Publications, Inc. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Advocate of Peace (1894-1920)*

JSTOR

largest number of delegates ever present at one of the Conferences of this body. The sessions were presided over by the Speaker of the Hungarian Lower House, the meetings being held in the House of the Hungarian Magnates. Delegates from various countries reported that the peace movement was growing rapidly everywhere. Mr. Philip Stanhope, who reported for England, was received with great applause. He gave an account of the progress during the year toward the establishment of a permanent treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which he believed would be realized before the close of the year. Count Apponyi, reporting for Hungary, said that the peace group in the Hungarian parliament now numbered 200.

The chief discussion of the Conference was on the subject of a permanent court of arbitration. Eloquent speeches were made on the subject, the discussion continuing all the first afternoon and a part of the next day. The basis of the discussion was the Plan for a permanent tribunal drawn up by the Conference at Brussels the previous year and sent in the form of a memorial to the different powers. The Interparliamentary Bureau at Berne was authorized to take steps to try to induce certain powers to proceed to create such a court.

The question of the protection of foreigners and the right of expulsion gave rise to an interesting discussion, and a number of proposals were adopted as to the civil, commercial, industrial and property rights of aliens, all in harmony with the best spirit of our time.

The question of neutrality, or the right of every state to declare itself neutral, was not discussed, but the Bureau was instructed to make a preliminary study of the subject.

The most animated debate in the Conference was upon the question whether delegates from non-constitutional states, like Russia, should be admitted into the Interparliamentary Peace Union. The discussion was participated in by delegates from Hungary, Poland, Austria, Germany, Italy, France, Belgium and England. The importance of securing the coöperation of Russia in the interests of peace was so ably presented by Count Apponyi and Mr. Stanhope that when the vote came only eleven votes were cast in opposition to their admission. The constitution of the Union will be so changed as to admit them.

The Report of the labors of the Interparliamentary Bureau at Berne was read by the Secretary of the Bureau, Dr. Gobat, and the members of the Bureau selected for the coming year.

The Conference closed, after three days of work, with a grand banquet given by the municipality of Buda-Pesth, at which the place of honor was given to Mr. Frederic Passy, the veteran peace worker of France.

#### SOME OBSTACLES TO INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

BY JEROME DOWD, PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL ECONOMY AND  
SOCIOLOGY, TRINITY COLLEGE, N. C.

In every state or nation there exists a public conscience and a private conscience; a public morality and a private morality. In a democracy the national conscience is the expression or effect of individual minds and standards, and it is always inferior in quality to the individual standards.

People will do things collectively through their governmental executives and legislatures which they would blush to do as individuals. People who would not steal in a private way will sanction a legislative scheme which enables them to steal on a larger scale. People who would not repudiate a debt in their ordinary transactions, will sanction a legal process which accomplishes the same end. The history of every country, and especially our own during the colonial period, furnishes many examples of this truth.

The present policy of nations in reference to international protection of their respective rights and properties, forcibly illustrates the inferiority of that policy as compared to the policy adopted for protecting the rights and property of individuals within each nation.

As individuals we have a profound contempt for the bully or coward who seeks to command respect by walking the streets with a pistol in his pocket or a bowie-knife in his belt. As individuals we regard any citizen with aversion and as a sort of barbarian, who wishes to draw that pistol or bowie-knife, when he has a dispute or misunderstanding with his fellow-citizen over a small pecuniary transaction or question of trespass on private right. We neither admire nor respect men who wish to settle matters with their fellow-men by force and violence. The bully and the dueller have fallen into disfavor in all civilized countries and among all enlightened citizens.

Yet the policy of nations in settling their differences is exactly that of the bully and dueller. The resort to force by nations is only duelling on a larger scale, and it is none the less a shame and disgrace to our civilization. Only by appealing to the public through the press, and especially through the organs of Peace Societies can we effect a realization of the fact and arouse that consciousness and general sentiment which will result in a change of national policy.

We need to have the absurdity of our policy presented to a wide circle of people. A great obstacle to a strong arbitration sentiment is the existence of a false pride among the people. On this point, a quotation from Ruskin comes to mind. "Questions of a few acres or of petty cash," he says, "can be determined by truth and equity—the questions which are to issue in the perishing or saving of kingdom can be determined only by the truth of the sword and the equity of the rifle."

The absurdity of the present belligerent attitude of nations toward each other is strikingly brought home to us by a paragraph in Sidé's *Political Economy* as follows:

"If the man in the moon, or rather an inhabitant of Mars were to visit our planet and learn that a civilized country like France was obliged to spend £40,000,000 a year to insure safety, he would pity her for having such barbarous nations as neighbors, but his astonishment would be greater if told that new countries like America and Australia have little burden for armies, because their neighbors are fortunately savages."

DURHAM, N. C.

#### WHEN WILL THE PEACE OF FRANKFURT BECOME A REAL PEACE?

BY O. UMFRIED.

Translated from *Die Waffen Nieder*.

On the 10th of May, this year, the memory of the peace concluded at Frankfurt twenty-five years ago, was cele-

brated with great pomp. Frankfurt was decked with flags and illuminated. A speech of the Emperor and an Imperial dinner added to the splendor of the festivities. A certain portion of the press recalled with delight the "iron" handshake, with which the Iron Chancellor had dismissed Jules Favre in the Hotel "Zum Schwanen" twenty-five years ago. Through the Franco-German war, they said, 14,509 square kilometers of territory, with a population of a million and a half, had been won for Germany; an apparently significant increase of power. So that our Chauvinists were already dreaming of a future, in which the German race will have everywhere driven the Latin off the field.

We friends of peace have every reason for rejoicing, not in a Chauvinistic but in a large human way over a peace which has lasted twenty-five years. The common weal has evidently advanced during this long period of peace, in spite of all the burdens which it has had to bear. The people of Würtemberg alone have raised their savings account from three millions (marks) in the year 1871 to eighty millions in 1895. The national wealth has increased on both sides of the Vosges, and many a wound made by the war has healed. In spite of all possible barriers on the borders, commerce between the two nations has more and more resumed its course. The broken-down bridges have been rebuilt and the barred gates opened again. Railways stretch like longing arms from one land to the other, and do not stop even at the Vosges. German capital is invested in French enterprises and *vice versa*. The German business-man speaks with his Gallic neighbor by telegraph and telephone, and strange to say the current is not broken. The laborers on the Seine have brotherly relations with those on the Spree, and nobody can hinder them.

We would not, however, make it appear that we are of those who say, "Peace, Peace," when there is no peace. The condition in which we find ourselves does not, in the full sense of the word, deserve the name peace. I shall not repeat what might be said about the burdensome military expenses; the growing debts of the nations; the increase of the peace footing, "this emulous scramble of the nations," as Richard Grelling calls it; the building of steel-clad ships; the hellish torpedoes; and all the dreadful discoveries in the realm of instruments of destruction. All this has long been known to the readers of this magazine. Nor is it my purpose to treat in detail the question of taxes. Nevertheless it is worthy of remark, that the German pays a tax of 29 marks per capita, the Frenchman of 60. It does not follow from this that the burden for the German should be doubled, for the Frenchman, if he receives a yearly income of 600 marks, pays his 60 marks easier than the German, with a yearly income of 300 marks, pays his 29. But even if more taxes could be screwed out of our people, it is questionable whether in the long run they will consent to have this done. It would be different, if the burdens which are heaped upon them served any noble purpose; if the means which are squeezed out of them were expended for the purposes of civilization. But a sound mind will not consent always to be obliged to be saying to itself: "I must work several months in each year, that civilization may be disturbed as much as possible and as many men as possible destroyed."

But I must speak of the conditions which to-day prevent the establishment of true peace. If in Paris every year they make a procession about the statue represent-

ing the city of Strassburg in mourning and lay their crowns sorrowfully at its feet, singing at the same time, "*Vous n'aurez pas l'Alsace et la Lorraine*,"—this contributes as little towards the creation of a peaceful disposition as when in the German provinces every year, at the celebration of the victory of Sedan, patriotic speeches are delivered, flags waved and bonfires kindled. To the honor of our patriots, I am glad to believe that they no longer remember those fearful scenes which took place in Bazeilles when after cruel fighting in the streets the houses were stormed and the overpowered enemy thrown headlong on the pavements below and their brains dashed out. It is to the honor of humanity that those who take part in the celebration of the victory of Sedan do not rejoice over these bloody horrors, but only on account of the remarkable turn of events through which the fearful drama of the Franco-German war came out in our favor. Nevertheless our people should bear in mind that the celebration of a day, which our neighbors rightly remember as a day of the deepest sorrow, must work upon these rivals as a constant provocation, and as mockery and scorn. It is as if two private individuals were living in enmity towards each other, and one of them on a favorable opportunity, should strike the other down, and every year thereafter should celebrate the anniversary of his heroic deed by illuminating his house and hanging flags out of his windows. Such a course would certainly not tend to reconciliation. Recent events show how strained are the political relations of the two peoples. It is still well remembered that the German government once found it advisable to inform the representatives of the people, that in the year 1875, war seemed almost unavoidable, and that the threatening danger was turned aside only through the skill of diplomacy—a proof that this sword of Damocles will always hang, as it were by a hair, over the heads of unsuspecting peoples so long as they do not themselves have the decision of questions on which their weal and woe and the lives of thousands depend. In the year 1887 the French boundary commissioner, Schnäbele, crossed the German border for the purpose of spying out the country, was pursued by the German boundary guards and captured on French soil,—an incident which came near involving the two great civilized nations of Europe in a bloody war, on account of a single man, "Schnäbele by name." In order to prevent the disturbance of the provinces of the empire through French emissaries the *Passzwang* was enacted in 1888, through which the German government proposed to widen the chasm between the two countries, with the express purpose of having those dwelling on the other side of the Vosges considered savages. This measure certainly had no tendency to soften hostile feelings. When the Empress Friedrich, on her visit to Paris, was insulted by some rude people, on the 14th of March, 1891, in violation of the principles of guest-friendship, the pass regulation was made more rigid, until suddenly on the 21st of September, that year, it was abolished. Since that time the two countries have become somewhat more friendly, but nevertheless we have not yet reached a true peace.\* For armed peace, if you consider its real character, is a contradiction in terms, as if you should say wooden iron. And how little Alsace has become reconciled to its fate, is clearly shown by the anonymous work, "A Voice from Alsace."

\* How unsatisfactory their relations still are in some respects is seen by the system of espionage kept up on both sides. In private life such a system would be considered rascality.

The Frankfurt treaty has not been able to work out a true peace, because on the part of the French it was made, under the pressure of necessity, with a secret reservation which contradicts the primary article of the peace code which Kant wished to see in force. In this reservation our neighbors said to themselves: "As soon as we feel ourselves strong enough and opportunity offers, we will take back Alsace-Lorraine."

When will the Peace of Frankfurt become a true peace? The answer will be entirely different, according as it is given on the German or the French side. German politicians and journalists are inclined to declare that it will be "when France formally and without reservation gives up all claim to Alsace-Lorraine, when the provisions of the Frankfurt treaty shall be heartily recognized as based upon right, when our neighbors cease all agitation in favor of recovering the provinces. So long as there exists in France as little inclination as at the present time to fulfill these requirements, nothing remains for us but to keep our powder dry. Perhaps our neighbors, seeing our colossal armament, will forego the pleasure of attacking us. Possibly also in the next war the French will be beaten worse than heretofore, and then, driven to the verge of destruction, will be compelled to disarm." The answer is entirely different on the French side. The Chauvinists on the other side of the Vosges say: "Give us back Alsace-Lorraine, and you shall have the peace which you desire." On the side of the Germans it is doubted whether they would even then be content; whether they would not think revenge necessary, in order to recover their lost glory; whether they would be satisfied with anything less than the left bank of the Rhine. It is of no avail for us friends of peace to follow a policy of concealment. We must not ignore the question of Alsace-Lorraine. Here is the knot, which must be untied, not cut with the sword.

An understanding is made more difficult, because even the friends of peace of both lands, when they speak of peace, do not have the same thing in mind; because our French colleagues first wish to know that "injured justice" has been vindicated, before they can cordially take the hand which is offered them; while we, on our side, hope to reach peace and at the same time maintain the *status quo*.

Although this difference of opinion exists, yet the labor of the friends of peace on both sides is not in vain. They see themselves compelled to pursue different paths, in order to attain their object, yet they can work to each other's hand. It is useless to quarrel about the way. I well understand that our French brethren would accomplish next to nothing in their country, if they placed themselves on the basis of the recognition of the Frankfurt treaty, just as our labor, at least for the present, would be in vain, if we demanded of the German people that they should give back Alsace-Lorraine to France, or if we should, as our peace friends on the other side wish, even give the inhabitants of Alsace-Lorraine the right to decide upon their own destiny. They know only too well that these new citizens of our kingdom would take advantage of this right of self determination, quicker now than at some later date, to return to France, while we in that event could not have for our loss the comfort of even a money consideration or of some foreign colony. In spite of this difference of view, everything possible ought to be done on both sides to realize the thought that force

ought no longer to be considered superior to right, that a system of law must be established to which our peoples shall submit, that every war is a crime and a delusion, that we must constantly strive for a federation among peoples, that our goal would be virtually reached if instead of a triple alliance we had a quintuple alliance, with France and Russia included in it. Let us disseminate these our common thoughts, on both sides of the Vosges, with all the persistence and energy of which we are capable, let us create respect for our noble and eternal idea, and at last public opinion, if won for our cause, will be like a stream which breaks down all embankments, and it will carry away with it even the stones which now lie in the way of reconciliation. If the idea of federation is once thoroughly inculcated, it will create for itself the necessary forms of realization. We must proceed according to the principle that nothing worthy to live can be *made*; it must *grow*.

What shall be done next? Let us try to put ourselves in each other's place. If we Germans had lost the war of 1870-71, if our Rhine lands had been taken from us, if our villages had been burnt, the champions of our freedom shot down as criminals, our hearth-stones desecrated, our women violated, doubtless there would have burned in the hearts of the German people the same thirst for revenge as to-day rages so violently among portions of the French people. We should have been willing to hear nothing of peace with France until our Rhine possessions were given back to us. When we put ourselves in thought in the position of our western neighbors, we can understand them. But to understand means also in this instance to forgive, even though we may be far from granting that France would do well to wage a war of revenge and wrest Alsace-Lorraine from Germany by force of arms. For whoever thinks, knows that every war has in it the seed of a new war, until such a time as we place ourselves on the ground of a new principle, that of a peaceful understanding between peoples on the basis of a system of international justice. We ought more and more in our attitude over against our neighbors to employ a calm, peaceful tone. I can quite understand what Henry Bauer meant when he said in the Paris *Echo* of the 1st of April, 1895: "The Germans are just as little inclined to give us back the two provinces as we are to renounce our claim to them. Must a lasting hostility be the result of this difference? Must all the vital forces of the two nations be exhausted in preparation for a war which would work the certain and remediless destruction of one or the other of them? It seems to me foolish to think so. It would be a piece of criminal folly to expect it.

Numerous injustices are regnant in the world, which can not be rectified in a moment.

In all this we must especially keep the question clearly before us: "How shall we prepare the different peoples for peace?" Which shall we have first, a tribunal or federation? I agree with Pandolfi, who says: "Among all the ideas which we have expressed in our Conferences that of federation seems to me to be the only one suited to present conditions and capable of realization." This is true for the present at least and probably will be for a long time. If we had a tribunal now, one of two things would happen. Either it would proceed according to our recognized principles and decide, for example, according to the principle that "peoples have the inalienable and imprescriptible right freely

to dispose of themselves" (Gaston Moch, *Révision du traité de Francfort*)—what would be the result? Europe would be plunged into incredible confusion. The Polish, Baltic, Schleswig-Holstein, Hannoverian, Alsace-Lorraine, and Irish questions would immediately demand solution. Austria, with her conglomeration of peoples of many types, would be riven to her centre. The Balkan region would be on fire. The tribunal would pronounce its decision, and declare the uprisen peoples free. But the decision would fail because of the invincible opposition of the governments. Or on the other hand, the tribunal would sanction the *status quo*, and declare that it would not meddle with the boundaries which have become established. But under present conditions, who will assure that in that event Alsace-Lorraine would not raise its head next morning, in order to shake from its neck the yoke of Germany, and that the following day France and perhaps Russia would not show their hand? If this possibility should be realized, we should at once have a new international conflict. How would the tribunal decide it? France, I assume, would step forward as accuser and say: "Alsace-Lorraine is flesh of my flesh and bone of my bone. It lived with me through more than two hundred years of history. It endured with me the world-disturbing upheaval of the French Revolution. It is French in life, thought and manners. Then came Germany, and with brutal force of arms, according to the barbaric law of conquest, tore the children from the arms of their mother. France wants her children back." Germany lifts her head and says: "France forgets what went before. Alsace was taken from me in time of peace by a robber king. Those are my children, as may be seen from the language which they speak. I have only taken back what was taken from me. Besides, that was a righteous contest which I had to go through in 1870. For it was France, which I had not injured, that declared war without any cause and threatened my peaceful provinces. If I drew the sword, it was only to defend my hearthstone." What would the tribunal say in this case? Perhaps it would keep back its decision for an indefinite time. I might offer it a Solomonian judgment ready made, something like this: "Alsace-Lorraine was French for more than 200 years and during this time became so essentially French that it entirely forgot its German origin. We will now let Germany have it 200 years. After this long period perhaps it will have become thoroughly German. If not, it may then go whither it will." I mean this as more than a joke. I can not on this point agree with Franz Wirth, who in his pamphlet, "Alsace and France," expresses the hope that in twenty years the Germanization of Alsace-Lorraine will be complete, just as the Rhine provinces accepted Prussian rule after twenty years. On the contrary, it must be remembered that the Rhine provinces were already naturally much more like the Prussian people than the provinces connected for two hundred years with France can possibly be like the German people of the present time. Moreover, the development of peoples is not measured by decades, but by centuries. We must then be very patient on both sides.

The conclusion of all this seems to me to be that we should not begin with the thought of a tribunal. Of course even now a tribunal may do wholesome service. It has already shown itself eminently practicable in many cases, the number of which may be constantly increased. But it is not of a nature, in the *beginning* of the develop-

ment before us, to be placed at the head of the new juridical order of Europe. Rather I think is a federation of peoples the healthy stock, the ripe fruit of which will be an international tribunal.

But on what basis ought the European states to form a federation? I see no other way than that of the mutual guarantee of their present possessions.\* It might be asked whether injustice would not thereby be sanctioned. We shall do well not to use the words justice and injustice in a formal juridic sense only. I grant that the partition of Poland, considered in a formal juridic way, was an injustice. Yet, according to Schiller's pregnant saying, "The history of the world is the world's tribunal," this partition was historically an act of justice. A people which can not govern itself has before the judgment-seat of history forfeited the right of self-direction. Considered in a formal juridic way, it may appear injustice that Alsace-Lorraine was taken by force of arms in the war of 1870-71; historically considered it was the nemesis of events, which visits the sins of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation. Considered in a formal juridic way, every conquest is an act of injustice, and in the future such injustice must disappear from the world, although we can not, for instance, for a long time yet get along without certain colonial enterprises. Historically considered, all states arose out of conquest, and in most cases—not in all—it can be said that the morally weaker people was obliged to give way before that which was morally stronger and better fitted for historical progress. In these things, then, in the history of the world it may be said that a world's tribunal has been rendering its decisions.

But apart also from this historico-juridical consideration, it will be the part of prudence for Europe, in forming a confederation, to guarantee to leave present possessions undisturbed, to leave all the skeletons in their closets. I think, finally, that it is the moral duty of even the subject peoples, to make it clear to their own thought that the freedom which they long for is not worth the monstrous price of a European conflagration; that in spite of all the censure which we may cast upon our governments to-day, yet we live in relatively well ordered relations. Subject peoples are no longer as in former times driven to despair by tyrannous treatment. You do not hear of men being hewn to pieces, women and children led away into captivity, and all that is held sacred desecrated.

It is self-evident to us friends of peace that rights historically founded should be enlarged and corrected by the standard of common law, and of those eternal natural rights which man, who refuses to wear the chains of slavery, brings down from the stars, to use Schiller's splendid expression. But if the peoples, as they now are, are to be brought to accept peace, we must not demand too much of them. We must look at them according to their historic antecedents and be slow to disturb these.

When once the peoples of Europe, possessed of these principles, take each other by the hand, they will not be able to do otherwise than recognize present boundaries as rightly existing. The weighty principle quoted above, "Peoples have the inalienable and imprescriptible right

\* I mean a guarantee against attack by war; not against changes and new arrangements peacefully agreed to on both sides. There must be a free field for development, for the natural onflow of events.

freely to dispose of themselves," would of course in that event not be applied to separate portions of states, but only to these states in their entirety. But when, as is to be hoped, the eternal right of human nature,—the right to a worthy human existence,—shall come to be more perfectly established in all European states, the difference between conquerors and conquered, between the ruling and the subject peoples, will disappear, and therewith many a question, which still to-day troubles our minds like a perplexing riddle, will naturally solve itself.

But since it will be possible for differences between particular nations to arise after a federation has been formed, it will be well for the European states to erect a tribunal or such cases. In that event "the United States of Europe" would have to bind themselves to submit unreservedly to its decisions. The tribunal, on its side, would have to hold inviolate the principle that existing boundaries should not be disturbed, that the states should have perfect self-government just as they have had, all forceful interference in their internal arrangements being excluded, and that only in their relations to one another should they be obliged to submit to the decisions of the tribunal. With questions of internal concern this high tribunal would not have to do in a judicial way. It would be entitled, however, morally to intervene; for instance, it might use its influence to relieve the lot of the Sicilians, of the Baltic provinces, and as far as might be needful of Alsace-Lorraine also. When we reach this point, I think it not improbable that some sort of autonomy would be granted to the inhabitants of Alsace-Lorraine within the German empire under the form of a personal union with the Emperor.\*

The chief thing is that reason should have the victory over old prejudices and narrow selfishness. Peoples will become convinced that any injustice which may have been done them can be righted only in a moral and juridic way, and not by rude violence; nay more, that if war shall be declared and cannon brought out, they will run the risk of losing not simply the object of their contention, but their independence also and possibly in a certain sense their very existence; that therefore the object for which they are contending is not worth such a venture. As soon as the truth is firmly grasped that peace is worth more than the most beautiful province, arms will drop away of their own accord; and then will the Peace of Frankfurt become that for which mankind in the deepest depths of its soul longs,—ETERNAL PEACE.

\* Herman Fried, in his book "Alsace-Lorraine and War," has declared that every proposed solution of the question is inadequate, as none of them would bring about the desired result. He is of opinion that this Alsace-Lorraine stumbling block is to be gotten over by a high idealism. In certain cases his plan of simply letting the matter alone may be allowable. This is my way of dealing with dogmatic differences. But here we have to deal not simply with something scholastic, but with the stubborn reality of actual contradictions. These we must look at exactly as they are, and seek a solution in a realistic way with constant regard to historic antecedents. I must not omit to remark also that I thoroughly sympathize with the idea of the civilizing and reconciling influence of an intellectual and spiritual communion between France and Germany.

Clara Barton has returned to this country. She was given a reception in Washington on her return. Her helpers remain in Armenia distributing relief. She has come back to try to create deeper interest in the distress caused by Turkish cruelties. Cheerful and generous response ought to be made to her appeals.

The insurrection in the Philippine Islands continues. Spain has so far been unable successfully to cope with it.

AN ESSAY TOWARDS THE PRESENT AND FUTURE PEACE OF EUROPE, BY THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN EUROPEAN DYET, PARLIAMENT, OR ESTATES.

BY WILLIAM PENN.

Published in the year 1693-94.

*Beati Pacifici. Cedant arma togæ.*

TO THE READER.

READER,

*I have undertaken a Subject that I am very sensible requires one of more sufficiency than I am Master of to treat it, as, in Truth, it deserves, and the groaning State of Europe calls for; but since Bunglers may Stumble upon the Game, as well as Masters, though it belongs to the Skilful to hunt and catch it, I hope this Essay will not be charged upon me for a Fault, if it appear to be neither Chimerical nor Injurious, and may provoke abler Pens to improve and perform the Design with better Judgment and Success. I will say no more in Excuse of myself, for this Undertaking, but that it is the Fruit of my solicitous Thoughts, for the Peace of Europe, and they must want Charity as much as the world needs Quiet, to be offended with me for so Pacifick a Proposal. Let them censure my Management, so they prosecute the Advantage of the Design; for 'till the Millenary Doctrine be accomplished, there is nothing appears to me so beneficial an Expedient to the Peace and Happiness of this Quarter of the World.*

AN ESSAY TOWARDS THE PRESENT AND FUTURE PEACE OF EUROPE, &C.

SECT. I. *Of Peace, and its Advantages.*

He must not be a Man but a Statue of Brass or Stone, whose Bowels do not melt when he beholds the bloody *Tragedies* of this War, in *Hungary, Germany, Flanders, Ireland*, and at Sea: The Mortality of sickly and languishing Camps and Navies, and the mighty prey the Devouring Winds and Waves have made upon Ships and Men since 88. And as this with Reason ought to affect human Nature, and deeply Kindred, so there is something very moving that becomes prudent Men to consider, and that is the vast Charge that has accompanied that Blood, and which makes no mean Part of these *Tragedies*; Especially if they deliberate upon the uncertainty of the War, that they know not how or when it will end, and that the Expense cannot be less, and the Hazard is as great as before. So that in the Contraries of Peace we see the Beauties and Benefits of it; which under it, such is the Unhappiness of Mankind, we are too apt to nauseate, as the full Stomach loaths the Honey-Comb; and like that unfortunate Gentleman, that having a fine and a good Woman to his Wife, and searching his Pleasure in forbidden and less agreeable Company, said, when reproach'd with his Neglect of better Enjoyments, *That he could love his Wife of all Women, if she were not his Wife*, tho' that increased his Obligation to prefer her. It is a great Mark of the Corruption of our Natures, and what ought to humble us extremely, and excite the Exercise of our Reason to a nobler and juster Sense, that we cannot see the Use and Pleasure of our Comforts but by the Want of them. As if we could not taste the Benefit of